4049

OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

Mc.G.

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

FOURTH SESSION—TENTH PARLIAMENT

7-8 EDWARD VII., 1907-8

VOL. LXXXVIII

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE SIXTH DAY OF JULY TO THE TWENTIETH DAY OF JULY, INCLUSIVE.

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

House of Commons Debates

FOURTH SESSION—TENTH PARLIAMENT

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, July 6, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I promised the House the other day that I would state to-day the remaining programme for the session. I expected at that time that we should have an opportunity for conference on Saturday evening, when I should be able to arrange with my colleagues as to the programme. But the House was in the humour to work on Saturday evening, so there was not the opportunity for that conference. I will make a statement on the subject this afternoon.

COST OF THE TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). I desire to submit certain information respecting the Transcontinental and Grand Trunk Pacific Railways.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton). As this information is in response to no motion made in the House, I would suggest to the Minister of Railways and Canals, that he might move for leave to lay it on the table so that it can be formally before us and be made part of the records of this House.

Mr. GRAHAM. I move for leave accordingly, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). May I ask if there is any probability of our getting a later report of the commission. The minister has laid on the table the printed report of the commission which covers down to March 31, 1907. It seems to me the commission has not harmed itself by over-exertion in getting out its reports, considering that it is one year and several months behind time. Cannot it make up by getting out last year's report before parliament rises ? Is it nearly ready now, or wholly ready ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have not heard anything about the report being made. Of course, conditions this year are peculiar. The House is in session away beyond the ordinary time of closing, and the report we were supposed to discuss this session is the one already before the House. I am trying to get information down to date as nearly as possible. I have not heard as to the position in relation to the report, but I will make inquiries.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When the report does come down, it might be so framed as to give a good deal more information than does the report which has been laid on the table. There is a remarkable lack of information on many points in the commission's report ; and I should think the leisure at their command would enable them to make a report much more satisfactory.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS.

YUKON—PUBLIC ADMINISTRATOR.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. What, if any, steps have been taken to have an investigation into an audit of the account involved in the estates and trusts that came into the hands of F. T. Congdon, as public administrator in the Yukon?

2. Will the government lay on the table of the House a list of these estates and trusts with the disposition made of the same?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. The matter of the audit of the account involved in the settlement of estates and trusts by the Public Administrator is one which under the law comes within the jurisdiction of the Yukon Territorial Court. There is no information here as to any steps having been taken by the commissioner to have such an audit made.

2. Yes. To the courts of the Yukon territory, where they are of record, will furnish them.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—CLASSIFICATION, DISTRICTS 'B' AND 'F.'

Mr. LENNOX asked:

Referring to letters of October 7, 1907, and April 28, 1908, from Mr. H. A. Woods, assistant chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, to Mr. Lumsden, chief engineer of the eastern division of the National Transcontinental Railway, in the latter of which Mr. Woods says:

'Dear Sir,—This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of April 24, in regard to classifications given on districts "B" and "F," wherein you say you could confer with me, either in Ottawa or Montreal, so as to arrange dates for arbitrating the points in dispute and for the appointment of a third arbitrator, &c.

'In reply thereto, will say that the action you propose cannot be taken until after you have complied with my request of October 7, which, as you will recall, has been several times repeated, that you and I personally make an inspection of those portions of the work on districts "B" and "F" where it is claimed improper classifiation has been made.

'Kindly let me know when it will be convenient for you to make this inspection, and I will place myself at your disposal.'

Have Mr. Lumsden and Mr. Woods personally inspected the portions of the railway referred to since April 28 last? If so, when and with what result? If not, why not?

Mr. LENNOX asked

1. Have the matters and questions respecting alleged over-classification on portions of the eastern division of the National Transcontinental Railway complained of in a letter of October 7, 1907, and subsequent letters, from Mr. H. A. Woods, assistant chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, to Mr. H. D. Lumsden, chief engineer of the eastern division. been referred to arbitration under the provisions of paragraphs 7 and 4 of the agreement, a copy of which forms the schedule to the National Transcontinental Railway Act If so, who are the three arbitrators?

2. When and how was the third arbitrator chosen or appointed?

3. When did the arbitrators enter upon their duties, and what progress have they made?

4. Where are the proceedings being carried on?

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). The answer will cover both these questions: Mr. Lumsden, chief engineer of the Transcontinental Railway Commission and Mr. Woods, assistant chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company have made an inspection of disputed cuttings in district 'F,' and are now engaged in inspecting similar disputed classification in district 'B,' as provided by paragraph 7 of the agreement, being the schedule to the National Transcontinental Railway Act. Their inspection not being yet completed they have made no report and matters have not yet reached the stage where the appointment of a third arbitrator is necessary.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—TIES.

Mr. STANFIELD asked:

1. Have new orders been issued respecting the delivery of ties upon the Intercolonial Railway?

2. What time limit has been set for delivery of ties for this year?

3. Has any change been made in inspection making two classes of ties as to quality?

4. What prices are being paid for the several classes of ties?

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

1. The time named in specification for delivery of ties was June 30, 1908, and notice was issued on June 16, 1908, that hemlock ties would not be accepted after that date.

2. The time limit set for the delivery of ties this year is June 30, 1908, as per classification.

3. No.

4. Prices paid for ties for the government railways are as follows: 30 cents each for hemlock, 36 cents each for cedar, Princess pine, tamarack and juniper. The railway also paid 30 cents each for hardwood ties in Cape Breton and 30 cents each for some white pine and black spruce ties in the northern part of New Brunswick.

CANADIAN ASSOCIATED PRESS.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance moved that the House go into Committee of the Whole to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to continue for a further period the granting of aid towards the maintenance of an independent and efficient service of telegraphic news from Great Britain for publication in the Canadian press, and that for such purpose it is expedient to provide for the payment of a sum not exceeding $9,000 for the period from July 1, 1908, to March 31, 1909, both days inclusive; for the payment of a sum not exceeding $12,000 for the fiscal year terminating March 31, 1910; and for the payment of a sum not exceeding three thousand dollars for the period from April 1, 1910, to June 30, 1910, both days inclusive.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General, having been acquainted with the subject matter of this resolution recommends it to the consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY—HARMONY-ELMIRA BRANCH.

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved that the House go into Committee of the Whole to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to provide that the Minister of Railways and Canals may, with the authority of the Governor in Council, construct a branch line railway from Harmony, on the Souris branch of the Prince Edward Island Railway, to Elmira, in Kings county.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General having been appraised of the subject matter of this resolution gives his assent thereto.

Motion agreed to.

GEORGIAN BAY CANAL—REPORT.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). While perhaps I may be out of order, the House will allow me, pending the completion of the Georgian bay canal report, now to report a complete detailed estimate of the cost of the proposed undertaking, accompanied by the plans illustrative of the project in its main features, prepared by Mr. A. St. Laurent, who has had direction of the survey; also of certain additional plans of the proposed work.

GOVERNMENT ANNUITIES.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved the third reading of Bill (No. 120) to authorize the issue of government annuities for old age.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I move that the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole House with instructions to insert the following as new section 6, and to renumber the later sections accordingly:

6. Any such person who has moneys sufficient for the purpose deposited in any post office savings bank, may, upon making demand in such form as is prescribed in that behalf by the Postmaster General, authorize the Postmaster General to transfer to the minister any sum which such person may desire to apply to the purchase of an annuity under this Act.

2. Any society or association of persons, being a body corporate for fraternal, benevolent, religious or other lawful purposes, may contract with His Majesty, on behalf of such of its members as are domiciled in Canada, for the sale to such members of annuities, otherwise purchaseable by them as individuals under this Act; and any sums of money necessary to the carrying out of the aforesaid object may be paid by such society or association direct to the minister, or may be deposited in any post office savings bank, to be transferred by the Postmaster General to the minister.

2. Employers of labour may, pursuant to agreement entered into with their employees in that behalf, such agreement to be of a form approved by the minister, contract with His Majesty for the sale to such of their said employees as are domiciled in Canada, of annuities otherwise purchasable by such employees as individuals under this Act; and any sum of money necessary to the carrying out of the aforesaid object, whether such sums be derived from the wages of the employees solely, or partly from the wages of the employees and partly from contributions of the employers or from contributions of the employers solely, may be paid by such employers direct to the minister, or may be deposited in any post office savings bank to be transferred by the Postmaster General to the minister: provided that any sums so paid shall in any event be held for the exclusive account of the persons in whose names they were deposited, respectively.

I may say in explanation, that the object of this amendment is, first, to make it possible for depositors in the post office savings bank to transfer their accounts, or any amount of their accounts, to the minister for the purchase of annuities. The second provision is to make a provision whereby friendly and fraternal associations and religious organizations may make arrangements for the purchase of annuities for the benefit of any of their members. The third provision is to make it possible for employers of labour and their employees to enter into a contract for the purchase of annuities for the employees, such annuities of course to be taken out in favour of the working men themselves. I think the House will agree, when we get into committee, to the insertion of these provisions in the Act, which I think will be of great benefit to the classes of people mentioned.

Amendment agreed to, and Bill considered in committee and reported with amendment.

Mr. FIELDING. The law clerk may be relied upon to make the necessary changes in the renumbering of the sections. I move that the Bill be now read a third time.

Mr. SPROULE. I would ask whether the provision allowing fraternal societies to take advantage of the Bill, means incorporated or unincorporated bodies. There are certain societies under letters patent of corporation, and others are not. Would it apply equally to both?

Mr. FIELDING. The section says 'any society or association of persons being a body corporate.' They require to be incorporated bodies.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

LEAD BOUNTIES.

Mr. FIELDING moved the third reading of Bill (No. 191) respecting the payment of bounties on lead contained in lead-carrying ores mined in Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Bill is read the third time I desire to make a short statement. When the Bill was in committee I asked the minister for certain information.

What I wanted to get at was briefly this: A large sum of money has been paid out in the shape of bounties for the production of lead, almost entirely in the province of British Columbia pursuant to a policy adopted some years ago and still adhered to. I wanted to get the amount of lead production by the several producers in British Columbia for each year during which the bounty has been effective and also the amount of lead on which they have been paid the bounty, and the amount of the bounty paid to each of these producers each year. The information which has been brought down does not give the amount of lead produced by these producers each year, it simply gives the amount upon which they were paid bounty, but of course the House sees in a moment that this is very different from the amount they produced. My object in asking for the amount paid each year by each of these producers was that we might see whether the policy had had the effect of stimulating the industry, whether it had grown under the application of the bounty. Inasmuch as these figures are not given, the lesson cannot be deduced. All that the House knows is simply that these producers in British Columbia, and to a small extent in Ontario, were paid so much each year but as there were years during which they were paid no bounty and may have been parts of each year for several years in which they were paid no bounty, the information as I said is not given which would enable us to make any inference as to the effect on the production of ore of the payment of the bounty.

I should have thought that the government when they started on a policy of stimulating the production of lead in British Columbia would have been anxious to have had all the elements of information necessary to prove to them whether their policy had resulted in doing what it was aimed to do and had really helped the industry to a further development. I would suggest to the minister now that from this time on he should require from every lead producer in British Columbia a return as to the total amount of lead produced by him during each year. Then at the end of the period which is set by this Act we may have the elements which are lacking now.

However, we glean something from the statement which has been brought down. We find that there were 147 producers who received a greater or less payment. But 112 of these received a very small amount indeed, an amount so small that one can scarcely believe that it had any effect whatever in helping the industry. When you also take into account that these payments, small as they were were in a great majority of cases for only one year and commonly the first year, 1903-4, it will be seen still more plainly how slight an effect the bounty must have had with reference to production so far as these producers were concerned. For instance the Sandon Sovereign was paid a bounty in the whole five years of only $260.57 and that entirely in the first year, 1903-4. The 'Province' received only $539 during those five years and that also in the first year. The Echo received only $129; the Netty L. $391; the Florida $137; the Mohican $36.70; the Gold Bug $1.71; the Horseshoe $34.44; the Bosun $528.66. All of these received this whole payment in the first year 1903-4 and received nothing thereafter, indicating I should think, inasmuch as other producers are paid bounty during the other years, that these had ceased producing after the year 1903-4. Then we have the Wilcox which received about $500 in the five years, the first year receiving $584, the second year $19.88 and none thereafter, indicating that it had ceased producing after 1904-5. The Bonnie Bell received $27.38 in 1904-5, and none in any other year. The Bounty received $5.46 in 1904-5 and none in any other year; the Baltimore received $22 in all during the two years 1904-5, 1905-6; the Helen received only $45 in all; the Evening Star received only $21.74 in all; the California received $367.41; the Rambler received $11.82; the Revenue received $37.06; the Highlander $93.62; the Montezuma $84.14; the Queen $22.48; the E. P. U. $72.58; the Arlington $163.27; the British Columbia and Tilbury $50.30; the Krao $348.69, and that in one single year; the Neepawa received very small amounts, about $100 in all; the Pontiac received about $180 in all; the No. 1 Mine received $29 in all; the Daniel received $28.82 in all; the Silver Bell received $39.88 in all; the Wonderful Group received $86 and $79 in two different years and none thereafter; the Blue Bell received $95.52, all in 1905-6; the Coronado received $14.36; the I. X. L. received about $78; the Delphine received about $350; the Noble Five received $6.93 in five years; the Lorna Doon received about $200 in the five years; the Whitewater Deep received $95.44 in the first year and none thereafter, until in the last year it received $1,022.54; the Waverley received $11.74 in all; the Eva, $7.96; the Elkhorn No. 2, $26.84 and so on with a large number of others, making in all a total of 112 of these producers which received these very small amounts, and commonly in the first and second years that the bounty was in effect.

Then we come to twenty-nine producers which received sums of money for bounty irregularly through the different years to a larger amount, producing 100,000 pounds and upwards of ore. Then we come to the six large producers, the Highland Kootenay which produced in the first year 4,941,075 pounds and received a subsidy or bounty of $37,058.05 and in the second year produced 720,561 pounds, receiving a bounty of $5,-

404.21 and thereafter in 1905-6,1906-7 and 1907-8 seems to have produced nothing, at least nothing is down here in these years whilst other mines producing have received bounties.

Then there is the Ivanhoe and Elgin which produced 1,240,834 pounds in 1903-4, and received $9,306.23 bounty; 1,081,677 pounds in 1904-5 and received $7,630.01 in bounty, but thereafter seems to have produced nothing for bounty purposes, and by inference not to have produced, as other mines in the succeeding three years received bounties on ore produced.

The North Star produced 2,349,647 pounds in 1903-4, and received a bounty of $17,-622.35; 2,394,432 pounds in 1904-5 and received a bounty of $17,363.21. The production then went down to 471,691 pounds in 1905 with a bounty of $368.36, none in 1906-7 and 523,102 pounds in 1907-8 on which a bounty of $1,927.29 was received.

The Payne produced in 1903-4 1,430,819 pounds on which it received a bounty of $10,731.14; in 1904-5 764,448 pounds, on which $5,559.52 bounty was received; in 1905-6 176,472 pounds on which a bounty of $634.66 was received, thereafter showing no return for bounties.

Another large producer was the Slocan Star which produced in 1903-4 1,407,269 pounds, receiving a bounty of $10,629.52; in 1904-5 1,722,581 pounds, receiving a bounty of $12,352.29; in 1905-6 553,825 pounds, receiving a bounty of $2,399.63; in 1906-7 no production and no bounty and in 1907-8 73,546 pounds on which a bounty of $59.40 was received.

The last and greatest producer was the St. Eugene which produced in 1903-4 3,429,-608 pounds, on which it received a bounty of $25,722.06; in 1904-5 16,449,431 on which it received a bounty of $117,039.70; in 1905-6 16,038,487 pounds on which it received a bounty of $48,450.37; in 1906-7 there was no production for bounty, and in 1907-8 8,927,-864, on which a bounty of $29,425.41 was received. The St. Eugene exported in 1903-4 2,267,614 pounds of lead on which it received a bounty of $11,328.07; in 1904-5 it exported 21,972,998 pounds of lead on which it received a bounty of $96,800.59. There have been no exports of lead from that mine since on which bounty was paid. That lead seems to have gone from the mine at first hand instead of going to the smelters. What method the government had of testing that I do not know.

Therefore it will be seen as a short resume of the information we have in this return, that it is altogether illusory to say that 147 producers were in the field during that time and benefited by the bounty, illusory I mean as far as showing any permanent or general results of the bounty. Twenty-nine mines did fairly well being small producers, but, according to the figures here, showing no distinct increase in production whilst six of the largest producers and notably amongst them the St. Eugene, appear to have absorbed nearly all of the bounty and to have produced, of course, nearly all of the lead. It is unfortunate that we have not had before us the actual production of these different producers for each year because there is a flaw in the argument and in the contention since that information is not given. However it does not seem to me that the peddling out of little sums from $6 to $500 for a period of five years to small producers does very much towards developing the lead industry or goes very far towards proving that this policy has been or is to-day advantageous. It would seem that such little dribbling payments have only the effect of taking the money out of the treasury but very little effect indeed in stimulating a great industry.

As to the imports and exports, I find that in 1904 there were imported into this country 9,512,400 pounds of lead, pig, scrap and block, of a value of $122,790, against a production of lead in that year of 26,-748,000 pounds. In that year there was exported of lead, pig, scrap and block, 42,410 pounds according to these figures, at a value of $997. If that be correct, it would seem that our production was twenty-seven million pounds, that our imports were nine and a half million pounds, and that the total exports were only 42,000 pounds. I have not here the information which I asked for of the importation of products of lead. In 1905 the imports of lead were 5,691,000 pounds, valued at $133,-340; the exports were 1,090,462 pounds, valued at $28,523; whilst the production of lead was 56,489,523 pounds, valued at $331,274. In 1906 the total imports were 8,272,900 pounds, valued at $271,105; the exports were 3,477,898 pounds, valued at $118,972; and the total production of lead upon which bounty was paid was 28,708,-428 pounds, valued at $90,196. In 1907, in the nine months, the imports were 8,404,600 pounds, valued at $293,453; the exports were 153,580 pounds, valued at $5,886; whilst the total production upon which bounty was paid was 21,479 pounds. In 1908 the quantity imported was 6,400,700 pounds, valued at $284,642, and the amount exported was 9,089,752 pounds, valued at $362,428. These figures are very unsatisfactory, because, in the first place, they give the amount of lead only, not the ore, upon which the bounty was paid. They do not give the total production of lead, whilst in the imports and the exports we have the amount of lead in pig, scrap and block. I thought it was well to put these figures where they would become ready for reference, in 'Hansard,' and to call the attention of the Finance Minister to the gap in the information, which I think he will admit the desirability of having filled during

the succeeding years, so that we may have the statistics of the whole production as well as those of that part of the production which applied for bounty and on which the bounty was paid. After reading these figures, I desire to emphasize the opinion which I expressed before, that the proper way to develop lead production in this country is to develop the lead industry; and I do not think that can be developed unless we give it an adequate and thorough protection, as we have tried to do in the case of the iron of the country; and that can be done, I think, only by the imposition of a proper and adequate customs duty on the products of lead. Then an impetus will be given which will be longer than simply for the year in which the bounty is given. It will secure a market for the lead producers of the country and in a permanent and, therefore, satisfactory form. The minister has come to the rescue of this industry, because he believes that it is proper to do so—that the industry requires it. The woollen industry has been before the Finance Minister, and is to-day before the Finance Minister, practically a ruined industry in this country—certainly an industry which will be ruined if some adequate help is not given to it. But neither the Finance Minister nor the government has raised a finger to enable the woollen industry to resuscitate itself and bring itself back to its former position of larger development—an industry which is of vital importance to this country, and in which, not only the manufacturers, but the consumers, including the farmers, are interested.

Mr. GALLIHER. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for North Toronto has just said that the figures of the amount of lead produced in each of the years in which bounty has been paid have not been given. If my recollection serves me rightly, I quoted those figures in discussing this question in committee, and I think they are in 'Hansard,' starting with a production of some 6,000 tons in 1903 and increasing to 26,000 or 27,000 tons in 1905, 1906 and 1907.

Mr. FOSTER. That was the number of tons in gross—not from each producer.

Mr. GALLIHER. Of course, I have not the number of tons produced by each producer. Considerable stress has been laid by the hon. gentleman on the fact that some of these 147 producing mines spoken of have drawn very little bounty. That is quite true and to a person unacquainted with the vagaries, if I may say so, of mining, it would appear that the hon. gentleman might very well make the remark he did. I am not an expert in mining, but from some years residence in the mining country, I have acquired some knowledge of the nature of mining there; and so far as my knowledge extends, many of these properties which have received small sums of money were mere prospects. A prospect, as we all know, is an undeveloped mine—a mine that has not yet been proved; and a number of these, after a certain amount of work, proved not to contain mineral in sufficient value to warrant the owners in working them and were consequently dropped. I have no doubt that among these 147 mines some were of that nature. If we had 147 producing mines of the calibre of the Slocan, Star or the St. Eugene or the Highland, our little $500,000 a year would not last very long. Everything that tends to bring about better knowledge of the existing conditions of properties taken up as mining properties, helps to develop that particular mining industry. When I prove beyond question that it is useless to go on spending money on what we term a prospect, we cast that to one side and no longer depend on it. As regards the mines which are large producers, such as some of the older ones mentioned by my hon. friend, they maintain a considerable community of people. Take one instance which my hon. friend has given, the Blue Bell mine. That is a very old mine, it was worked a number of years, and a smelter was built in connection with it at Pilot bay. But for many years it was not worked at all, one reason being that there was a great deal of zinc in its contents. That Blue Bell mine has only drawn $95 bounty in the five years, but let me point out that since this bounty was brought into force and since we have had the assurance that it will be continued, something like a quarter of a million dollars has been expended by the company in the erection of reduction works and machinery for development. Although the mine has only received a very small grant because it was not producing, the fact that the owners knew they could depend on the bounty when they did produce was sufficient to induce them to spend a quarter of a million dollars in developing it. I did not wish to go into this matter at any length further than to point out that while probably a comparatively small number of mines, when we take them all into consideration, are shown as having received bounties to any considerable extent, yet the industry itself, and the people who are operating it, the boards of trade throughout the country and the community in general, are unanimous in the belief that the bounty has been a great advantage to that industry and that its continuance will prove further advantage to the development of lead mining in British Columbia.

Bill read the third time and passed.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY HOTEL SITE, OTTAWA.

Bill (No. 89) to authorize the sale to the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada of a por-

tion of Major's Hill Park in the city of Ottawa as a hotel site—Mr. Pugsley—read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was understood that when the Bill came up for consideration in committee, I would produce the plans of the proposed hotel, and I now lay them on the table. The Bill ratifies the order in council which was passed containing the agreement between the government and the company. It provides also that the price of the land, which is $100,000, shall be paid over by the government to the Ottawa Improvement Commission, to be expended upon improvements under the direction of the Governor in Council. Before the Bill passes, I beg to propose the following amendment:

That the following section be added:
Provided, however, that if the Grand Trunk Railway Company so requests, the conveyance of the said land may be made to the Ottawa Terminals Railway Company.

The Grand Trunk Railway proposes to place the property, consisting of railway station and hotel, in the name of a subordinate company, which was incorporated by Act of this House for the purpose of holding these properties. The matter was fully discussed on the first reading, and I do not know that I need explain the plans further than to say it is intended to erect a six story building.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the total height?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Apart from the towers, the height will be about 100 feet. There are to be five floors above ground, in addition to the attic floor, and also a basement and sub-basement.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the dimensions?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I presume it is pretty nearly the size of the lot of land that has been arranged for. The land extends 285 feet on the canal basin and 135 feet on Rideau street. The basement plan which is here shows the shape of the building. Extending from the side of the canal, at the rear, the land is 66 feet in width. Then it extends parallel to the canal basin 205 feet 3 inches, and then running parallel to Rideau street 86 feet 6 inches. My information is that there is to be a subway running from the station into the basement of the hotel, and of course, elevators to the higher floors.

Mr. FOSTER. And an entrance to the hotel from Rideau street on the ground floor?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that entrance on their own ground?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. There is also an entrance on the side facing the canal basin. On the side facing Mackenzie avenue there is a terrace and entrance direct from the terrace.

Mr. HAGGART. There is no entrance on the side next Mackenzie avenue?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No entrance from the avenue itself.

Mr. LENNOX. Is there no entrance from the park to the hotel?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This being a public park, I presume there will be an opportunity for guests of the hotel to reach the park and for the people from the park to enter the hotel.

Mr. BENNETT. That is only a question of not having a fence.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Can the minister tell us the total amount the Grand Trunk will spend upon the hotel?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot tell, except from statements I have seen in the newspapers. I have seen, as, no doubt, members generally have seen, that lengthy negotiations have been going on between the City Council of Ottawa and the Grand Trunk Railway Company over the plans of the hotel and station. Plans have been approved by the City Council, and a few days ago I was informed by his worship the mayor that an agreement had been entered into in accordance with the resolutions of the city council. I have seen it stated that the hotel is to cost somewhere in the neighbourhood of $1,500,000.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Has the government no definite knowledge before entering into this arrangement with the Grand Trunk?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This Bill ratifies the order in council, and the plans and specifications are to be approved by the Governor in Council. So that, passing this Bill will not conclude the matter, but the plans will then come formally before the government for approval.

Mr. LENNOX. What clause of the order in council is that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. On page 2 of the order in council, the hon. gentleman will find this:

The minister also recommends one condition of the grant to the railway, that the hotel shall be constructed within two years from the date of said grant, such construction to be in accordance with plans approved by the government of Canada.

Mr. BENNETT. Is not a minimum expenditure guaranteed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not aware as to that.

Mr. BENNETT. Then, so long as it suits the city and the government the contract

will go, even though the cost is only $100,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend may rely upon it that the government will not approve these plans unless they provide for a first-class hotel.

Mr. BENNETT. At what expenditure?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The plans show a splendid structure, one which will be an ornament and a credit to the city.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Has the minister any knowledge of what the government intend to exact from the Grand Trunk in the way of an expenditure on this hotel?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot say further than this: I believe that the plans which have been approved by the city will also be approved by the Governor in Council, although I am not able to speak definitely on that point. If, on examination, it was thought by the government that there were any changes necessary, those changes would be insisted upon. But I have looked the plans over, and, speaking only for myself, I believe that if these plans are carried out the hotel as I have said will be such as will be a credit and an ornament to the city.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Does the government guarantee to carry out the plans?

Mr. PUGSLEY. These are the plans.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. They guarantee to carry them out?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Of course. That is the agreement with the city; and, when it comes to council, we would make that a stipulation—that the building should be in accordance with these plans.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. And that will necessitate the expenditure of a million and a half?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is what I have understood.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Bill is passed, does not the minister think that he ought to tell the committee what is the view of the government as to the expenditure that will be necessary? Surely he does not think that he will get his Bill through unless he pledges the government in some way to a minimum expenditure, that it should not be below a minimum expenditure. As it is, the minister has nothing but hearsay, what he saw in the newspapers, and what he believes will be the case. But his order in council gives absolute power to the government to say whether it shall be a hundred thousand building or a million building. We must have some statement of the policy of the government with reference to it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think it would be extremely foolish on our part to insist that there shall be an expenditure of a million and a half, or a million, or four hundred thousand. If we get a building of this design, upon these plans which have been approved by the city council of Ottawa, which has devoted a great deal of consideration to the subject, would it not be an absurd thing for us to say to them: Although the building is erected upon these designs, although these plans are fully carried out, yet unless it actually costs $1,500,000 the grant shall lapse. What we will stipulate is that the Grand Trunk Railway shall erect a building according to these plans and according to the specifications, and as at present advised, I would assume that the government is likely to approve of the plans and specifications which have been agreed upon by the city. My information is that this building will cost in the vicinity of $1,500,000. If any member of the committee will look at these plans he will see that they provide for a very expensive and a very handsome building, which will give a large hotel accommodation. That being so, it seems to me it would be absurd for us to put in a provision that the building must cost exactly a certain sum of money, and that if it costs one dollar less, or $5,000 less, the grant shall become void. It is our duty to stipulate for a handsome building, for a first-class hotel which will give first-class accommodation to the travelling public and will be an ornament to Canada and to the capital. When they do that, I think we will have done our full duty.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister might have a first-class hotel and built in first-class style that might cost $250,000 or $150,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My information is that a building erected according to these plans will cost in the vicinity of $1,500,000. We must remember that two parties have to be consulted in regard to this matter. There is the city of Ottawa, which is vitally interested in this matter, because it has been making certain arrangements with the company I believe with regard to taxation, and after very lengthy deliberations and submission of plans from time to time, the present plans have been agreed upon as those which the city are satisfied will give a first-class hotel. Unless there is some very good reason, I assume that the government would not insist upon departing from those plans.

Mr. LENNOX. The minister is not meeting the point raised as regards the amount to be expended. It is customary in transactions of this kind to have a stated amount of expenditure. When the minister says that if a dollar less is expended we would be disposed to claim the forfeiture of the right granted to the company, that is not meeting the point at all. The company represent that they are going to put up a

building costing a certain amount, say a million and a half. What the government should insist upon is that the company shall substantially expend that amount; therefore, there should be a limit below which they shall not fall, say a million, or a million and a quarter, but at all events, the government should insist that substantially they shall fulfil the representations they make. When the minister talks about a difference of a dollar, or two dollars, or five dollars, or a thousand dollars, that does not meet the point at all. I would expect that before the government passed an order in council they would ascertain from the company exactly what the company proposes to do. They should say: We want to know something of the character of the building you are going to put up.

Mr. PUGSLEY. And nothing can show more clearly than the plans which are submitted.

Mr. LENNOX. We want to know something about the cost of the building. What the minister has done is this: He has passed this order in council without knowing anything at all, without having the first tittle of information as regards the cost. He lets these negotiations all go on with the city; he says the city is vitally interested, but it is not nearly so much interested as the people of Canada, as we who represent the people of Canada. I can think of no greater outrage perpetrated upon a people than this very transaction—going right into the centre of the property of the people, the beauty spot of the city of Ottawa, the place of which we are so proud, Major's Hill park, to plant in the centre of that park a commercial edifice, a money-making institution—that is surely an absolute outrage upon the rights of the people. Therefore, the least we should insist upon—because the government seem to be determined to carry the thing through—is that they should proceed upon some business basis. Now, I asked the minister if there were outlets from this hotel direct to the park. The minister does not know. So little attention has been paid to this matter, so little interest has the minister taken in the preservation of the public rights, that he does not know to-day whether there are one or a dozen outlets from that hotel to the public park. He does not know whether that is to be the backyard of a hotel where baby carriages shall be trundled at will——

Mr. PUGSLEY. They do not trundle baby carriages in backyards, usually.

Mr. LENNOX. It will virtually become the backyard, because it is at the back of the hotel. My hon. friend may know a good deal more about baby carriages than I do, but what I say will prove substantially to be the case, that this will be the sporting ground for that hotel, and that the hotel might just as well own the whole park. That is the position of the case, and for a paltry $100,000 we are invading this park belonging to the people. There could be no greater outrage perpetrated upon the people of Canada—unless it were the erection of the Ross rifle factory upon the Plains of Abraham at Quebec, and I doubt even whether that is a greater outrage. Now, I want to ask the minister a few questions. We are devoting this $100,000 to this Improvement Commission in Ottawa. I understand from looking at the statute that ordinarily it would go to consolidated fund. Why is it that the minister proposes to give this over to the Ottawa Improvement Commission?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I can very well understand the reasons which influenced the government at the time. These negotiations were entered upon before I became minister, and therefore I am not able to give in detail the actual reasons which influenced the government. But I would assume that these are the reasons, and I have understood that the reasons which I am about to give are those which did influence the government. Hon. gentlemen are aware that Major's Hill Park is a large park, it extends down to Nepean Point. There is a considerable part of that which is unimproved. The situation is very beautiful and with the expenditure of a reasonable amount of money it could be made an ideal park. The building of a first-class hotel there, magnificent in proportion and beautiful in design, if the improvements are continued to Nepean Point, so far from being any detriment will be a distinct improvement to the city. I assume it is intended, and this has been my information, that either the whole or a large part of this money shall be expended by the Ottawa Improvement Commission in the beautifying and improving of the remainder of Major's Hill Park right down to Nepean Point.

Mr. FOSTER. Where do you find that authorization?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is authorized by the order in council.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think so.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It does not say so in express words, but it says the money shall be paid to the Ottawa Improvement Commission to be used by them under the direction of the Governor in Council.

Mr. FOSTER. It does not say for what.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is true, but that is one reason why the money is to be given to the Ottawa Improvement Commission. The Prime Minister will be able to state

this more positively than I am. But I think I am safe in saying that it is intended that the Ottawa Improvement Commission shall devote this money to the further improvement of Major's Hill Park right down to Nepean Point. The reason it is given to the Ottawa Improvement Commission is that that commission, composed of public-spirited citizens of Ottawa, have been devoting a great deal of their time and attention to the beautifying of the city, and this is just the kind of work that ought to be done by the proceeds of this sale. I do not think it would be proper that we should let this money go into the consolidated revenue. As we are selling, for the purposes of this hotel, a portion of a park to which the public have resorted for a great many years, I think it is only right that the money should be used for the purpose of beautifying that park, and I know of nobody under whose direction it can be better expended than the Ottawa Improvement Commission.

Mr. LENNOX. These are ordnance lands.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. We have a statute which provides that ordnance lands shall be divided into two classes and shall be dealt with in a special way. These particular lands would come under class 2 and the statute says that unless they are handed over for provincial purposes these lands shall be sold by auction. I admit it would be practically impossible to sell them by auction because it could never have been sold at all, but I venture to say that if this land had been put up at auction it would have realized a far larger sum than has been obtained for it from the Grand Trunk Railway.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Surely my hon. friend must be mistaken. This land has only a frontage of 135 feet on Rideau street. My hon. friend must know that $100,000 is a good price for that quantity of land, and if it were put up to auction I doubt if it would realize that much.

Mr. LENNOX. I fully believe that with the easements and advantages that will be given, it is worth far more money as an hotel site by reason of its unlimited connection with the park.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is $800 a foot frontage.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not care if it is $800,000, that is not the point I am dealing with. I venture to say that for an hotel site that property is worth five times as much as you are getting for it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What do you base that on ?

Mr. LENNOX. On the fact that you are not only selling that little patch of land, but that you are practically giving the company the use of a large park which is the most beautiful in the city of Ottawa. It is idle to talk of $100,000 for so many feet of land under the circumstances. I get angry when I talk about this ; I get so indignant at this proposal that I find it hard to keep my temper. But if we are going to dispose of this property I would point out that there are special provisions which have to be met before we sell ordnance land and not only that but there are special provisions in the statute as to the disposal of the money. The statute now says that moneys arising from the sale of ordnance land shall form part of the consolidated revenue of Canada and a separate account shall be kept thereof.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is why the legislation is necessary.

Mr. LENNOX. I know that. When the statute says it is to be kept in a separate fund and as a separate account there is good reason why we should preserve that money in a separate account. But the question of what price we get for this land is comparatively trifling as compared with the disastrous scheme of selling the land at all. I presume this means that the conveyance shall be signed concurrently and that the minister will see that is done.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The plans are to be approved.

Mr. LENNOX. I do hope that when this outrage is consumated it shall be nullified as far as possible by making some provision to protect the people's rights in the balance of the park.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The people's rights can be in no way interfered with.

Mr. LENNO. The people's rights could be interfered with if there is not a fence placed between the hotel property and the park. I have enough experience of this government to believe that there may be easements granted to that company which would be inconsistent with the rights and interests of the public, and I want to warn the minister now that we will expect that the people's rights in that respect shall be safeguarded. The minister does not appear to have gone very deeply into this question, but I would like to know from him what about the rights we have secured as regards exemption from taxation for Major's Hill park and the free supply of water and things of that kind. Will the company stand in the same position as the government in that regard ? Will they get free water from the city for that hotel ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is nothing in the agreement which will give any exemption to the Ottawa Terminal Company in respect to the hotel. They will have to pay

the ordinary charges for water and the taxes to the city under an agreement they have made with the city. That is a matter between the company and the city with which the government has nothing to do. We do not profess to give—we do not give any right of exemption so far as the company is concerned.

Mr. LENNOX. That is all right if it is all right, but there is nothing in this order in council which defines the matter one way or the other.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does not the hon. gentleman know that the moment we part with the land it becomes private property and is subject to ordinary civic liabilities ?

Mr. LENNOX. I do not know that and I am not sure the minister knows it, and I would like him to explain the contract between the government and the city with reference to Major's Hill park.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In what way?

Mr. LENNOX. The government undertook to pay certain moneys to the city for improvements and they got certain water and other rights in return. Is the minister prepared to say that the condition with regard to the hotel site on Major's Hill park being watered free by the city will go out of force as soon as this property is passed to the railway company.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no doubt whatever about it. The moment this piece of property is sold it ceases to be Major's Hill park and the title passes to the railway company who have to put up an hotel upon it, and that property would be subject to the ordinary civic liabilities and any water they use must be paid for. The city is not bound to supply water to private individuals and the company must make arrangements with the city in regard to that matter. The company will become liable for the civic taxation the same as ordinary individuals and ordinary companies.

Mr. LENNOX. I have great respect for the opinion of the minister as an able counsel but I am not quite prepared to agree——

Mr. PUGSLEY. You would not like to deny that proposition.

Mr. LENNOX. I am not going to admit or deny but I am not prepared to agree that the moment that property passes over to the company it ceases to be a portion of Major's Hill park any more than I am prepared to admit that if the city undertook to supply water free for No. 12 on Bank street when it belonged to the government, if sold by the government it would cease to be No. 12 Bank street. I call the attention of the minister to section 15, chapter 10 of the Act of 1899, which deals with this matter of supplying water free by the city among other things, and I think it would be very desirable to have some understanding as to that.

Mr. STEWART. I may say that the rights of the corporation of the city of Ottawa to exact taxation and water rates have already been recognized as between the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the city. After some considerable discussion an agreement has been drawn up under which the city agrees to give the Grand Trunk Company exemption from taxation for a certain number of years in consideration of the company expending a certain amount of money on the erection of the hotel and central station. The first arrangement made was for an expenditure of $3,000,000 by the Grand Trunk on the two buildings. There were suggestions made regarding the construction of the building which might have reduced the cost below $3,000,000, and there was some discussion as to that, but there is now a distinct agreement signed between the city and the Grand Trunk Railway Company as to the amount of money that shall be expended on the hotel. Among the conditions ceded to the company by the city were exemption from taxation for a certain number of years and the purchase of certain property on Nicholas street so as to widen the street leading to the station and make easier access. The recognition of the rights of the city to exact taxes is all settled in the agreement that has been signed by both parties.

Mr. LENNOX. That probably changes the situation, but the minister did not seem to know anything about it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The order in council in connection with this matter was passed on the 26th of September; parliament opened on the 28th of November, and some time afterwards this proposal was submitted to it. It has stood on the Order Paper for five and a half months without any attempt on the part of the government to advance this legislation, which demonstrates in the most unmistakable manner the absence of necessity for the haste with which the government rushed into this proposal without consulting parliament. Judging from the long delay which has elapsed between the introduction of this measure and its present stage I was in hopes that the government had receded from their position and that they had made up their minds not to perpetrate this most outrageous piece of vandalism that was ever perpetrated against public property. This proposal to thrust an hotel into the grounds of parliament is so incongruous and unnecessary that I cannot understand how the government ever came to accede to it. I have already said, and I repeat it, that it would be just as well for the government to have authorized the building of that hotel on one of the lawns in front of this building. There are to be large

departmental buildings erected on Mackenzie avenue and when they are erected this hotel will be thrust into the midst of the government buildings and parliament grounds. The government that would approve a scheme of that kind may be expected to do almost anything. Next session we may find that the new departmental block has been leased for a dance hall or that the library of parliament has been devoted to the purposes of a permanent circus. Either proposal would be little less shocking than the proposal which the government now submits to this parliament. This is national property. In 1898 the Minister of Public Works of the day justified the expenditure of a very large sum to erect a fence around this park on the grounds that this was a national property.

We take this national property immediately contiguous to and indeed forming part of the grounds of this parliament, and we propose to build an hotel upon it. If there were no other place in Ottawa suitable for the purpose, I would not protest so strongly; but there are places without number which would be just as suitable as this for an hotel. I admit that the city of Ottawa ought to have a good hotel; but it may be a question how far parliament should intervene for the purpose of supplying the deficiency. If the Grand Trunk Railway Company build an hotel there, I have no doubt that it will be a good one, and will be operated in an efficient and creditable manner. But when you say all that, you afford no justification for placing that hotel on one of the lawns of parliament or appropriating Major's Hill Park for the purpose. I regret very much that the government has seen fit to adopt this course. I had hoped, from their long delay in proceeding, that they had receded from the proposal. They might at least have come to parliament in the first instance—because it is now plain that there was no need of any haste—and have obtained the views of the representatives of the people from the Atlantic to the Pacific before undertaking to appropriate a portion of the national domain for the purpose of building an hotel at the very doors of parliament, and on grounds which have been regarded with pride by all the people of the country as forming part of the beautiful lawns on which these parliament buildings are erected, and on which they ought to be extended in the future.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There are two sides to this question, as to every other. But before I proceed any further, I must say that for my part I cannot find fault with the fastidious aestheticism of my hon. friends on the other side of the House. It is very creditable to them in one sense. The people of Ottawa want the hotel, and they are not likely to suffer because a portion of the park is to be taken for the purpose, especially in view of the fact that the money which is to come from the transaction is to be devoted to extending Major's Hill Park to Nepean Point.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the authority for that?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The authority will be given by parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the authority for saying that the park is to be extended to Nepean Point?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is a part of the exchange.

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. At all events, the money is to go to the Ottawa Improvement Commission, and if that is not provided for, it may be yet provided for. Everybody will agree with me that that is a most laudable provision. Now that we have public buildings erected in that direction, the time has come when we should make that extension, and I think we could not do a better thing with the proceeds of this transaction than to use the money for such a purpose. While a good deal of objection has been taken to the action of the government, everybody realizes that we must have an hotel, but people have not been very ready to come forward with offers to build an hotel. The Grand Trunk Railway Company selected the proposed site, and the government, after considering the matter, came to the conclusion that it would be advisable to agree to it. Does anybody believe that an hotel placed there will not be an ornament to the city? On the one hand you have the post office, on the other the station, and opposite the hotel. The two bridges, the Dufferin and the Wellington, should in my opinion be united and extended to the hotel, and this I understand is in contemplation. When all this is done, I believe that many gentlemen who now criticise the action of the government will change their minds, and will say that after all the city of Ottawa has not been disgraced but rather improved by the construction of these buildings.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The right hon. gentleman seems to be looking at this matter purely from the standpoint of the city of Ottawa. I am looking at it from the standpoint of this park as a portion of the national domain, and a portion of the grounds of parliament.

Mr. FOWLER. Which way is this hotel going to front?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It will front on Wellington street.

Mr. FOWLER. I might point out that there will be a fine view from the parlia-

ment grounds of the back premises of the hotel.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Of course, nature unadorned has its own beauty; but I do not know that fine buildings are an offence to the eye, but quite the contrary.

Mr. FOWLER. I am speaking of the rear of the hotel.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Where will the hotel offices be?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The plan provides for a terrace extending over the canal. The offices are to be below that.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. How are the people to get into the park—through the bar of the hotel?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There will be a space of 120 feet from the hotel to the other side of Mackenzie avenue.

Mr. PERLEY. The right hon. gentleman said that the people of Ottawa had decided that they wanted the hotel there. I do not understand that the people of Ottawa had anything to say about the situation at all. The people of Ottawa want a good hotel in the city; but if a vote of the people of Ottawa were taken to-morrow as to whether they would prefer to have the hotel in Major's Hill Park or in another place, they would vote to have it in another place. The great majority of the people of Ottawa want an hotel, and when the government offered this land to the Grand Trunk Railway Company for the purpose, the people of Ottawa were willing to have it there, but would have preferred to have it somewhere else. This hotel is going to get the benefit of the whole of Major's Hill Park. Even if there is a space left as an entrance, the park really will become a back garden for the hotel. The hotel may be built in such a way that its front will really be on Major's Hill Park; so that the guests of the hotel will practically have the use of the whole park, while the people of the city of Ottawa will not make very much use of it at all. If the government have made up their mind to put this Bill through, I suppose they will put it through. At the same time, I think it was a very wrong and improper thing for the government, without consulting parliament, to have made an agreement with the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, which they ask their followers to put through, whether they think it right or not, in order to put in this place an hotel which will entirely cut off the view of the new buildings which it is proposed to erect on Mackenzie avenue, and which this hotel will certainly make it very hard for any one to see.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not at all.

Mr. PERLEY. I would ask the minister whether it is possible for a person standing on Dufferin or Sappers' bridge to see the new buildings on Mackenzie avenue when the hotel is between the two.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If he goes and plants himself in one spot where he cannot see the new building, of course his view will be blocked.

Mr. PERLEY. Well, he might go to Sussex street and see them, I suppose.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Or he could take a balloon.

Mr. PERLEY. This hotel will cut the government property in two, and there are plenty of places just as good for the purpose as that particular spot.

An hon. MEMBER. Where ?

Mr. PERLEY. I would think just above the Supreme court is as good a site as can be found in the world for a hotel, and there are other places. I do not see that the hon. gentleman is warranted in putting a hotel there on the plea that the city of Ottawa wants it. The people of Ottawa need a hotel but they do not want it in that particular place.

Mr. BENNETT. Have these plans been ear-marked and before the Bill passes, will there be an agreement between the government and the company to put up a hotel according to them ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They are ear-marked in this sense. They are in the custody of the city. The mayor allowed me to have them for the purpose of showing them here. They will be returned to him and we will see that these identical plans are submitted to the Governor in Council for approval.

Mr. BENNETT. As far as the city of Ottawa is concerned, they have practically nothing to do with the giving of the land or the construction of the hotel beyond their arrangement with the company regarding taxes. On the passage of this Bill, this land will rest in the company.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Before giving a conveyance, we must have the plans submitted to us and approved by the government.

Mr. BENNETT. What is there to prevent the Grand Trunk Railway coming back in a couple of months and saying : We will not build on these plans. They will then be free to exact new plans.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Clearly not because the city has acted in good faith and entered into a written agreement with the company by which the company have bound themselves to build according to these plans. The Governor in Council will not allow any departure from these plans unless, on the advice of our chief architect, we think they should be altered. But we will allow no

plan which will provide for a less expensive or less commodious building, though we might require a larger building.

Mr. BENNETT. The city of Ottawa is no party at all to the agreement between the company and the government, and both the railway company and the government can ignore the city altogether.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But we shall not.

Mr. BENNETT Where is the proof? Supposing that in three months the Grand Trunk Railway come to Ottawa and say: We will build such a hotel as provided for in the plans but will construct one costing only half a million dollars, under this arrangement, the government could agree to that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does the hon. gentleman not see the absurdity of his contention? The city was anxious to have a first-class hotel and the Grand Trunk Railway expressed its willingness to build if it could secure a certain site. This is the site it selected, and it said: if we cannot build there, we will not build at all. The city negotiated with the company regarding what concessions it should give the company in the matter of taxation and came to an agreement with the company.

Mr. BENNETT. Simply for the purpose of assessment.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Even so, the city and the company have come to an agreement, under which the hotel and the station are to be built according to these plans and specifications. As at present advised, I am prepared to recommend to the Governor in Council the acceptance of these plans and I do not propose recommending the acceptance of any other. Surely the committee can trust the government to insist upon these plans being carried out.

Mr. BENNETT. And no other plans?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No other.

Mr. FOSTER. Section 2 ought to be left out entirely. It applies to something apart altogether from the object of this measure. It provides that:

2. The proceeds of the sale of the said parcel of land shall be placed to the credit of the Ottawa Improvement Commission, to be applied by them for the purposes of the commission under the instructions and directions of the Governor in Council.

That has nothing at all to do with the sale of this property to the Grand Trunk Railway for the purpose of erecting a hotel. If we want to give the money to the Ottawa Improvement Commission, we should do so by voting an appropriation for that purpose, and in the meantime let this money go into the consolidated fund and become part of the revenue of Canada.

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This has been agreed to by a resolution of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. I know that, but you are not obliged to go to the full extent of the resolution.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Where is the objection?

Mr. FOSTER. The objection is this that you are proposing a new expenditure which is alien altogether to the agreement between the Grand Trunk Railway and the government. We have an Ottawa Improvement Commission to which the government has given certain money and may decide to give more, but that is a matter which ought to be dealt with separately. If it be made part of this Bill, we shall have to inquire into the necessity for the application of this additional $100,000 to the credit of the Ottawa Improvement Commission. That commission has been already provided with a considerable sum from the Dominion treasury and it has gone into a wide and ambitious system of improvement. I believe it has gone to the limit of its means, and you are now proposing to give it another $100,000. Before we give that money, we must have information as to the policy of the government as to how this money is to be expended and so on. The government here are taking up two different matters. There is the public appropriation and the power to sell lands for entirely different purposes from those to which they are now devoted.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This matter was carefully considered before. After consultation with the minister this Bill was decided upon. We thought it better that the Bill to provide for the sale of the property should also provide that the money should not go for ordinary purposes but should be used for further improvements to be made in the park. And, as my right hon. friend the Prime Minister says, this is regarded by the government as a sacred trust and the money is to be used for the further improvement and development of the park down to Nepean Point.

At one o'clock, committee took recess.

Committee resumed at three o'clock.

On section 1,

Mr. PUGSLEY moved:

Provided, however, that if the Grand Trunk Railway Company so requests, the conveyance of the said land may be made to the Ottawa Terminal Railway Company, incorporated by Act 67, Edward VII., chaper 117.

Mr. LANCASTER. In regard to this matter I wish to reiterate what I said earlier in the session, that I think the whole thing is wrong in principle, and I have heard nothing since to change my opinion about it. I am more than ever of the opinion that this is a bad bargain, and one that should not have

been made with this railway or with any other railway company, under all the circumstances. It is a wrong principle to take the land of the country for this purpose. I am not going to elaborate that now, as I have done so on a previous occasion. But in regard to what the Prime Minister said this morning, I wish to say a word. He said that we must have a hotel in Ottawa, and this was the only way to get it. I do not wish to say anything disrespectful to the Prime Minister, but I must say that it seems to me his first duty is to protect the public interest of Canada and not bother his head so much about what the city of Ottawa wants. I ask myself whether any other city in Canada, looking at it from a municipal standpoint, if it felt the need of a hotel, could come to this government and get the government to allot a portion of the public lands of the Dominion for a hotel site. I am satisfied it would never be done for any other city; and I do not see on what principle Ottawa has a right to come to the Dominion parliament and ask us to make a bargain like this, and hand over to a railway company lands that belong to the Canadian public. I do not know upon what principle we are to make an exception in favour of the city of Ottawa and assist it to build a hotel. I think the Minister of Public Works let the cat out of the bag in answer to my hon. friend from East Simcoe, when he said that it was this way, that the Grand Trunk Railway Company wanted this site and would not agree to take any other, and so this site had to be given them. The whole matter is wrong. If the Grand Trunk Pacific would not be satisfied with any other site in Ottawa, that is a question for the Grand Trunk and the city to settle between them. But why should this Dominion government step in and sell or barter away to the company a portion of the public lands for a hotel building, simply because the Grand Trunk Pacific demand it? I think the principle is entirely wrong, and I cannot accede to it. I do not know whether a vote is going to be taken on the matter, but if there is, I am prepared to vote against the whole proposition.

Mr. BOYCE. It sems to me that this proposition is an extraordinary one, especially as it has been put before us by the Minister of Public Works. I understand that in 1884 or 1887 this park was created by the government of Canada and became ordnance land.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It became ordnance land long before that.

Mr. BOYCE. It was ordnance land, and by virtue of an Act of parliament it was created a park for public purposes, and has remained so down to this day. I do not know whether the minister is able to inform the committee at this time of the amount of money that has been expended upon it, first, by turning the waste land into a park, and next, for annual maintenance since that time. But the minister at any rate will concede that a very large amount of money has been expended on that park for public purposes, and it does seem to me an extraordinary proposition, and possibly something more than extraordinary, that the government should, under these circumstances, expropriate or give away to a hotel company, or for the purpose of a hotel, a part of the public domain situated just where this land is situated, especially in view of the fact that immediately adjoining it are lands of very great value which this government has expropriated, and for which it will have to pay a tremendous amount of money. If the government was so much in need of land that it had to expropriate at the cost of a million dollars——

Mr. PUGSLEY. What!

Mr. BOYCE. If the government was so much in need of land for the purposes of public buildings that it had to expropriate lands between Mackenzie avenue and Sussex street——

Mr. PUGSLEY. At a cost of a million dollars you say?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes, when you buy the Lindsay block out.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The Lindsay block alone will cost $750,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The government have no intention of buying the Lindsay block.

Mr. BOYCE. I may be beyond the mark, but I will let it go at a million dollars that it will cost the government to expropriate lands in the immediate vicinity for public buildings.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will my hon. friend pardon me?—because it might go out to the country as if there were some shadow of truth in the remarks of my hon. friend, although I take it for granted he does not intend to make a misstatement. The total expenditure for this land is very far from being a million dollars. The land alone will not amount to very much more than half a milion dollars, I think about $600,000.

Mr. BOYCE. Does that include the Lindsay block?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not at all. We do not propose to buy the Lindsay block.

Mr. BOYCE. The hon. gentleman will admit that if it does include the Lindsay block, it will exceed a million dollars by the time the expropriation is completed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It does not include the Lindsay block.

Mr. BOYCE. Then we will say at a cost of about a million dollars for expropriating land on which to erect public buildings in the immediate vicinity of this park; and the government is giving away for far less than

its value a portion of that park, defeating the purposes for which that park was originally intended, and for which it has been maintained for a great many years at a great cost to the country, and allowing an hotel to be erected there, with a bar for the purpose of the sale of intoxicating liquors right amongst the government buildings, as they will exist on Mackenzie avenue and Sussex street. Does not that seem to the Minister of Public Works somewhat of a shocking proposition? Would it not be more economical, if that park has to be taken away from the use of the public, that the government should use it for the erection of its own buildings, and thereby get them much nearer to the main parliament buildings on parliament hill? I am astonished that the government should be so lost to all sense of decency so far as the recognition of public rights is concerned, that it should consent to a proposition at once so monstrous and so wanting in economic features. Now I have made some inquiries, and I understand that $100,000 for that site is a very small percentage of the value of the land for the purposes for which it was intended.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Has the person who informed the hon. gentleman the slightest idea of the value of the real estate in that vicinity or does he know the frontage on Rideau street ?

Mr. BOYCE. Yes, I think he does.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does he not think $800 per foot frontage is a good price ?

Mr. BOYCE. It might be for lands across the street but having regard to the purpose for which the land is to be generously given by this government it is not. The planting of a hotel right in the middle of the parliament buildings on land from the public domain of Canada is not I think a proposition that will appeal to the people of Canada who have such an interest in the maintenance of that park.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We do not propose planting it in the middle of the parliament buildings.

Mr. BOYCE. I am looking forward to the time when the new buildings shall have been erected, this hotel shall have been completed and the park which has been for the benefit of the people of Canada will be the back garden of the hotel for its benefit and improvement.

On section 2,

2. The proceeds of the sale of the said parcel of land shall be placed to the credit of the Ottawa Improvement Commission, to be applied by them for the purposes of the commission, under the instructions and directions of the Governor in Council.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the minister mean that the money which is paid by the Grand Trunk shall not be paid into the Receiver General and become a part of the consolidated revenue fund ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, it is intended that this should be placed specially to the credit of the Ottawa Improvement Commission to be drawn from time to time and expended under the direction of the Governor General.

Mr. FOSTER. But all moneys that may come in for any purpose whatever must go to the consolidated revenue. It must first be paid into the fund and then you can vote it from the fund or appropriate from it. But in what way will you keep accounts if you are to sell off portions of the public lands of the country and instead of placing the proceeds in the consolidated revenue, pass the money over to the credit of some appropriations?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This section was brought to the notice of the Minister of Finance. It was drawn by the Minister of Justice. I do not myself see any reason why if it is intended to keep this as a special fund for the purposes of the work of the Ottawa Improvement Commission it should not be placed by the Minister of Finance to the credit of that commission.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose the government could do anything it chose if parliament authorized it, but is that the proper way ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not see any objection.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not suppose the hon. gentleman sees objection to anything.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is to be a special fund to be applied for a special purpose under the direction of the Ottawa Improvement Commission and with the approval of the Governor in Council. It is intended, as the Prime Minister informed the House, that the whole of this money shall be devoted by the Ottawa Improvement Commission to the improvement and extension of the Major's Hill park so as to carry the improvements right down to Nepean point.

Mr. FOSTER. I think my hon. friend had better not increase that system in this country. That seemed to be a principle introduced into provincial finance in New Brunswick but I do not think we should do it here, that you can take money out of the country's resources in any way other than by cheque from the consolidated fund. Surely you are not going to commence that game now with the funds of this country.

Mr SAM. HUGHES. What possibility would there be of this government obtaining any record ? If it is turned over to the commission the government have no record or means of enforcing the payment of it in any sense.

Mr. LENNOX. It does not matter at all I think; this matter has developed in this way. Nominally the Grand Trunk Railway pay $100,000; actually they do not pay anything of the kind. This money is not to go to the benefit of Canada generally but to a specific purpose, the improvement of the land adjoining this hotel property, the hotel garden; it is an extension of the benefits they will get. Virtually the money remains in the hands of the Grand Trunk Railway for the improvement and enhancement of their property. There is a great measure of consistency in the hon. gentleman's action in not passing it over to the credit of the consolidated fund but letting it go gradually as a reversion to the Grand Trunk Railway Company.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Carried.

Mr. FOSTER. I protest against that kind of finance. I am certain the Minister of Finance has never looked that through or he would not allow it. How are you to credit that to the commission account, is it a donation from the Grand Trunk Railway Company? It will not get into the public revenues of this country, neither will it be checked out from the public revenues. Here is a transaction where public lands are sold, $100,000 received, and neither put into nor checked from the consolidated revenue.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I presume it will be placed pursuant to the authority of the statute by the Finance Minister to the credit of the Ottawa Improvement Commission, to be expended by them under direction of the Governor in Council. When the hon. gentleman says it has not come to the attention of the Finance Minister, he is entirely in error. The Finance Minister thought it would be the better way because if it went into the consolidated revenue in the ordinary course it might be devoted to other purposes. It is intended to keep this as a sacred trust to be handled only by the Ottawa Improvement Commission.

Mr. DANIEL. The minister states it will be paid over from time to time to the Ottawa Improvement Commission. I presume it will be paid in bulk by the Grand Trunk people but to whom? To the Department of Public Works?

Mr. PUGSLEY. To the Minister of Finance and Receiver General.

Mr. DANIEL. But it does not go into the funds of the country. Does the Minister of Finance propose to keep it in his own private safe, and hand it out from time to time to the Ottawa Improvement Commission? This is very loosely drawn up, nobody can tell what becomes of the money. The funds of the country apparently will get no credit from this amount, there is nothing to say when it will be paid over, nothing is said as to what will become of the money in the meanwhile and I certainly think the matter ought to be dealt with in a more definite manner than it is going to be, because it allows this $100,000 to be placed nobody knows where for an indefinite length of time.

Mr. FOSTER. I must again protest against that. When that money is paid, to whom will it be handed over?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I presume to the Minister of Finance.

Mr. FOSTER. To his private account?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No. It would be his duty, I presume, to put it to the credit of the Ottawa Improvement Commission, and that commission would cheque it out from time to time under the direction of the Governor in Council, without whose approval they cannot spend one dollar of the amount.

Mr. FOSTER. How will the debit and credit account of the country show that as being done? Will the Improvement Commission be chequeing against Dominion funds or against what?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They will be chequeing against this money, which is a special fund placed to their credit under authority of statute.

Mr. FOSTER. The more the minister looks into it the more he will see it is absolutely irregular. I do not think you can find in the history of Canada an example of money being used in that way.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The government thought that when it was proposed to sell a part of Major's Hill park the money should be devoted specially to the purposes of the Ottawa Improvement Commission and not credited to the consolidated revenue fund, where it might be used for other public purposes. The object the government had in mind is the extension and beautifying of the remainder of Major's Hill park right down to Nepean Point. I think it would be a proper exercise of the power of this parliament to require that the money should be placed to the credit of the Ottawa Improvement Commission, who will receive it clothed with the trust that it is to be devoted to the purposes of the commission and subject at all times to the control of the Governor in Council.

Mr. DANIEL. Does not the government give an annual grant to the Ottawa Improvement Commission?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. I think it is $60,000.

Mr. DANIEL. Then what is the objection to placing this money to the credit of the consolidated revenue fund and handing it over to the commission in annual instalments in addition to the $60,000?

Mr. PUGSLEY. If it went to the consolidated fund it might be devoted to such purposes as parliament should decide from time to time, but this being money received for a part of this park which has been dedicated, if not by deed, by user, to the people of Ottawa, we felt that this money should be devoted to the one purpose and the one purpose only. If it went into the consolidated fund it would have to be voted out from year to year as parliament might determine.

Mr. LANCASTER. Why not?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The country has every confidence in the Ottawa Improvement Commission, which is composed of certain members nominated by the city and certain members nominated by the government. It does seem to me that parliament can safely allow this money to be at once placed to their credit and drawn out by them, subject always to the direction of the Governor in Council.

Mr. FOSTER. A company may be organized to build a railway and the government may make a loan for the purposes of the construction of that railway, but the loan goes into the consolidated fund, and is not placed to the credit of the railway company. Why should $100,000 be placed at the credit of the Ottawa Improvement Commission when it may not use that money for several years?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It would draw interest in the meantime. There is a broad distinction between a railway company and a public body like the Ottawa Improvement Commission. It does seem to me that this money might be placed to the credit of the Ottawa Improvement Commission clothed with the trust to which it is to be devoted. It cannot be expended without the approval of the Governor in Council, and I can see no objection to it.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it intended that this $100,000 shall be paid out in addition to the $60,000 a year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. I would assume that the regular course would be that the proceeds of the sale of this property are to be handed over to the commission, and it may be that the identical cheque that comes from the Grand Trunk Railway Company may be placed to their credit.

Mr. FOSTER. How will that appear in the Public Accounts?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Governor in Council will make a record of it, and the Ottawa Improvement Commission will make a return of it in their report.

Mr. FOSTER. Then it will not appear in the Public Accounts?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There will be a record of it.

Mr. DANIEL.

Mr. FOSTER. That money will not come into the possession of Canada, and therefore it will not appear in the Public Accounts of the country. The fact remains that we have disposed of the property of the country for $100,000 and that there is no entry in our books with reference to it.

Mr. BENNETT. I suppose the minister anticipates that a large portion of this money will be the nucleus of a campaign fund in the elections which will take place next fall, and it is to be supposed that some of it will be devoted to the city of Ottawa in that way?

Bill reported; read the third time (on division), and passed.

SUPPLY—CANADIAN NATURALIZATION.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria and Haliburton). Mr. Speaker, I have taken the following clipping from an American newspaper:

Since our republic set up for itself there never has been until very recently an emigration of Americans from the United States that was worth noticing, says a recent 'Harper's Weekly.' Some of our women have married Europeans and become subjects of kings, but until lately exceedingly few United States voters have ever given up their citizenship. Within ten years, however, a good many thousands of our Northwesterners have gone over the border into the Saskatchewan country, and taken up wheat lands, and these emigrants from Uncle Sam's domain have usually, as part of the process of getting their land, taken out papers to be Canadian voters. This involves finally swearing allegiance to King Edward, so that these adventurers give up their citizenship in the United States. And what do they get in return? Almost all of them expect that they become British citizens, with all the rights as well as the obligation of that condition. But it seems not. We learn from the Winnipeg 'Telegram' that they become merely citizens of Canada, with the right to vote and hold office in the Dominion governed from Ottawa, but that as soon as they go outside they become citizens of no country. By British law it seems a naturalized Canadian is not a British citizen. He cannot take out naturalization papers in England until he has lived there five years. 'Not a single British colony,' says the Winnipeg 'Telegram,' has, as the law stands to-day, the slightest power to grant to an alien rights of British citizenship that can be enforced outside its own boundaries. . . . There is not the slightest doubt about the law.'

This, Sir, brings up for consideration the whole question of Canadian citizenship—the question of what classes should be admitted into the Dominion of Canada. During the war between Japan and Russia thousands of Japanese who had lived for years in the Hawaiian islands returned to

their native land to do service for it. One officer, who had married a lady of the Caucasian race in the city of Honolulu and had raised a family, parted from his family and went back to serve the land of his nativity—it was understood at the time by an order from the Japanese government. Men of Japanese extraction in Canada who had taken out their naturalization papers in order that they might become citizens of the Dominion, also obeyed the mandate of the Japanese government and returned to do service for their native country. More recently, when the governments of the United States and Japan were disturbed over the question of Japanese colonization on the western coast of North America, it was charged by newspapers and officials in the United States that numbers of Japanese were returning to their native land in order to serve it in the event of trouble between the two countries. This suggests what is to my mind a point worthy of the consideration of the Dominion government. At the very time that question was agitating the world, the American people found that every transcontinental railway in the United States, every pass, every tunnel, every strategic point, if I may use the term, was mapped out and was in the possession of Japan. Had war broken out between Japan and the United States, ten Japanese soldiers, properly placed, with dynamite cartridges in their hands, could have prevented the transfer of any United States soldiers from the east to the west for six months. The people of the United States were aware of this. In the United States there is a tableland varying in width from 500 miles to 1,000 miles, separating the eastern part of the continent from the Pacific slope. That tableland is difficult of access for railway purposes, and unless the railways were kept open it would be impossible to transport troops from the east to the west. Should war break out between the United States and Japan, the Japanese would immediately control the whole of the western coast of North America, and by blowing up a few railway bridges and tunnels they could prevent for months the transfer of one solitary soldier over the mountains. In Canada we have but one railway across the Rocky mountains. Any one who has traversed that region knows that there are a hundred places where a charge of dynamite would prevent the passage of trains for weeks, aye, for months, and that being accomplished it would be impossible to transfer soldiers from the eastern parts of this country to the western coast. Should Great Britain chance to be engaged in a war with any power on the Pacific ocean and wish to utilize the great transcontinental Canadian route for the transportation of troops or munitions of war from the home land to the Orient, a few men could very readily render such transport nugatory by destroying these passes. The United States people have taken into very serious consideration what class of citizens they shall naturalize on the western coast. A very few thousand people planted properly on this western coast could readily control the situation there. The Japanese have been coming into the western part of Canada in large numbers. The Chinese have also been coming in, but their coming has been more or less checked by the poll tax. Our field of settlement on the western coast is limited, and I have no hesitation in saying that the government should be very careful indeed what class of citizens are given naturalization papers and allowed to settle within our borders. The first requirement on which they should insist is that the incoming settler should be absolutely loyal to the empire, should be in every sense a British citizen, and above all be ready to defend the British empire against every enemy and in every circumstance. Do the Japanese and the Chinese fulfill the latter condition? Would they be ready at all times, at the drop of the hat, to fulfill that obligation and do active service for the British empire even against their own country? It has been pointed out by our American friends that at the time, when the little agitation was going on between the United States and Japan some years ago, colonies of Japanese were found convenient to every mountain pass. We know that application was made to Canada to plant a large Japanese colony convenient to the posts traversed by our railways in our own Rocky mountains. It may possibly be that they desired to become British subjects and accommodate themselves to our institutions and laws. If so, other things being equal, I have no hesitation in saying that they would make a very eligible lot of people. But if their intention was to live in colonies, as they always do, if they had no desire to subject themselves to our laws, or accommodate themselves to our language and institutions, if their design was to grow up in this land but not of it, the settlement of such people in our midst is not one that should be encouraged or even permitted. There are other classes of immigrants which require to be carefully looked after. There is the transient labour class, whose admission we should carefully control and supervise. At present in almost every county in the eastern part of Ontario, especially in the lumber counties, you will find hundreds and thousands of men out of employment, and whoever lives to see next winter will see that number more than doubled. You can go around to any part of this community, and you will see imported farm labourers, by the hundreds and the thousands, driving our own men out of employment. I happened to be in the post office one day last winter when scores of Italians were taking out post office money orders, many of them for large sums, and send-

ing them home to their native country. That certainly is something which is not to our advantage. It is something which ought to be checked. In every municipality in Canada, before even a pedlar of any description can ply his trade, he has to pay a license. In like manner every transient labourer coming into Canada should be required to pay a certain tax so as to indemnify slightly our own people for the loss of employment that they have to suffer through this foreign competition; and certainly it is our own people, who are trying to bring up their families in this country and build up our institutions, whose interests we should specially safeguard. Those alien labourers who come here without any intention of becoming British subjects, who have not the slightest intention of living and growing up amongst us, should be made to pay a tax on coming in. There is another class which should not be permitted to come in unrestricted. I refer to the ticket-of-leave men, the hooligans and the hoodlums who have been taken hold of by charitable societies and sent to this country in large numbers, and who make the people of the old land, the honest British born people residing in this country, blush at the thought of having to recognize these degenerates as hailing from the same land. These people should not be allowed to come into this country. We should insist on every man we admit having a clean bill of health and character. There is another class to which I wish to refer, and in doing so I shall quote an advertisement which has been given me and which is eing largely circulated in eastern Assiniboia. This circular was sent me by one of the constituents of the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), and I am told that thousands of them have been scattered throughout that constituency. I understand also they are soon to be published generally throughout the Northwest. Many years ago, when I was still in my teens, I heard Barnum say that he would rather be condemned by his opponents than praised by them; and throughout my life I have heard numerous evidences of the truth of that saying. I take therefore this circular as a complimentary advertisement. It gives a quotation from some remarks I made during the present session. It is headed: 'Col. Sam. Hughes, the Conservative member for Victoria and Haliburton, occupies one of the front benches in the House of Commons,' and then goes on as follows:

Speaking in the House of Commons on April 8, 1908 (see 'Hansard,' page 6438), on a Bill to amend the Immigration Act, Col. Hughes said:

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Take the case of a Hindu who comes here from Hong Kong, you may send him back on the steamer and he may not be allowed to land at Hong Kong. I do not think this will help the matter. Why does the hon. minister not bring in a law covering that aspect of the case? This will exclude any man coming from any country other than that of his birth or adoption. Personally I would much prefer a Hindu who has served the empire in the armies of Great Britain to a galvanized Yankee who has been an anarchist in his own land and has come to the United States where he has done his best to disrupt that republic, and who, if he crosses over to Canada, seeks in many instances to disrupt the established laws of the Dominion. I must say that a Hindu who has served in the British army and has had the discipline of a soldier is much more likely to make a good citizen of Canada, much more likely to upbuild the welfare, morality and dignity of this country than many of the class of animals who are imported——

An hon. MEMBER. Order.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. No 'order' about it. Many of these are not worthy the name of human beings. But these people are admitted, while soldiers who have served in the British army are excluded, not allowed to land and turned adrift.

I was about to say that I am surprised, but on reflection I am not surprised at anything some of these gentlemen would do. In one sense, however, I am surprised that even the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) would have the hardihood to stand up, even in the remote parts of his own constituency, and there cast the stigma on the honest intelligent American settler of suggesting that there could be possibly, or that any one could dream there could possibly, be any relationship or connection between him and the class of American anarchists or galvanized Yankees, as they are termed in their own country. But after the prominence which these gentlemen of the Liberal party have given the Jacksons and the Wagners and others of that class—criminals and fugitives from justice—who were proven guilty of all sorts of offences in the calendar—after the prominence these men have received at the hands of certain members of the Liberal party, I am not surprised at anything our hon. friends opposite might do. But these gentlemen will find that they have shot wide of the mark in endeavouring to show the honest sturdy American citizen of our west that he is a galvanized Yankee and an anarchist. The attempt of these gentlemen to convince the enterprising American citizen that he is an anarchist or that any one in his senses could suspect of him of being one, will only recoil on themselves. The class I had reference to is that class of men who invaded the Dominion and never contributed to the revenue except in the way of excise on whisky and tobacco, who never turned a hand for the benefit of one honest law in the Dominion —men who were driven out of the United States largely for the benefit of that country. These were the men of whom I was speaking, men whose hand is against everybody, and who recognize no law. These are the class we do not want.

But these gentlemen, forsooth, will admit the 'galvanized Yankee' freely—and let me tell these hon. gentlemen that that term 'galvanized Yankee' is well understood on the other side of the line; it is used to describe the man who would disrupt the republic and destroy law and order. We had a wing of them come into Medicine Hat only a few months ago, and they indulged in all kinds of performances, even to committing murder. These are the men we object to; these are the men that the honest American citizen objects to. And I want to tell the hon. member for East Assiniboia that he will fall far short of his object in seeking to impress the honest American citizen by suggesting that he is a 'galvanized Yankee'. The honest American repudiates this class, for the honest American citizen upholds law and order when he comes to our side of the line as he has been accustomed to uphold it where he lived before. On more than one occasion I have pointed out that the Americans are the most law-abiding people in the world—I speak of the genuine American. I can take you to counties in the United States—towns of 2,000 inhabitants in Pennsylvania, Maryland, Ohio, Illinois and elsewhere where, for over thirty years, they have not had a single arrest, where hotels cannot be maintained—not merely because they cannot be licensed, but because the people will not drink the liquor. I can show you whole counties where they have not had a criminal case in twenty-five years.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I would ask you whether the hon. gentleman can continue a discussion that arose in connection with another matter that was before this House some months ago.

Mr. SPEAKER. At the moment I cannot recall anything the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) said that was out of order.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I know this is not congenial to the distinguished statesman and constitutional lawyer from Yale-Cariboo, the gentleman, who I suppose has been associating with and possibly owes his election to, the very class of men that I am condemning.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. You will be making more apologies in a short time.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. No. I never made an apology in my life. What I stand to is the word I utter. And I want to tell my hon. friend and his friends that when the time comes, they will find themselves in a very serious position for attempting to fasten upon the honest people of the North-west or of British Columbia who have come to us from the United States the term 'galvanized Yankee'.

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

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works. I would ask the committee to take up harbours and rivers, Ontario.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the minister please place on the table the tenders of which he spoke when the House was last in Committee of Supply?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The tenders for dredging are on their way over, and will be here in a few moments.

Public Works, chargeable to income—harbours and rivers, Ontario—Belle river dredging, close piling, &c., $1,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a revote of $1,000. It represents the cost of carrying on works at the mouth of the Belle river in the county of Essex.

Mr. CLEMENTS. What is the nature of the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is forty feet lineal of sheet piling on the west side of the harbour, dredging and driving of some piles 24 feet long.

Mr. CLEMENTS. What is the depth of the water?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Nine feet at low water.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What has been expended on this work previously?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About $14,000. This is supposed to complete what is now in view.

Mr. BLAIN. Is it under contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, it is done by days' labour. There is such a variety of work that it cannot be done under contract.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Who is the foreman?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have not yet appointed a foreman.

Beaverton—harbour improvement, $3,500.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I want this to go through, but I want the minister to explain what is the total cost of the work, who is doing it, on what terms and when it will be completed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This work represents sheet piling and dredging. The total expenditure is estimated at $2,000 for the dredging and $1,500 for the other work.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is this all in connection with it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was an expenditure last year of the same amount.

Blanche river—improvement, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is in Nipissing. The work is the removal of snags and other obstructions to navigation.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What is the policy of the government in relation to these in-

land lakes that are not taken under the control of the federal government ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. By the terms of the British North America Act the federal government has control of navigation. It is quite within the power of the federal government to exercise control over matters relating to navigation in any lake. There is no such a thing as taking over control of navigable waters.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What towns are on this river ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is a newly developing country. The country along the shores of Lake Nipissing is rapidly developing, principally owing to the rich mineral discoveries being made.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What minerals have been discovered along the Blanche river?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Quite a number. The people are coming in there, and require this improvement.

Blanche river—improvements of navigation on south branch, $3,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This also is for the purpose of removing obstructions to navigation caused by trees, roots and snags.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. In what riding is it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the county of Nipissing. I may say that Nipissing is improving very rapidly. The population of Nipissing county to-day, I believe, is about 70,000. Hon. gentlemen will see how rapidly that northern country is developing.

Mr. BLAIN. This work was commenced in 1904, and why does it take so long?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This work is being done from year to year with the plant which is provided by the government for work in all those rivers. Last year the total expenditure was about $4,000.

Blind river wharf—dredging, &c., $6,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is in the county of Algoma. It is to complete the extension of an L to the present wharf, 100 x 30 feet, at a cost of $1,250. It will cost $1,050 to clean up the slip around the pier at the mouth of the river. It is also for the purpose of enlarging the channel at the mouth of Blind river. We propose to expend this year $3,700.

Bronte harbour—repairs to piers, &c., $1,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. Would the minister say what damage has been done to the pier at Bronte which requires $1,000 for repair? I would like at the same time that the minister should tell the committee how much money has been spent on the pier and approach at Bronte?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES.

Mr. PUGSLEY. From 1900 up to the 31st of March, 1907, the total expenditure in Bronte harbour has been $30,923. This vote of $1,000 is not required entirely for repairs, but it is to complete a new crib to connect the same with the northern pier, and also some repairs to the old crib work.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is any portion of this to be applied to further dredging?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is it the intention of the minister to do any more dredging in Bronte harbour?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not considered that.

Mr. HENDERSON. We will see when the supplementary estimates come down. From the wording of the motion 'repairs to piers, &c.,' I was wondering how much was for repairs, and how much for the &c., and I thought perhaps the minister intended to do some more dredging. I would say to him that I think it would be a mistake to extend the dredging. I do not think at the present time any more dredging is required.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is for the repair of the pier, and connecting the pier with the northern pier.

Mr. ALCORN. Will there be an item in the supplementary estimates for dredging Picton harbour?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am unable to inform the hon. gentleman what will be in the supplementary estimates.

Burlington channel piers—head block at east end of south pier, $6,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a revote. The work is under contract. The total probable cost is $10,500.

Chute à Blondeau (county of Prescott)—wharf, $4,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is for the purpose of constructing a public wharf on the south side. The work is under contract. The object of the wharf is to afford proper landing and shipping facilities for the river traffic in the locality.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is there any recommendation by the engineers that the government should undertake this work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was a numerously signed petition presented by forwarders on the river, by merchants and others doing business along the Ottawa river, which was transmitted to me by my hon. friend representing that county (Mr. Proulx).

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. How far is this from L'Orignal?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know; it is in the same county. It is sufficiently far

away to have warranted the construction of a wharf at this place twenty years ago. That was a private wharf, and it has become dilapidated. A public wharf is very much required.

Mr. J. D. REID. This is a sample of what I object to, and that is, the points where the government build public wharfs. The policy which the government are carrying out is hardly in accordance with the public interest. I could mention one case where a wharf was built at an expenditure of thousands of dollars, and there was no reason for it except that a petition was sent in from the residents of that locality. The government never sent an engineer to look into it, made no inquiries at all, but as soon as the petition came in the government said: All right, here is a petition, go ahead and build this wharf. I am afraid this is a similar case. From what the minister has just said, there was only a petition sent in to the member for the county, and forwarded by him, I suppose, to the government. On that petition the government decided to expend, when it started, I suppose, $5,000 or $6,000, and by the time they get through with it they will have expended $60,000 or $70,000. When a petition is sent in by residents of any locality, the first thing the government should do is to send an engineer to the spot and see what is really required, and also get a report from the chief engineer of the department as to what is actually needed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman will be gratified to know that that is exactly what the government does. When a petition comes in for the construction of a wharf it is referred to the engineer, and he is instructed to make a report as to the necessity of the work and as to the probable cost. This course has been followed in every case since I have been minister, and I am informed it was the previous custom. I can give my hon. friend a little more information with regard to this wharf. It is five miles west of Point Fortune and seven miles east of Hawkesbury; that will give him an idea of where it is located. The old wharf to which I referred was built by James McAllister some years ago. It has been vested in the Crown so the Crown now owns the property, and this is for rebuilding it and making an extension to it to give very much needed accommodation.

Mr. J. D. REID. I am bound to accept the minister's statement that this is the policy of the department, but we have had evidence under oath to the contrary in the Public Accounts Committee in the case of the Pointe aux Trembles wharf. No engineer went there, the chief engineer knew nothing, there was no recommendation by him, the wharf was simply put there because a petition was put in. I have no doubt we could get other cases.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Since I became minister my directions have been when petitions are presented to have reports made as to the necessity and cost of the proposed works.

Mr. J. D. REID. I referred to the general policy of the department.

Mr. PROULX. The private owner of this wharf did not want to repair it; it is in very bad condition and the transportation companies made strong representations to the Department of Public Works for a new wharf. The private owner asked $2,500 for the wharf, but received only $800.

Mr. J. D. REID. What did the government want to buy it for?

Mr. PROULX. Because they wanted a site; this wharf serves as an approach and there is a good shed on it which can be used. The contract for the extension and rebuilding is $6,000.

Mr. J. D. REID. Along the St. Lawrence the transportation companies build these wharfs, and I do not see why the same rule cannot be applied on the Ottawa.

Mr. PROULX. I do not see why the transportation company should build it. There is no railway communication and there is heavy traffic from this point especially in butter, cheese and other agricultural produce.

Mr. J. D. REID. What is the population?

Mr. PROULX. The population is about 300 or 400, but there is a large farming section around it who use the wharf. It serves the whole township of East Hawkesbury, which has a population of 5,000 or 6,000.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is the private owner to continue to manage the wharf?

Mr. PROULX. I am not decided as to that; after it is built that must be arranged.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I wish to correct my hon. friend Mr. Reid for saying that the wharfs on the St. Lawrence are built by the transportation companies. The late member for Prince Albert, now a senator, said only a few sessions ago that the government had piled wharfs along the St. Lawrence so thick they had not room for them on the banks and had to hang them in the trees to get the money expended.

Mr. J. D. REID. I think the forwarding companies and those interested in the wharfs should keep them up. Are there to be dues charged and will they allow a man to collect and retain the dues?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The wharf apparently was built some 20 years ago and was owned by Mr. McAllister. Evidently it was affording a great deal of accommodation to the people of this district, and as I understand there was not sufficient profit in its operation to justify Mr. McAllister in putting it into thorough repair. The forwarders, the merchants and the farmers were all anxious for this accommodation, and finally it was determined that the Crown should purchase from Mr. McAllister for $800; it had cost him $2,500. In addition to the wharf the purchase includes a two-story shed in good condition, and the government is building a wharf of a substantial character at a reasonable cost. As to the revenue I do not know what it would be, but in the ordinary course I presume it would be transferred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. The practice is not uniform in that respect, as many wharfs remain under the control of my department while a large number are transferred to the Marine Department. That has been the practice since confederation. The revenue will not be large, but I presume that whatever it is it will be devoted to keeping the wharf in repair.

Mr. PRINGLE. The upper wharf in the town of Cornwall is used, I believe, only by the Cornwall and Montreal Navigation Company, and was built for their accommodation. The wharf was constructed at considerable expense and is a great convenience to the community. I would like to know if that wharf is free or whether the steamers using it pay dues?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will get the information to-morrow.

Cobourg—extension of breakwater, dredging, &c., $45,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This work includes the extension of a breakwater.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That is in connection with the Grand Trunk?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Grand Trunk is establishing a car ferry there. This is an important work, and will be done by contract.

Colborne—wharf, $15,700.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is this the work that was promised during the election?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no knowledge of any such promise. How many years ago would that be?

Mr. J. D. REID. There was a by-election in the county not long ago, and one of the ministers went up there and promised this work to the people.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It cannot be the same; this vote was in the estimates last year.

Mr. J. D. REID. They purchased the timber when the election was going on and promised to build the wharf if the Liberal candidate was returned.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The money was voted last session of parliament, so that the hon. gentleman must be wrong.

Mr. LANCASTER. But the work was not done.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. The contract was entered into on the 5th of July, 1907.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Just previous to the election.

Mr. LANCASTER. Then all I have to say is that this minister pretended to the electors that the vote had not been acted on, and that if the people elected a Liberal it would be.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman should not believe all he hears.

Mr. LANCASTER. It is true I should not believe all that a minister of this cabinet says.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Mr. Cochrane, who represented the county, died last year, and in the by-election the Liberals promised this wharf would be built if the people returned a Liberal. The dock is a necessary work and should be built at once. The good people of East Northumberland proved to the government that they would not sell their votes, and they turned down the Grit candidate and elected Mr. Owen. Independent electors of that sort deserve to be encouraged, and I am glad this wharf is going to be built.

Collingwood harbour improvements, $15,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to complete this very important work.

Mr. LANCASTER. How long has this work been going on?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. From time immemorial.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is under contract.

Mr. LANCASTER. When will this work be completed? This item is a very old friend in the estimates, and I would like to know when we are to see the end of it. Collingwood seems to be getting a great deal of attention lately.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is a very large shipping business done at Collingwood.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. This is a very necessary work if the money is properly expended, but it has not been properly expended always.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no information of that kind. The harbour is of rock foundation, and I should think it would be at least two or three years before the work necessary in Collingwood harbour would be completed. If the work in contempla-

tion is done it would take perhaps upwards of $100,000.

Mr. LANCASTER. What is the depth of the channel?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The ideal depth would be 22 feet, but we are dredging to 19 feet at low water.

Mr. BARR. Were tenders called for this year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BARR. Who has the contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The C. S. Boone Dredging and Construction Company.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. How much a yard?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not the figures here, but last year the prices were: For rock, $2.30; hard pan, $1.40; other materials, 35 cents. I think there is a slight increase at Collingwood this year.

Mr. BARR. How many tenders were put in?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think two.

Mr. BARR. Did the lowest get the contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. LANCASTTR. Is the work done under government inspectors, and who is the government inspector at Collingwood?

Mr. PUGSLEY. W. A. Clarke was the inspector last year and we are continuing him this year.

Mr. MONK. I was not here on Saturday night late when most of the estimates for wharfs in the province of Quebec were passed. I would like to call the attention of the minister and of the government to the necessity—if it is their policy to go on building wharfs in so many places—to the necessity of establishing a wharf at the town of Lachine. On many occasions since I have been a member of the House I have called the attention of the government to the importance of having a public wharf there. Lachine has a population of 12,000; it is situated at the head of the Lachine canal, and many important industries are located in the town, amongst others, the Dominion Bridge Company and the Dominion Wire Company; and just at the place where a wharf should be erected they are now building great locomotive works which will employ some 5,000 men. If the government is to adopt the policy of building wharfs at different places rather than give effect to the report of the Transportation Commission, provision should be made for Lachine. There are several sites which may be obtained. There is the old wharf which belongs, I think, to the St. Stephen's Church Boating Club, and which can be had for a mere bagatelle. That old wharf might be improved in such a way as to serve the purposes of trade. There is also a private wharf which could be purchased at a moderate cost, and which could be repaired so as to be useful. If neither of these sites is available, then the government could easily secure another site. At the present moment the most vital question is the question of carrying out the suggestions of the Transportation Commission. If you do that, speaking of the province of Quebec alone, you will render a far greater service to my province than you will by building small wharfs here and there throughout the province; and if you will build the Georgian Bay canal and make Montreal and Quebec free ports, you will benefit the whole province in a way that these isolated works cannot possibly do.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Some time ago I was urged very strongly to construct a wharf at Lachine and I may say that the matter is under my very favourable consideration, and I think that very likely I may be able to make provision for it in the supplementary estimates this session. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has referred to a very important matter, namely, the recommendation of the Transportation Commission. I am quite sure that the government as a whole are thoroughly impressed with the very great importance of those recommendations; but I am not prepared to admit that if those recommendations are fully carried out, and the great ports of Montreal and Quebec, and the ports of St. John and Halifax, and other ports of the St. Lawrence and the maritime provinces, and the great ports on the western coast and on the great lakes, are made free, that is going to meet all the requirements of the people of this country. The people of the smaller localities along the St. Lawrence and other rivers, on the seacoasts of the maritime provinces, on the great lakes, and on the coast of British Columbia, are entitled to a reasonable measure of accommodation, and they will not be satisfied to see these great cities having large sums of money expended upon them and the requirements of the smaller localities in the matter of transportation neglected. As far as the larger question of transportation is concerned, the government are alive to it. We are to-day spending large amounts of money in improving the port of Halifax in connection with the Intercolonial Railway; we are spending large amounts on the port of St. John; and these ports are rapidly drawing away from Portland the Canadian business that has hitherto been done there during the winter season. We are spending large sums of money in Montreal in addition the money spent by Harbour Commissioners. We have just erected a magnificent wharf at Maisonneuve. This could not have been better done if Montreal had been made a

free port. We are building a magnificent pier at Quebec to afford accommodation for large ocean steamers. On the great lakes also, in conjunction with the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, we are developing the harbours of Victoria and Tiffin, so as to afford accommodation for large steamers ; and I am happy to say that we are dredging those harbours so rapidly that we expect by the 1st of October to make it possible for large steamers to come right up to the elevators which those two railway companies are building. I believe the result of this will be to build up a new Buffalo at each of these places, and thus to draw away from Buffalo, New York, Baltimore and Portland millions of bushels of grain that now find their outlet by these American ports. At Port Arthur and Fort William we are carrying out the same large national idea, deepening the harbours in order to give ample accommodation for the large lake vessels that go there. This is our policy from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and if we have not in words carried out the policy enunciated by the Transportation Commission, we are in fact carrying it out as rapidly as we can, consistently with the resources of the country.

Mr. MONK. I do not like to allow the statement of my hon. friend to go entirely unchallenged. I for my part am impressed with the idea that he has not recently read the report of the Transportation Commission, for its suggestions are not being carried out in the spirit any more than in the letter. We were advised by the Transportation Commission to do something without delay to establish national ports on the Pacific coast, at Victoria, Vancouver and even Prince Rupert, if I remember rightly.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Do national ports necessarily mean free ports ?

Mr. MONK. Unquestionably. If there was any doubt about that, that doubt was set at rest by the Transportation Commission stating in so many words that they should be free ports. What have we done at Fort William and Port Arthur ? We were advised to set aside without a moment's delay a certain space along the waterfront and construct shipping facilities in that space ; but we have not done so. We have instead instituted a Harbour Commission there, which was exactly what the Transportation Commission did not suggest. What we have done at this end of the great lakes I will not take time to dilate upon. But take the port of Montreal. At present we have arriving there large steamers laden with grain. It is the beginning of an immense grain trade at Montreal, which we have not had so far because of the lack of facilities. A steamer carrying 90,000 bushels of grain arriving in Montreal takes nine hours to discharge its cargo, while other vessels are waiting, because our grain elevator there has only one leg. It ought to have at least eight or ten additional legs, which could be built at a cost of from $30,000 to $60,000 each. Go to Duluth and Superior, and see how the discharging of vessels is done there. Although this matter has been referred to time and again, the government has continued deaf to this necessity in the port of Montreal, while they squander money on wharfs which in many cases are not asked for, or are asked for by members simply for some private reason. What are the government doing in regard to constructing the Georgian Bay canal ? Mr. Reford deemed that work to be of such importance that he supplemented the report of the Transportation Commission with another report in which he said that the developments recently taking place in the United States rendered it absolutely imperative that we should without any further delay proceed with the construction of the Georgian Bay canal.

My hon. friend speaks of obliging certain localities. Well, there is a public work twice recommended by that commission which will benefit many localities. It will benefit not only Montreal but the whole country ; and if the money we are spending uselessly on works, with the sole object of gaining political advantage, were not spent, there would be enough to pay the annual interest on the cost of the Georgian Bay canal. It is high time that we should leave out politics in the selection of public works to be done and master this transportation problem, instead of squandering money on works that may be of some use here and there but that are by no means urgent.

Mr. PUGSLEY. With regard to the port of Montreal, my hon. friend does not do justice to the Harbour Commissioners who are carrying on so successfully the great work of developing that port.

Mr. MONK. They are doing it very well.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They are doing it so well that not long ago, quite a note of alarm was sounded from New York at the way the port of Montreal is drawing trade from that city. I believe the commission will continue to do good work, and the government can be reasonably generous in furnishing the necessary funds. It is all very well to accuse this government of squandering money on wharfs ; but instead of making a general statement, it would be better to point out on what particular wharfs the money is being squandered.

Mr. MONK. I know that is a very disagreeable task and exposes one to very unfair attack. But I have no hesitation to point them out if forced into that position. Take my own province, there are very extensive works going on at St. Johns. I believe that the government are there doing works which largely, if not entirely, should

be done by private interest, which are the cause of the flooding of the country. Why should we come to the assistance of parties who, by developing water-powers, are flooding the country.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Was the Chambly canal not built by the government ?

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend is not familiar with the locality or he would know that the dam works which are the cause of the flooding were put up by electric companies in Montreal, and it is these companies which should repair the damage, and not the government.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. The hon. gentleman is out of order. We are discussing Ontario items.

Mr. MONK. I have been asked to give details ; and when I do so, I am called to order.

Goderich harbour—improvements, $75,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is for building a breakwater, some 500 feet long, for the protection of the harbour and the safety of vessels. I need not speak of the importance of this harbour. It is one of the most important on the eastern shores of Lake Huron.

Gore's landing—wharf, $1,000.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would call attention to the wharf at Grand Bend in my riding. Will the government not have some dredging done at the mouth of the river ? It has become so choked up with sand that even small boats cannot go up. I would like to ask the minister if he intends to take this matter into consideration. I understood that it was estimated that $1,125 would do the work. Will he do it this summer ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. One of my hon. friends from Huron county (Mr. McLean) has urged very strongly these improvements. The matter is under consideration. I think that there is very little doubt that this session provision will be made for the work.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Does the hon. gentleman intend to put it in the supplementary estimates ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Until His Excellency submits the estimates my mouth is closed.

Mr. LANCASTER. What the hon. gentleman (Mr. Armstrong) wants is that the minister might take it into his 'most favourable' consideration. I think the minister did not put in the adverb.

Ontario—harbours, rivers and bridges—general repairs and improvements, $25,000.

Mr. BLAIN. I would ask the attention of the minister to Port Credit harbour in the county of Peel. For several years the occupant of the position of Minister of Public Works has promised to have some dredging done at the entrance of that harbour. As far back as 1903, I made this statement :

Port Credit is very close to Toronto where the hon. gentleman has a dredge working all the time; and perhaps the minister could allow that dredge to go to Port Credit and dredge out some of the sand that is continually drifting in there.

To which the Minister of Public Works answered :

I think no one would object to that, and I will see that it is attended to if there is a dredge in that locality.

Since that time, petition after petition has been sent to the government, and we have had promises from the department from time to time that something would be done. But, up to this moment, the government has failed to fulfil its promises. I believe the minister has before him a further petition from the residents of Port Credit asking that something be done. Port Credit is a rather important point between Toronto and Hamilton, which accommodates a great deal of shipping. It is looked upon also as a harbour of refuge. I believe it deserves the attention of the minister, and I do not see why it has not received that attention. I hope he will see that something is done. If we are not making requests strong enough, I would ask the hon. gentleman what he requires. Petitions have been sent in, resolutions carried, and I have directed the attention of the government, in my own humble way, to the condition of affairs there. Now, since the new minister has come in, with large amounts of money at his disposal, now that we are voting estimates freely, I hope he will see that Port Credit is not forgotten.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My sympathies are strongly with the people of Port Credit. But the difficulty is that the harbour is a private harbour. A great many years ago the Ontario legislature did what strikes us from the lower provinces as a very peculiar thing—it vested the whole Port Credit harbour in a private company. That company owns the wharfs, the water and the bed of the harbour. I suppose that has been one difficulty in the way of getting federal money expended in the harbour. Some time ago a petition was sent to me asking if I would not buy out the Port Credit harbour company at a cost of $20,000 or $25,000. I did not think I could do that ; for it seemed to me that, if it were a private harbour before confederation, it had not in any way passed under the control of the federal government. I suggested that it might be a matter for the provincial authorities to attend to. I would suggest now to my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) that, as his influence would be very powerful with the provincial government of Ontario, if he could get that government to agree to buy out this private company and to contribute half the cost,

I think I would recommend to my colleagues the contributing of the other half. I do that because it is a private harbour, and might very well be taken hold of in that way and made a public harbour. I may say further that I have requested my chief engineer to see if he could send a dredge there and do a reasonable amount of dredging to give further facilities to vessels to reach the wharfs.

McGregor's creek—renewal of bank protection works at Chatham, $15,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is under contract.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Is that intended for the piling alone ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to renew a section of the bank protection, 88 feet long on the south side of the creek and another section 65 feet long about 400 feet above the bridge. There is also a second contract for sheet piling. On the south side of the creek in the city of Chatham. There is other work the details of which I need not give.

Mr. CLEMENTS. What is the total estimated cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $16,000.

Meaford harbour—improvements, $30,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is under contract.

Mr. BENNETT. Who are the contractors ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Joseph Battle, of Thorold.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the nature of the work ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It consists of three different classes of work, first, extending the breakwater fifty feet in an easterly direction ; second removal of fifty of the L on the east side ; third, building a revetment wall of 300 feet in length, and dredging twenty feet below low water level. The estimated cost is $43,700. There were four tenders received, and the lowest was accepted. This amount I think will complete the work.

Midland and Tiffin harbours—improvements, $75,000.

Mr. BENNETT. I want to make a few remarks about this work at Midland and Tiffin. Generally, dredging operations in the province of Ontario, and particularly as conducted on the Georgian Bay, have been the scene of the greatest swindling operations that have been carried on in Canada for a number of years and I think I shall be able to prove that by the record. For several years prior to 1906 there was a concern known as the Owen Sound Dredging Company, the stock of which is held practically one-half by A. G. Mackay, local member for North Grey in the legislature of Ontario, the other half being held by Mrs. Horsey, widow of a gentleman who at one time occupied a seat in this House as representative for North Grey. Now, having had a contract at Midland for several years prior to 1907, and having two dredges standing in the harbour at Midland at the time tenders were invited in the year 1907 it is rather odd as will be seen by reference to the documents now before the House, that Mr. A. G. MacKay, as representing the Owen Sound Dredging Company, did not tender for the work at Midland. I have in my hand a memorandum from the advertisement which appeared in the Toronto 'Globe' on April 27 and other dates, in which will be seen invitations to tender at a number of different points, and among others at Midland. Now I take the tenders that were received for that year at the town of Midland, and I find that no tender was placed before the Department of Public Works in 1907 by the firm known as the Owen Sound Dredging Company. In the foll of 1906 a dredge was brought to Midland harbour owned by a company known as the Canadian Dredging Company —I think the Canadian Dredging Company is the corporate name. Of that company a gentleman named F. W. Grant, of the town of Midland, a barrister, is the secretary and treasurer. This dredge was there in 1906, and I believe was in the employ of Mr. Mackay engaged on a work which he then had under contract. But it goes without saying according to the public documents before the House, that the Owen Sound Dredging Company, or the Mackay Company as I will call it after this placed no tender before the department for the work at Midland in 1907. But there were two different tenders placed before the department for that work to which I will refer, these were the tenders of the Grant company, and what is known as the Spohn company or the Penetanguishene Company. There was also another work to be performed at Waubaushene and for the work at Waubaushene the Grant company and the Spohn company placed tenders before the department. The figures are these : The Grant company, fifty-three cents for the general material ; and the Spohn company, fifty-seven cents for the general material. As betwen these it will be seen that the Grant company was lower by four cents than the Spohn company for the Midland work. For the Waubaushene work, the tender of the Grant company was eighteen cents for what is known as otner material, while the tender of the Spohn Company, or the Penetanguishene Company, was sixteen cents. So that between these two companies, had there been no other tender, the Grant company would have had the work at Midland, and the Spohn company would have had the work at Waubashene. Now I have here in my hands the original tenders brought down by the minister. I may say just here that it is regrettable that year after year we have to witness the same spectacle and I

trust that next year a new minister will occuply the place now held by the Minister of Public Works, but a new minister from this side of the House. There have been several different gentlemen occupying that position recently, and as a result the hon. gentleman who now occupies the position had nothing to do with the matters I am going to deal with. But I do say that when a gentleman occupying the responsible position of Minister of Public Works for Canada has a staff under him such as the Minister of Public Works has in this country, it is regrettable that men who are tendering on public works involving the expenditure of thousands of dollars, can openly and in the most barefaced manner enter into collusion, and, whether by ignorance or design such collusion is not noticed by the minister. I hold in my hand first, the tender of the so-called Grant company on the work at Waubaushene, I also have the tenders of the Grant company on the work at Midland; I also have the two tenders of the Spohn company on the Midland work and on the Waubaushene work, and I challenge the Minister of Public Works to say that he is not driven to admit that the tenders of the Grant company for these two works and the tenders of the Spohn company for these works, are in the selfsame handwriting. It is indisputable, and no man who looks at the tenders can say otherwise.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say to my hon. friend that after he made his previous statement to the House, I looked at the figures, and although I am not an expert in handwriting, I would say that they bear every appearance of having been written by different hands. I say the figures giving the price of the material have every evidence of being written by a different hand. I examined with great care, and that would be the judgment I would form.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, I am glad the minister has practically admitted that the body of the tenders is written by the same hand.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, I do not admit that at all, because I am not sufficient of an expert in handwriting to know, but I think I am sufficient of an expert to know that the figures giving the price of the different materials bear not the slightest resemblance o each other, and do not afford the slightest indication that they were written by the same person.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, before the discussion closes I shall show these documents to other hon. gentlemen, and I think they will verify my contention, and will say that it is indisputably correct. Not only are the tenders of the Grant company and, as I allege of the Spohn company, written in the same handwriting but the figures are also the same.

Another proof lies in the fact that the envelopes are distinctly the same and are addressed in the same handwriting. The signatures to the tenders put in by the Penetanguishene Company are in the handwriting of a man named Kastner who was connected with the Penetanguishene Company, and any man who looks at the handwriting of Kastner which is irregular and ragged, and compares it with the figures will see that they were never written by the same man. More than that the envelopes which inclose the tenders—for the two tenders of the Grant Company were in one envelope and the two tenders of the Spohn Company were in one envelope—were, according to the postmark, both mailed in Ottawa on the same day proving that the two representatives of this company, admitting that they each mailed his own envelope, were in the city. More than that, there are two marks on these envelopes which denote that they were received at the department consecutively. I shall pass these over to my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) who can see that what I say is correct.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think he is a Sherlock Holmes.

Mr. BENNETT. But he is able to detect a palpable fraud and anybody can detect that this is one.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Was there not another tender ?

Mr. BENNETT. I am coming to that. Apart from these two tenders of the Grant and the Spohn Company there was a third tender for the Midland work, that was the tender of the Stewart Company, of Ottawa, which was at 30 cents and perhaps when the minister comes to make his explanation he will explain to the House how it was that the Stewart Company did not proceed with the work, their tender on the Midland work being the lowest. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) was at that time acting as Minister of Public Works. For some reason best known to himself, whether it was due the fact that the Mackay Company had done the work there at figures ranging from 15 cents to 18 cents in prior years and that then the lowest tender was 53 cents, or whether it was due to the fact that Stewart refused to go on with the work at 30 cents, I do not know, but the tender of the Stewart Company was not acted upon and although the Grant Company were the next lowest tenderers at 53 cents, the acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Aylesworth) did not award the contract to them. I make the charge that Mr. A. G. Mackay was a party to this tendering by the Grant Company and that he was thoroughly conversant with it.

Mr. PARDEE. What have you to prove that ?

Mr. BENNETT. I will read a document of A. G. Mackay. Some correspondence was brought down in the House during this session in reference to the extension of these contracts and among others there is a letter written on the 9th of September by Mr. Grant, representing the company that I have termed the Grant Company, addressed to the hon. the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) in reference to the extension of the work at Midland and in that letter, among other things, he says :

As you are aware, the Owen Sound Dredge Company and this company have been working under contracts from your department at Midland harbour, Tiffin harbour and Victoria harbour—the contracts for Midland being in our name, and those for Tiffin and Victoria harbour in the name of the Owen Sound Company. Altogether both companies have three dredges—two large steel dredges and one smaller one—and these dredges have been working on all the above contract works as circumstances required.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is either of these the Penetanguishene Company ?

Mr. BENNETT. No, this is the Mackay Company and the Grant Company working together, and I have before stated that although Mackay's Company had had the work at Midland for several years prior to that time they did not tender on the work for that year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I understood my hon. friend to say he would show that the same man was interested in these two companies that tendered first at Midland, one being the Penetanguishene Company. That is why I asked if there was any evidence that Mackay was interested in that.

Mr. BENNETT. I hardly know the refenence the hon. gentleman makes, but I say the two tenders were the result of collusion between the Spohn Company and the Grant Company and the documents bear that out. As to the alleged fraud that was being attempted to be perpetrated on the country by obtaining 53 cents a yard for work at Midland for which Mackay had before been employed at prices from 15 cents to 17 cents, I say that Mackay was a party to that attempted fraud by not tendering himself and thereby hoping, by the placing of these two fraudulent tenders before the department, to get the benefit of it. I have quoted that clause from Grant's letter which goes without saying——

Mr. PUGSLEY. Did not Mackay tender for the work at Victoria harbour ?

Mr. BENNETT. That was later on and was altogether apart from Midland. I shall quote one more statement to show that Mackay and the Grant Company were closely identified, Mackay having the work at a point in Midland harbour which is called Tiffin and where the two dredges of the Mackay Company and the Grant Company were working together. In proof that they were united in a business arrangement there is this further clause in the Grant letter :

There is another matter which is disturbing us considerably. At the present time, there is a large balance of money due the Owen Sound Company under the Tiffin contract, and when the December account goes in, it will probably amount to over $60,000. Ordinarily we could wait until next spring for this money, but financial conditions are so strained this year that the pressure is very heavy. It is not a question of security with us, or our bankers, but simply a necessity for ready cash. The work at Tiffin this year, because of its importance had to be rushed ahead whether there was available money to pay or not and we would appreciate very much if you could have money provided for payments of our accounts by the first of the year.

I submit that so far as this letter of Grant's is concerned, the Mackay and Grant Companies were the one acting concern. But I do not want to rely on the Grant letter alone, I shall have recourse to another letter written by the same Mr. Grant under date of January 14, addressed to the minister. Among other things he says :

I have the honour to further write you along the lines of my letter of December 9 last, and also our conversation on Friday last regarding the contracts for dredging at Midland and Tiffin harbours.

The contract for the latter stands in the name of the Owen Sound Company, with whom we are associated. The former is in our name.

Further on in the same letter Grant says :

With your early approval for the extension of the contracts as they exist, we will undertake along with the Owen Sound Company to have the harbour in such condition that the moment the elevator is completed the largest freight boats on the lakes will be able to dock and discharge their cargo. But to do this we would have to know at the earliest possible moment.

The other points which were taken up in my previous letter it is not necessary to repeat, but I might again say that our combined plants, we feel sure would meet the approval of any capable engineer as the most efficient plant on the lakes available for this work, and the only plants which can insure its rapid completion.

Those are the letters of Grant which demonstrate beyond the shadow of a doubt that Mackay's Company was associated with Grant's Company in that contract. But here is a letter of Mackay himself which is addressed to the minister, dated January 25, 1903 :

Dear Sir,—As you are doubtless aware, the Owen Sound Dredge and Construction Company, Limited, have the contract for the dredging of Midland harbour at Tiffin.

But the Mackay Company had not the contract at all for dredging. The contract stood in the name of the Grant Company. I am referring to the contract at Tiffin; I am not referring to the contract at Victoria harbour at all.

We think that by using the two dredging plants our company own and by continuing to employ the dredging plant of the Canadian Dredge and Construction Company, of Midland, we can have the harbour ready for the grain trade in the fall.

If these three dredging plants are not sufficient to expedite the work, and if it is absolutely necessary, our company has a new dredging plant in the course of construction.

What are the facts. Here are a set of tenders placed before the department by Mackay through Grant, and Mackay and Grant, and the letters of Grant and Mackay are by really the same person. What was the end sought by Grant and Mackay? Mackay before had contracts at 15 and 16 cents a yard. There is an arrangement among these dredging concerns by which they collude to place higher figures on work they do not wish to get.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Among which dredging concerns?

Mr. BENNETT. Here are two, Mackay's and Grant's to commence with, and there are more. Now what was the position? Mackay expected—having two dredges there on the ground and having a third one in course of construction as he said in his letter—by the fraud that was being perpetrated by the Spohn Company and by the Grant Company not to be driven to do the work as he had done it in former years at 15 and 16 cents a yard, but to be able to steal from the people of this country 53 cents a yard. And every man who knows Mackay and who has heard this matter discussed as it was discussed during the local campaign took Mackay at his own estimate when he made statements that were inconsistent with the facts.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The people of Owen Sound do not seem to agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett).

Mr. BENNETT. His majority in Owen Sound of 450 was reduced to a miserable 43, and it may be a matter of exposure in the election courts how that was brought about.

Mr. TELFORD. The hon. member is wrong with respect to the figures.

Mr. BENNETT. What were the figures?

Mr. TELFORD. About 178 in Owen Sound.

Mr. BENNETT. In the last election?

Mr. TELFORD. In the one before.

Mr. BENNETT. If the hon. gentleman gets any comfort in Mackay's majority being reduced from 270 to 43 he can have it. But anyway it is more of a majority than the hon. gentleman (Mr. Telford) will have in Owen Sound next election.

Mr. TELFORD. Is the hon. member aware that Owen Sound is a Conservative town and that the Conservatives generally give a majority?

Mr. BENNETT. And they will give a majority again, and I hope they will have an opportunity to do so next fall. Here is this man Mackay, according to his own letter associated with this Grant Company; here is the precious Mr. A. G. Mackay of unsavory reputation and memory with the people of Ontario. Here is this same Mr. A. G. Mackay with two dredges lying in the harbour and a third one coming in as he says, having had the work in Midland harbour at 15 and 16 cents a yard, entering into a scheme or a contract or an agreement with this so called Grant Company that they were to share the work between themselves. Now, Sir, what remained to be done by Grant? Grant comes down to the city of Ottawa accompanied by a man named Kastner from Wiarton who had a record in one of the North Grey election trials when these blackguards were brought over from Buffalo, and these men together sat down and as the tenders prove Grant writes the two tenders to which Kastner signs his name and the tenders went to the Department of Public Works. Mr. Aylesworth was acting Minister of Public Works, and in view of the fact that their tender is 53 cents a yard and that a lower one of 30 cents a yard is not acted upon, the acting minister (Mr. Aylesworth) refused to give the work to Mackay at 53 cents. There was fraud perpetrated by Kastner and by Grant, and the parties participating in the prospective fraud were Mackay and Grant as was shown right on the face of the documents, and it cannot be gainsaid. Why did not Mr. Aylesworth give the contract at 53 cents?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not like to interrupt my hon. friend, but he will remember that under the terms of the advertisement tenderers were allowed to tender for the various works in each province. The Dominion Dredging Company tendered for other work. I do not know that they tendered for other work in Ontario, but they certainly tendered for other work in the province of Quebec, and they had no more dredging plant than was absolutely necessary to enable them to perform the work that was awarded to them, and so the Dominion Dredging Company could not undertake this work. Consequently the acting minister was obliged to call for new tenders. My information is that had the Dominion Dredging Company been prepared to do this work the contract would have been given to them as the lowest tenderers.

Dredge Company been prepared to do this work the contract would have been given to them as the lowest tenderers.

Mr. BENNETT. What a childlike explanation from the Minister of Public Works. Did Mr. Aylesworth believe that the Grant Company was tendering honestly when they tendered prior to the 6th of May and their tender was 53 cents? That is why he called for new tenders.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does not my hon. friend know there was a lower tender than that, namely for 30 cents, and that the Dominion Dredging Company having declined to do the work at that price, that it was the exercise of the best judgment on the part of the acting minister that he should make a second call for tenders?

Mr. BENNETT. I am quite willing to give credit to Mr. Aylesworth for dealing honestly with the matter and I believe he acted honestly. I believe that when he looked at these documents he saw fraud on the face of them and said: Although you are the next lowest tenderer at 53 cents I will not award it to you. And so he called for new tenders and Mackay instead of tendering at 53 cents tendered at 26 cents. What has the Minister of Public Works got to say to that, along the line of common honesty?

Mr. PUGSLEY. As I understand it, Mr. Mackay never tendered at 53 cents.

Mr. BENNETT. Why, I have read the letters of Mackay and Grant in which they say they are associated together in the work. Is the minister going to have the temerity to say that Mackay had nothing to do with that contract at all?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Was it not in 1907 that he says they were associated?

Mr. BENNETT. The tenders were invited in 1907.

Mr. PUGSLEY. And after the work had been undertaken they might easily make arrangement for the use of each other's plant.

Mr. BENNETT. Can the minister give any sensible explanation of why with two dredges lying in the harbour and Mackay having the contract for several years before he did not tender?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not all the facts in my memory now, but my impression is that the tender with which Mr. Mackay was connected was for the work at Victoria harbour, and it was then understood that the work was going to be a very important work and might very properly require the services of the dredging plant which his company was possessed of.

Mr. BENNETT. Now, we will take that part of it.

Mr PUGSLEY.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman will be able to say whether that is correct or not.

Mr. BENNETT. It is not correct. The only tender for the work at Midland——

Mr. PUGSLEY. Take Victoria harbour.

Mr. BENNETT. There were no tenders invited for Victoria harbour until some time after Mackay, for some reason or other, was awarded the contract at this part of Midland harbour called Tiffin. Why didn't Mackay tender? The reason Mackay did not tender was this: That the year before Mackay had sent his manager down here to tender on a prior work and the result was that, as appeared by these tenders, there was collusion and fraud between this Mackay Company, represented by his agent Wilkinson, and the Penetanguishene Company. The tenders of the Penetanguishene Company are in Mackay's own private envelopes. Mackay was attempting to obtain some prominence in the province of Ontario and he did not want to come down here to Ottawa and be engaged in these games. He knew, as any sensible man must have known, that probably this thing would leak out, and for that reason Mackay did not come near the scene of the operations at all, but instead of that in the first place Wilkinson, his foreman, came down, and Wilkinson according to the evidence in the tenders was in palpable collusion and fraud with Spohn of the Penetanguishene Company. It went so far that the envelopes containing Spohn's tenders were in Mackay's own office envelopes.

Mr. PARDEE. That was fully explained in the committee.

Mr. BENNETT. Certainly it was explained when this fellow Spohn stood up and swore on his solemn oath that he did not know where he got the envelopes and Wilkinson did the same thing, and I think people who know them both in their own localities will have their opinion of the oath of either one of them.

Mr. CARVELL. Will the hon. gentleman say whether these were the lowest tenderers and whether either of them got the contract?

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. member (Mr. Carvell) is always ready where there is anything nasty or dishonest to defend it; all he wants to do is to rely on quibbles.

Mr. CARVELL. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) will not answer I cannot make him, but it is only fair he should answer the question.

Mr. BENNETT. Let me tell the hon. member who acts as an understudy for the Minister of Public Works, so that when the avalanche overtakes the present minister which he is hoping for, he will be ready to take his place.

Mr. CARVELL. I have a right to an answer to my question. Were either of these tenders accepted by the government? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) dare not answer; he is simply attempting to deceive this House.

Mr. BENNETT. The understudy is getting very violent.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He would have to answer 'no' to your question and that is what he does not want to do.

Mr. CARVELL. I think the hon. gentleman should in all decency answer the question.

Mr. BENNETT. Let us hear your question.

Mr. CARVELL. Were any of these tenders accepted by the department? Was there not a lower tender at a very much lower price, and was not that contract given to the lower tender?

Mr. BENNETT. I will come to that. Mr. Aylesworth, by reason of the fraud that had been practised on the department, and not believing in the genuineness of the supposed rival tender——

Mr. CARVELL. Answer the question.

Mr. PARDEE. If he does he will show there was no fraud.

Mr. BENNETT. My hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Pardee) thinks there is no fraud. As a follower of the muddy Ross administration he was thrown out of the local House. He would stand up for anything whether it was right or wrong.

Mr. PARDEE. The hon. gentleman has not yet answered the question.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman was defeated for the local House, and very properly so.

Mr. PARDEE. I am not ashamed of having been defeated, but in the meantime you might tell the facts and answer the question.

Mr. BENNETT. I have told the facts as to the dredging. No one can deny that the tenders of the two supposedly rival firms are in the same hand writing.

Mr. PARDEE. Was the contract awarded on these tenders? That is the question.

Mr. BENNETT. When Mr. Aylesworth saw that the tender of the Mackay and Grant Companies was for 53 cents and that Mackay had done the work in prior years for 16 and 17 cents, he would not give the contract at all, though they were the lowest, at 53 cents.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They were not the lowest.

Mr. CARVELL. They were not the lowest.

Mr. BENNETT. They were, outside the tender of the Dominion Dredging Company which the minister says was withdrawn.

Mr. SPROULE. An old trick.

Mr. BENNETT. As a sample of the common honesty of Mackay and the Mackay and Grant companies what did they do? They then came in with a tender for exactly the same work at 26 cents.

Mr. CARVELL. And they got the contract.

Mr. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. CARVELL. Did the country suffer anything?

Mr. J. D. REID. It would have if they succeeded.

Mr. CARVELL. We will get the true story after a while.

Mr. BENNETT. The country did not suffer, of course it didn't.

Mr. CARVELL. Well that is all right then.

Mr. BENNETT. Had Mackay and Grant been permitted to carry out their game of fraud as they expected, they would have got the contract at 53 cents a yard.

Mr. CARVELL. Which shows we have a good honest government.

Mr. LANCASTER. Have you just found it out?

Mr. BENNETT. I quite agree that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Carvell) coming from New Brunswick has a very hazy idea of what public morality and public honesty in this country should be.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. BENNETT. And the people of New Brunswick made it pretty plain to him the other day and they will make it plainer still when they get a chance at him.

Mr. CARVELL. I must apologize for interrupting my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) but it seemed necessary that some one should interrupt him and try and set him right.

Mr. BENNETT. And when anything of that kind is required somebody can always be relied on in the person of the understudy from New Brunswick because what other gentlemen would scorn to do that hon. gentleman is willing and anxious to do. Let him play out his part, it suits him admirably.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Well, push along.

Mr. BENNETT. This is a fair sample of the dredging operations as they are conducted in Ontario and the manner in which tenderers approach the foot of the throne when they are tendering. There were some tenders called for Thunder Bay and Fort

William. There is a company up there called the Great Lakes Dredging Company, one-half of the stock in which is owned by C. F. Bowman (a member of the local House) and one C. A. Bowman, and the other half is owned by Mr. James Whalen of Port Arthur. What is the modus operandi of this company in tendering for contracts? The company puts in a tender at 9 cents a yard and Mr. A. F. Bowman puts in a tender at 16 or 17 cents a yard. The idea that they have is that the gentleman who is a one-fourth holder of the stock of the company puts in a tender at 16 or 17 cents while his own company puts in a tender at 9 cents. What explanation has the minister to give of that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I had no conversation with these gentlemen.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Bowman was examined under oath.

Mr. CARVELL. Were they public tenders?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes, and fortunately for the country a couple of tenders intervened between the 9 cents and the 16 cents. The idea of this company was that there would be no tender lower than the 16 cents except their own of 9 cents and that the department would be so complacent that they would pull out the 9 cents tender and substitute the 16 cent tender.

Mr. CARVELL. Did the government get the work done for 9 cents?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. CARVELL. Where is the harm then?

Mr. BENNETT. My honest opinion is that they would never have got the work done for 9 cents were it not that two tenders for 11 cents and 12 cents intervened. Mr. Bowman was examined under oath.

Mr. CARVELL. It is fortunate we had these gentlemen examined because their evidence spoils your argument.

Mr. BENNETT. Will that perpetual parrot please pause for a while? I know the hon. gentleman is anxious to make an exhibition of himself before the Prime Minister in anticipation of his advent to the cabinet, but that is very far away. Now what happens next?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. You might tell us the truth about it.

Mr. BENNETT. Listen to my hon. friend from Kootenay; a gentleman who in cold blood murdered a minister by an interruption which he made in this House. I am surprised that he of all men in the House should open his mouth, he, the murderer of a former minister, he who drove that minister outside the cabinet.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Personally I am not concerned very much about what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) says or does not say, but I fancy that language is out of order and is not such as should be used in parliament.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Such language had better not be used.

Mr. GALLIHER. I have also to enter an objection to his reference to the member for Kootenay. I happen to be the member for Kootenay.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, I will withdraw the expression political murderer and I will call him the gentleman who precipitated the terrible descent of a minister of the Crown. I think that is in order.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. You ought to withdraw the other expression.

Mr. GALLIHER. You should withdraw the reference to Kootenay also

Mr. BENNETT. All right, I meant to refer to the member for Yale (Mr. Duncan Ross). Where the expenditure runs up into hundreds of thousands of dollars, because these dredging operations run into the millions, the tenderers come down and flaunt themselves before the department, confident that they are going to be able to perpetrate their frauds, and the most wonderful thing is that the government go on dealing with the self same men. When these tenders of the Grant Company were not acted upon by the department, for reasons best known to Mr. Aylesworth, what next happened? Tenders were invited and placed before the department on the 20th May, the former ones having been cancelled immediately. These tenders were invited by telegram, and a number of well known contracting firms either telegraphed or sent down their tenders. There was one from the Wilson Company of Toronto, one from Randolph McNally, one from the Sarnia Company and another from the Goderich Company. They were all willing to tender either by telegram or memo. Mr. Mackay, however, thought something better might be done, and he came right down to the field of operations and placed his tender with the department personally. That is proved by the fact that the envelope bears no postmark in which he placed his tender. Neither did the envelope in which the Grant Company placed their tender bear any postmark. And by a strange coincidence, although these two tenders are for different parts of Midland harbour, Mackay's envelope and Grant's envelope were together, showing how close these contractors are to each other. May I ask where the tenders are for the work to be performed at Victoria harbour?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It must be there.

Mr. BENNETT. The Owen Sound Company have a tender in and the Windsor Dredging Company. That is another of

these political associations. It has W. J. McKee at its head, a well known politician. There was another tender put in by this so-called Grant Company afterwards, on the 20th May. I am not going to deal with the question of the frauds perpetrated by the unloading of the scows. The evidence given in the committee is so clear that the dishonesty cannot be doubted. Wilkinson, the master of the Mackay dredge, when confronted with the statement which shows that his dredge was employed sixteen hours frankly said that he did not believe the inspector was there, and that the inspector did not know how many scow loads were taken out and whether the scows were full. In the locality it is well known the inspector was not there. I am glad the minister is now taking some precaution by compelling the inspectors to sign a form of declaration. The minister and the Liberal press took great credit from the fact that by refusing to renew the contract and inviting new tenders the country had lost money. What has been the result? In the work at Midland the price paid is 2 cents a yard more. But that is no fault of mine. If the minister thought that the former price was fair, why did he pay a higher price? He could have got the work done at the same rate.

Mr. PUGSLEY. After asking for tenders we let the contract to the lowest.

Mr. BENNETT. The minister knew that they had done the work the previous year at 26 cents, and he has himself to blame if anything more was paid.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not throw the responsibility of accepting the lowest tender on any one.

Mr. BENNETT. If he has succeeded in making the country pay a couple of hundred thousands of dollars more for dredging this year, that is no fault of mine. Parliament voted a certain amount of money for dredging operations; yet in the face of the direct appropriation by parliament the Mackay-Grant Company did work that amounts to $75,000 more than the appropriation, and the minister had to come down with a vote for that amount. Does he propose to do that this year again? Is he going to ask for an appropriation and then let the contractors exceed it to the extent of $75,000 or $100,000? I quite agree that the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway are both doing a large mount of work at Victoria harbour and Clifton and that dredging is required at both these points, but I want to see the country get good value. I do not object to the expenditure; but when contractors put in tenders which are fraudulent on their face, the department should act with them in a summary manner.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Last year it was found that the approrpiation was exceeded before the close of the season. There was very important work being done by both the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway with a view of getting the harbour ready by the time their railway tracks reached these ports; and I thought it would be a public misfortune if I were obliged to close down the dredging work before the end of the season. And while, under the contracts, I might have done so, I said they might go on with the work, they taking the risk of the appropriation being made by parliament. I am happy to say that when parliament was asked to make an appropriation in the supplementary estimates of the last fiscal year there was a ready response, no objection being raised. With regard to this year's work, I think that in the supplementary estimates there will be found a sufficient vote to enable the dredges to work during the whole of the present season. It may be that some work will be done beyond the appropriation, but I have reason to believe that the appropriation will be quite sufficient.

Now, with regard to the company with which Mr. Mackay was connected, I do not know why it was that that company did not tender for the work of Tiffin and Midland.

Mr. BENNETT. Let me set the minister right at the outset, for I am sure he does not wish to misstate the case. No tenders were called at the commencement of the year for Tiffin. I have the advertisement and the hon. gentleman will see that the dredging was at Midland.

Mr. PUGSLEY. At present, we distinguish between Midland and Tiffin, but we did not at that time. The reason why Tiffin was included in Midland last year was that it forms part of Midland Bay, or even Midland harbour, although the new terminals of the railway company are being made in a very different place from the terminals at Midland. Now, my hon. friend, I think, would have achieved great eminence if he had adopted a different profession. His abilities, certainly, would have adorned the profession which was made famous by the celebrated Sherlock Holmes. Even in the matter of the comparison of handwriting, my hon. friend is able to see with absolute certainty resemblances in the handwriting of different documents which nobody else is able to discover. Take the tenders for Penetanguishene and Owen Sound and my hon. friend can see resemblances in the figures written in these two tenders, which, I am positive, no other hon. member of this House or anybody else will be able to see. I have looked at the two, and while I admit that there is some

resemblance in the handwriting in some parts, yet in the figures, which are the essential thing to show collusion, there is not the slightest resemblance. Yet the hon. gentleman is able to say without a moment's hesitation that they were written by the same hand.

Mr. BENNETT. Is there any resemblance in the handwriting?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I said that in some parts there was some resemblance. But I have had a large experience in court and my experience tells me that if a man has a vivid imagination he can see resemblances in handwriting specimens that one less gifted would fail to discover. When experts in handwriting desire to find resemblances, it seems the easiest thing in the world for them to do so. The result of my experience is that I do not place great reliance on the tests of experts in handwriting. With regard to the figures which, as I have said, are the crucial thing, I venture to say that the figures in the two tenders do not bear the slightest resemblance, nor is there anything else to indicate that they were prepared by the same person. Now, when these tenders came to the attention of the minister he found that there were three tenders, one from the Owen Sound Company, one from the Penetanguishene Company, and one from the Dominion Dredging Company, the prices being 57 cents, 53 cents and 30 cents. It was obviously the minister's duty to accept the lowest tender. He accepted the Dominion Dredging Company's tender, and advised the company of that fact. They had tendered for other works on the St. Lawrence and other rivers; and they informed the minister that with the other contracts which they had accepted and the work they had to do, they would not be able to perform this work, not having a sufficient dredging plant. And so they declined to do the work at 30 cents. What better evidence does the hon. gentleman want that there is nothing in his statement—which, if not unparliamentary, I would call a reckless statement—that it is the practice of these companies to combine and secure whatever prices they desire from the government, than the fact that the Dominion Dredging Company which he likes to call the 'Stewart Company,' because Mr. Stewart happens to be the son of a member of this House—what better evidence could he desire of the lack of foundation of his statement than the fact that when the Dominion Dredging Company could not do the work, and, in a perfectly proper manner the minister called for new tenders, the company with which Mr. Mackay is connected, which, for some reason that I am not aware of, probably a perfectly good reason had not tendered before, tendered for 27 cents a cubic yard? So the country got the work done at 3 cents a cubic yard less than the lowest tender, that of the Dominion Dredging Company, which he has so frequently mentioned in this House in terms, certainly, not of the greatest respect. Can any fault be found with the minister?——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Six o'clock.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would suggest that this item be passed——

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Then, I shall have some remarks to make after recess.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Just before recess I was making some observations in reply to my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Bennett). I shall not pursue the matter along the same lines beyond saying this, for I want to be as brief as possible. My hon. friend has failed to point out that in any single case the department has accepted any other but the lowest tender; in every case the contract for dredging work has been given to the lowest tenderer. There have been a few cases, very few indeed, in which there has been a failure to perform the contract satisfactorily on the part of certain companies, in these cases the contracts have been given to the next lowest tenderer, provided he has brought his price down to the price of the lowest tenderer. But with those exceptions, which have occurred very rarely the contract has always been awarded by competition to the lowest tenderer. I may also say that in some cases where the work is urgent, exceptions have been made, in cases where it was necessary that work should be done immediately.

Now my hon. friend referred to the fact that something had been said in the newspapers regarding the objection which he made to the extension of the dredging contracts. I do not know what has been said, but I do know that after the matter had been raised in the House by the hon. gentleman, when I decided to extend the dredging contracts, there were in the newspapers supporting hon. gentlemen opposite, strong expressions of triumph at what was supposed to be some great act performed in the public interest and which would redound to the party benefit. Now I want to say a word or two with regard to the extension of the dredging contracts. When the question of how to deal with the various dredging works came before us, I looked into the existing contracts, looked into the prices, and I found they provided that the dredging should be completed during the then current season, or at such other date as might be fixed by the minister. It seemed very

clear that under the terms of the contracts, I had power, if I thought it in the public interest so to do, to fix a later date for the completion of the work. I asked for a report from the chief engineer of my department with reference to the prices which were being paid for the various dredging work that was being done under the different contracts. His report was that in all cases the prices were fair and reasonable. In many cases they seemed to me very low, and I am free to say to the committee that I thought that it would unquestionably be in the public interest if I could extend those contracts and give until the end of the present year for their completion, where that time was necessary in order to complete them. But the hon. gentleman voicing the sentiments of the opposition raised an objection to that. Well, I felt that the views of the opposition were entitled to respect. They represent a large and important section of the people of this country, although numerically a considerable minority of the people. Still, they represent an important section, and their opinions are entitled to respect. I felt that if there could be any ground of criticism levelled against me and levelled against those with whom I have the honour to be associated, not only my colleagues in the government but our supporters in this House and throughout this country—I felt that I ought not to subject them to that criticism. So in looking into the matter more closely, I found that the advertisements for tenders which were issued last year called for dredging during the then present season. My hon. friend had not called the attention of the committee, and had not called my attention to that. But in consequence of the matter coming up, and as I felt that if there were any ground of criticism it was my duty to remove it, I looked back to see what were the advertisements which called for tenders on which these contracts had been let, and finding that the advertisements were limited in the way I have mentioned, I came to the conclusion that, even although the contracts upon their face gave me power to fix a later date for the completion of the work, yet upon the whole there might be a question as to whether the contracts were not broader than was warranted by the advertisements. In view, therefore, of the objection which was raised by the opposition, and in view of the criticism which I knew would be levelled against me and against the government if I were to extend the contracts, I thought it would be better for me to yield to the objection which had been raised, and to issue an advertisement for new tenders. I did so, Mr. Chairman, and I did so reluctantly, because I felt that the extension of the contracts would be in the public interest. I felt it would be a saving of money to the country to extend the contracts. However, as I say, I yielded to the objection which had been made, and in view of the circumstances regarding the advertisements for tenders. Well, the result of calling for new tenders has been that in the great majority of cases, although the widest possible publicity was given to the advertisements, and although in many cases a large number of tenders were received, the total result has been that the price at which the lowest tenderer in each case tendered, is, with few exceptions, considerably higher than the price at which the work was being done last year. I will give some examples. In the case of Owen Sound, the contract was being done last year for materials, outside of rock, at 20 cents per cubic yard; the lowest tender this year was 25 cents per cubic yard.

Mr. BENNETT. Who is the tenderer?

Mr. PUGSEY. Mr. Bowman. And Mr. Boone also tendered. Mr. Boone's tender was 28 cents per cubic yard, 8 cents higher than the price given last year. The lowest tenderer this year was 5 cents per cubic yard higher than the price last year. In the case of the Hamilton work it was done last year at 12 cents per cubic yard, the lowest tender this year is 15 cents.

Mr. BENNETT. Who is the tenderer?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Phinn. Mr. Healey, the next tenderer, 23 cents. At Cobourg there were five tenderers: Phinn at 18 cents, Morgan at 22 cents, Healy at 23, Randolph & Macdonald at 23, and Manley at 30. Last year the work was being done at the low price of 11 cents per cubic yard, 7 cents per cubic yard lower than the lowest tender of this year, and 19 cents per cubic yard lower than the highest tender of this year. In that case there were five tenderers for the work. In the case of Goderich there were three tenderers: Horton at 35 cents, Manley & Co. at 35 cents, and J. B. Bertram, of Toronto, at 42 cents. Mr. Bertram is a dredging contractor. He is doing work at Port Burwell at present. The price of the work last year, 25 cents per cubic yard, was one cent per cubic yard less than the lowest tender this year and 17 cents lower than the highest of this year. In the case of Midland this year there was only one tender at 28 cents, while last year it was 26 cents, a difference of 2 cents. The Canadian Dredging and Construction Company has the contract. At Little Current the price this year is a little less than last year. Last year it was 30 cents and this year it is 25 cents. The same contractor, Mr. Boone, has the work.

Mr. BENNETT. How many tenders were there at Little Current?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Two.

Mr. BENNETT. Who was the second?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Bowman. At Wingfield basin, Boone tendered last year and

had the work at 65 cents. This year he was the only tenderer and he has it at 78 cents. At Blind river the tenders this year were 23 cents, the lowest, and 26 cents, the highest. Last year the work was being done at 18½ cents. At Port Elgin there were four tenders, the lowest 22 cents, the highest 42 cents. Last year the work was done at 25 cents, so there is a saving of 3 cents a cubic yard there. At Trenton harbour there is a marked difference. The lowest tender this year was 26 cents a cubic yard and there were three tenders, the Morgan Company, the Weddell Company and the Randolph Macdonald Company. The Morgan's tender was 26 cents, Weddell's 39 cents and Macdonald's 43 cents. Last year the work was done under contract at 14 cents per cubic yard. The contract has been given to Weddell at the price of Morgan's tender. Morgan has been doing work in Quebec and without wishing to say anything to injure him there was a great deal of dissatisfaction with his work last year.

Mr. J. D. REID. Who had it last year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Prendergast, of Montreal. He lost a great deal of money on it. In Toronto last year the work was being done at 13½ cents, but this year it is 19½ cents. The work is being done by Healy who is the only tenderer. At Penetang, Bowman who had it last year at 14 cents was the only tenderer this year at 19 cents.

Mr. BENNETT. Did the minister of his own accord raise the dredging there from 14 cents to 19½ cents?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not of my own accord. We advertised publicly for tenders and the lowest tender was 19 cents. It was a question of accepting that tender or not proceeding with the work. My hon. friend seems to think it would be a proper thing for the minister when he advertised publicly for tenders for dredging work and did not get any which according to the judgment of the chief engineer were reasonable, to refuse to accept tenders and not go on with the work.

Mr. BENNETT. Did the chief engineer certify when the price was 14 cents that it was reasonable and also when it was 19 cents?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, and my chief engineer was of opinion and so advised me that in a large number of these contracts last year the work was being done not only at a reasonable price, but at a lower price than we could ever expect to get contractors to tender for the work at.

Mr. BENNETT. Rot.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Another remarkable instance was at Port Burwell, where there were four tenders this year. Bertram and Company tendered at 39 cents, Finn at 43 cents, Horton at 44 cents and Manley at 45 cents, all most reliable contractors, men of large experience and of the highest reputation.

Mr. BENNETT. Horton included?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Horton included.

Mr. BENNETT. You should read the evidence in the East Elgin trial to a man of that name who took part in marking ballots.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I feel very sorry that my hon. friend has this unfortunate disposition to find fault.

Mr. BENNETT. I say truthful things about men of the stamp of Horton whose reputation is known in Ontario.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot help thinking that when my hon. friend retires from the House and gets home in the silence of his bedroom he must regret the disagreeable things he has said because there is no lasting pleasure in that sort of thing.

Mr. BENNETT. The minister may hear some things of himself if he does not keep a little bridle on his unruly tongue.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have heard a great many things about myself and very nasty things in my lifetime, and there is no man living who can say anything against me that I should be ashamed or afraid to hear, no man living.

I was explaining that at Port Burwell there were four tenders, and the lowest tender this year was 39 cents, while last year the work was done at 15½ cents. Our information is that the contractor was losing money upon that contract last year. I need not go through all the others, but I will take the case of the Thames. There there were four tenders, the Bertram Company at 24 cents, Horton at 22 cents Healy at 23 cents and Manley at 20 cents. Last year that work was done at 13 cents.

The total result, as near as I am able to figure it out, taking in Ontario and Quebec, of the calling for new tenders—and I regret that this should be the case—has been to cost the Dominion somewhere between $175,000 and $200,000 more than it would have if I had extended the contracts and insisted on the work going on at the same price as that in force last year.

Mr. BENNETT. Why did you not extend it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have already explained the reason. I take, of course, the full responsibility, but I have been obliged to assume that responsibility under the circumstances I have mentioned. I felt as I have said, that the contracts gave me full power to extend them, and I felt in view of the low price at which the work was being done that it would have been the part of wisdom for my hon. friend who has been

commissioned by our hon. friends opposite to take charge of the criticism of dredging contracts and who speaks for the opposition, to have acquiesced in what I proposed to do, but, as I said, under the circumstances that it was due to myself and to the government and to the friends supporting us to ask for new tenders and then, having called for new tenders, I felt that as the prices were certified to be reasonable by the chief engineer it was my duty to accept the lowest tenders.

Mr. J. D. REID. The minister finds fault with the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) for complaining because tenders were not advertised for in the usual way during the present year and he tries to show that the country has lost money by having to pay larger prices than what were paid last year. If these contractors were willing to do this work at the same prices that they were paid last year, it reflects seriously on the hon. minister that he gave them a renewal of the contract at the advanced prices he has stated.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not renew a single contract. I asked for public tenders, and gave the contract to the lowest tenderer.

Mr. J. D. REID. And they are going to be paid $175,000 more this year than they were paid last year for the same work. I would think that the hon. minister, when he received a tender of 26 cents for work that was done last year for 14 cents per cubic yard, while the contractor was willing to do it this year at the same price, would have hesitated before making a contract at nearly double the price paid before. We learned in the Public Accounts Committee that on all these dredging works the government appointed as inspectors men who had really never had any experience in dredging work.

Mr. PARDEE. All of them ?

Mr. J. D. REID. Nearly all of them. I defy the hon. member to name one who had any previous experience of dredging work.

Mr. PARDEE. The man at Penetang said he had been doing it for three years.

Mr. J. D. REID. What was he before he went into the dredging business ? One inspector swore that the engineer in charge, I think Mr. Sing from Toronto, only visited the works once or twice during the whole season. This same inspector had charge of two dredges, and he farmed out one part of the work to another man. Any one can see at a glance that in that way the government must necessarily lose. The contractors have everything in their own hands. The chief engineer of the Public Works Department and all of the staff will swear that the only honest way to pay for this work is by scow measurement ; and yet these inspectors swear that they cannot come within from ten to thirty yards of the actual measurement in a scow. On the other hand, the Department of Railways and Canals will tell you that to pay by scow measurement is almost sure to result in a loss to the government, and in their contracts they specify that the work must be measured in situ. The officers of the government swore that the scow measurement made a difference of about one-third.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was stated that the price given per cubic yard in situ is always different from the price by scow measurement. It is understood that there is an expansion of from 30 to 40 per cent, which is always figured on.

Mr. J. D. REID. There is no doubt there is an expansion. By the scow measurement there is no way of telling whether you get the right quantity or not. The scow may or may not be filled.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The scows are filled.

Mr. J. D. REID. How can the minister say that when the inspectors admitted that they did not see all the scows going out ?

Mr. PARDEE. In the great majority of cases they did. All the inspectors swore that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is the duty of the inspector to see every scow that goes out, and in the forms that I have prescribed he must swear that he was personally present and saw every scow go out.

Mr. J. D. REID. I admit that that is his duty, but he has not been doing it. I believe the government has not been getting the actual measurement in a single contract by this scow measurement. That is the reason I find fault with this method of paying the contractors. When any dredging is to be done, a profile of the work is made before it is commenced, so that the government know exactly the quantity of stuff to be dredged out when it is in situ ; but with the scow measurement, there is no check at all, especially with the kind of inspectors the government have been employing on these works. I claim that on every dredging contract work involving hundreds of thousands of dollars, there should be an engineer. But we have an engineer located in Toronto, and perhaps a tailor or a shoemaker acting as an inspector of the work, and not even keeping track of the number of scows that go out.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. Will the hon. member tell me what the inspector's duties are on the scow ?

Mr. J. D. REID. According to the minister, his duty is to tell the quantity of material in each scow as it goes away from the dredge.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Could not a shoemaker tell whether a scow was full or not ?

Mr. J. D. REID. He might possibly, but I should think he would be better engaged in making shoes. What I claim is that there should be an engineer stationed on the work to see that the contract is properly carried out; and he should have an assistant under him capable of estimating the quantity of material in the scow.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The inspector is not to estimate the quantity in the scow. The contents of the scow are given him by the engineer, and it is his duty to see that no scow goes out unless it is filled.

Mr. J. D. REID. If that is the case, the hon. minister, if he was at the Public Accounts Committee, knows that hundreds of scows went out only half filled.

Mr. PARDEE. And the inspector swore that when they were only half filled he charged them as being only half filled.

Mr. J. D. REID. When a scow was only half filled, the inspector, who never had any experience in measuring scows, stated that he had simply to guess the quantity in the scow.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Was not that an exceptional case, in which, owing to low water, the scow could not go out fully loaded ?

Mr. BENNETT. I challenge the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) to produce a return in which it was sworn that there was less than the full amount in the scow.

Mr. PARDEE. The inspector swore that half scows went out. The hon. member for East Simcoe asked how it was that full scow loads were charged. He said that the two halves were added together, and he made his return accordingly.

Mr. J. D. REID. There was a case, as the minister stated, in which a scow went out only partially loaded on account of the low water. But in every contract it is left solely and entirely to the inspector to estimate the quantity the government are paying for. I claim that if the Public Works Department are going to continue this dredging work by contract, they should have an engineer on each work every day. It is not in the interest of the public or in the interest of the Public Works Department or in the interest of the minister, to let a large dredging contract involving hundreds of thousands of dollars, and to leave it entirely to the kind of men the government have been appointing as inspectors to decide the amount the government has to pay under these contracts.

Mr. PARDEE. Would the hon. gentleman advocate the policy of having a civil engineer continuously on every dredging job ?

Mr. J. D. REID. The amount the government is paying engineers in charge of these

works is, I think, not more than $150 a month, and the inspectors receive something like $3 a day. I would ask the hon. member for Lambton, if he had a work involving the expenditure of several hundreds of thousands of dollars, whether as a business man he would not pay the difference and have an experienced engineer qualified to measure the work and go into it thoroughly and know exactly the quantity in each scow ?

Mr. PARDEE. All I can say in answer to my hon. friend's question is that throughout the whole investigation in the Public Accounts Committee this year into the dredging contracts, it has not been shown by any evidence that any inspector made any false return, or that the country was injured in the very least. If it was shown that the returns were honestly made, why add to the expense, when hon. gentlemen opposite are always complaining of the expenses of the government ?

Mr. J. D. REID. I am surprised at the hon. gentleman making the statement that it has not been shown that the government have lost anything. He knows that one inspector inspected for two dredges.

Mr. PARDEE. It was not shown that anything was lost. It was shown that one inspector had been guilty of malfeasance in office by farming out his job, but the moment the government found that out he was dismissed. But it was not shown that the returns were untrue.

Mr. J. D. REID. How could we show anything else ?

Mr. PARDEE. Why draw a conclusion if there is no evidence from which to draw it ?

Mr. J. D. REID. We had the evidence of the government engineers that the scows varied to the extent of from ten to twenty yards.

Mr. PARDEE. And you have the further evidence that just what was in the scow was returned.

Mr. MONK. I would like to call the attention of the committee to the point raised by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) at the beginning of the discussion on this question, which the minister has not yet elucidated; that is, the resemblance of the handwriting in two rival tenders for this dredging work at Midland and Waubaushene. The hon. member for East Simcoe asked me to have a look into the handwriting of these two tenders, and I have done so, and there is no doubt that the addresses on the two envelopes are in the same handwriting.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Has the hon. gentleman looked at the figures setting down the prices?

Mr. MONK. I will come to those in a moment. There is no doubt that both ten-

ders are addressed in the same handwriting——

Mr. PUGSLEY. Neither of which was accepted by the minister.

Mr. BENNETT. That does not matter.

Mr. MONK. I have not followed the discussion enough to draw conclusions; I am only pointing out the fact. The minister states that the tenders are in different handwriting; but, strange to say, if you compare the body of the writing in the Grant company tender for Midland harbour with the body of the writing in the Spohn company tender for the same work, it is exactly the same; so that although there is something in the contention of the minister that in the two first tenders, which are presumably rival tenders, there is some difference in the body of the tenders though none in the addresses, still if you take another pair of tenders and compare the Grant tender with the Spohn tender, you find them in exactly the same handwriting, whatever conclusion you may draw from the fact. I would like to say, with reference to the dredging in the province of Quebec, that it is considered the greatest windfall possible to obtain a dredging contract from the government. There has been a regular scramble for them for years, and you find people who have had no experience at all going into the dredging business. Those who have been successful in obtaining such contracts in the province of Quebec live very well. I know these men. They were in rather penurious circumstances before they went into this business, but now they dazzle us with the luxury of their living. Some are lawyers. My hon. friend mentioned Mr. Morgan. Mr. Morgan has gone into the dredging business and I remember when Mr. Morgan was practising law.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Has he made a fortune out of it?

Mr. MONK. It is very difficult to say of any man that he has made a fortune, but the indications are that he found the dredging business more profitable than the practice of law.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It cannot be contended that Mr. Morgan is a political friend of the government.

Mr. MONK. He is a very strong political friend, a friend of the deepest dye. He is like many so called Conservatives, who have cleaved to the present government, ready to support it under any circumstances.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I know personally that Mr. Morgan was three times the Conservative candidate in the county of Richelieu.

Mr. MONK. And I remember a very hotly contested campaign we had in the city of Montreal in which Mr. Prefontaine, a friend of the Postmaster General, was a candidate, and in that contest the Conservative Mr. Morgan was working for him for all he was worth. At that time Mr. Morgan had gone into the dredging business. I am speaking of facts that are admitted. In the province of Quebec when you find a man suddenly prosperous, you ask: has he got a dredging contract? It is notorious. We have Mr. Prendergast.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Has he made a fortune?

Mr. MONK. I do not know, but he lives well—much better than people who work harder.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Prendergast will tell you that there is not much money in dredging unless you have considerable experience.

Mr. MONK. They all say that, but the facts are there. They all seem to prosper. And outside of lawyers, whose occupation and technical knowledge would not lead them to dredging, there are coal merchants. It is extraordinary how coal merchants go in for dredging. In the province of Quebec we have Mr. Cowan and Moore & Company. My hon. friend the Postmaster General knows these people. They are coal merchants and they have found it advantageous to leave their occupation and go in for dredging; and although they always pretend there is nothing in it, they still tender and try to obtain the work, and having obtained it they seem to thrive considerably on the profits. As a rule—and I assert this on my responsibility as a member—the dredging is pooled in the province of Quebec. Tenders are sent in and it looks very regular, but when the work comes to be divided, some find they cannot attend to it here and others that they cannot attend to it there, and as a matter of fact the contract is divided up among them so that each is satisfied. We should abandon that old system of giving out dredging in order to distribute patronage, and have a policy dictated by the urgency of solving our transportation problem.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONK. I am glad to have my hon. friend's approval. I expected when he came into office that he would find somewhere, wherever it is to be found—I had a great deal of difficulty in finding it in the Department of Public Works—the valuable report of the transportation commission, and that he would see if it was not possible to put into execution the suggestion so well and so urgently made by that commission, and cast aside this system of doing odd-jobs here and there just to please political friends. Go to the province of Quebec, and you will find dredging done in the most impossible places at the greatest expense. It is a race among the friends of the gov-

ernment as to who will have the most influence and get dredging done in his county. Whether the dredging is really necessary is a matter of very secondary importance. Whether it will enter into the scheme of transportation, is not considered at all. The only thing thought of is who can exert the greatest influence to have it done in his own county. You will find one place in the St. Lawrence where last year the government spent between $28,000 and $30,000 dredging a channel across the river, through the soil under the river, and on account of the current the channel fills up as quickly as it is dredged. Ask the people on either side: What about this channel that is being dredged? They smile and they will tell you it is being dredged, but it fills up just as fast again. Everybody knows that a channel across the St. Lawrence in the vicinity of Lake St. Peter, where the soil is extremely soft, must fill up at once, but the government will go on dredging there as long as people have influence to get it done.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will my hon. friend state where that is?

Mr. MONK. No, but I will tell it privately to my hon. friend. I do not want my criticism to be taken down into that county and be tortured into an opposition by me to public works in the province of Quebec. But I would be glad to inform the minister privately of the circumstances connected with that political piece of waste and extravagance.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am sincerely desirous of finding out whether any work is going on which is not required in the public interest. If I can find any evidence of that, I will stop the work. When my hon. friend refers to an important matter like that, done in the channel of the St. Lawrence, he ought not to have the slightest objection to making it known.

Mr. MONK. No objection whatever, and I will give my hon. friend the information with pleasure. In other parts of the country, you will find dredging done in small rivers, where there is really no call for it. You will find dredging done around some island belonging to an influential proprietor, in order to make his island larger, and fill up the space around it. You will find dredging done at considerable cost to the country in order to facilitate the approach to the private ice house of an ice dealer in a favoured locality.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Where is that being done?

Mr. MONK. I shall give the information with pleasure, and my hon. friend can verify it. You find dredging done in these localities by these contractors who are on the most friendly basis with the sitting member, who have obtained the contracts for them. They make the sitting member presents and treat him well and they are always together. I mention these facts—why? Because if my hon. friend is sincere, if we are to go back to the suggestions of the transportation commission, there is most important dredging to be done which cannot wait, if we are going to compete with our neighbours to the south. It is often alleged that we have a thirty foot channel from Montreal to Quebec. A thirty foot channel is one of the improvements most impressed on the government by the transportation commission. If we are going to solve the problem of transportation from Montreal to the sea, the commissioners consider it very important that we should at once have a thirty-foot channel. I have heard it alleged by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that we have that at present. I doubt that statement. I do not say that it was not made candidly, but from what information I have gained from experienced men, pilots and others interested in shipping, there are several points between Montreal and Quebec where it is by no means certain that we have that depth at low water. Therefore, I say that, with the increasing size of ships, it is most necessary for us to carry out the suggestions, and, if we have dredging to do, it must not be done to advance private interests, it must be done at the points where it is so urgently needed. There are two points between Montreal and Quebec where the channel is very narrow, as is pointed out in the report of the commission. Large ships sailing through these parts of the river, even if a fog supervenes, cannot cast anchor, for, if they do that, the ship will turn and there is no room to allow it to turn in safety. Consequently they must go on and trust to luck and the signals. And accidents have occurred there on that account. It seems to me that the suggestions of the Transportation Commission ought to be heeded first and foremost. Why? Because the rates of insurance are against us as compared with those of American ports, and this is precisely on account of the difficulties which, I say, we can eliminate promptly if we reserve for these expenditures the money which we spend uselessly elsewhere.

In the same way, if my hon. friend will take the trouble to ascertain, he will find out that we are paying a great deal for dredging in the Ottawa river, which, I think, could be done in a better way if we keep in mind that the Georgian Bay canal has been investigated and recommended as a work of national importance, and dredge where it will be useful for that channel, instead of dredging to suit the convenience of political favourites and members of parliament who do not take the trouble to investigate these large ques-

tions, but are satisfied simply to have the work done in their own counties.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. Where is dredging done of that kind?

Mr. MONK. I mentioned a moment ago that, to my knowledge, dredging was done in the Ottawa river, last summer or the summer before, to facilitate the approach to a private ice-house. That is somewhere in the county of Vaudreuil. If my hon. friend will take the trouble to investigate he will find that that is absolutely correct.

Peterborough steamboat landing, $$2,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That may be dropped.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Why?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Because the work has been completed and paid for.

Petewawa—extension of wharf, $11,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Of that $8,500 is a revote. We have added $3,000 more on further investigation, because of the larger amount of cribwork which must be built.

Mr. J. D. REID. Has the contract been let?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. J. D .REID. Is it to be put up by public tender?

Mr. PUGSLEY. If built, it will be by public tender. I am not absolutely sure as to whether I will go on with that work at the present time or not. I am looking into the question of the public necessity for it.

Mr. OWEN. While we are on the subject of wharfs, I would ask the minister the nature of the report made by the engineer of his department sent to inspect a wharf at Brighton.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am under the impression that I gave the hon. gentleman (Mr. Owen) that information. We have not had a report yet. There was a report some years ago. Owing to my having received information that the owner of the wharf declined to sell, I have taken no further proceedings.

Mr. OWEN. The hon. minister will remember that the chief engineer, Mr. Glass, was down there a few weeks before the deputation came to Ottawa.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is no Mr. Glass an engineer in my department.

Mr. BLAIN. If an engineer was sent from the Department of Public Works to Brighton, will the minister bring down a report to the committee at some future meeting?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Certainly.

Mr. J. D. REID. Which department would have charge of this wharf—Public Works or Railways?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a private wharf.

Mr. OWEN. There are two private wharfs there, and both are in a dilapidated condition. Brighton is a thriving town of 1,800 people, yet the wharf there is a disgrace to the Dominion of Canada. Some months ago a deputation came down and the minister was going to do something, for it was clearly shown then that something was needed. I hope he is not going to wait until the general election.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend will remember that a delegation waited upon me. and I think he accompanied that delegation. It was stated that there was a private wharf which it was desirable the department should purchase, making the necessary repairs, and make it a public wharf. I said I was not prepared to undertake the expropriation of a private wharf at Brighton at present, but if they could obtain from the owner a statement that he was willing to sell at what was regarded as a reasonable price, I would take the matter into consideration. Some little time afterwards I received word from one of the most prominent members of the delegation——

Mr. OWEN. What name?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have forgotten the name—that the owner of the wharf refused to put a price on it. So I have done nothing further in the matter.

Mr. J. D. REID. I would like to know if the Department of Public Works had an engineer there at all. The member for East Northumberland (Mr. Owen) says that the government sent an engineer to look over the wharf, and the Minister of Public Works said they did not.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief engineer informs me that he has given no instructions to any engineer of the department to make an examination.

Mr. WHITE. I am surprised to hear the Minister of Public Works say that he does not know that there is a necessity for this work in connection with the Petawawa wharf. Last session I brought the matter to the attention of the acting Minister of Public Works, and an appropriation was made in the supplementaries. During the summer I took the matter up with the department, and they assured me that the work would be commenced last August, but up to the present time nothing has been done. I have here a letter from the manager of the Pembroke Navigation Company which I would like to read to the House:

Dear Sir,—Some time ago I brought to your attention the matter of the extension of the Petewawa wharf. At that time I pointed out the urgent necessity of the carrying out of this work. I understand that there was an amount in the estimates passed last session for this purpose. Up to the present nothing

has been done although you informed me that according to a conversation you had with the engineer of the Public Works Department, this work would have been commenced last August. As you are aware during the low water season, we are unable to land our boats there without danger of going on the shoals or reefs which are in close proximity to the dock in its present condition. We have also had trouble with the government booms swinging out beyond the end of the wharf and blocking the channel so that we were prevented from landing. I trust you will bring this matter to the attention of the government and endeavour to have the work completed at the earliest moment possible as this is an important point for landing supplies and men for the military camp, the settlers and the lumbering interests on the Petewawa river.

Yours truly,
GEORGE SCHMIDT,
Manager and Secretary Treasurer.

I would like to impress upon the minister the necessity of undertaking this work as soon as possible. During the season of low water it is almost impossible to get up to this dock with boats. It is a very important point on the Ottawa river at the present time.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Of course, nothing could be done until parliament voted the money. We are getting along pretty late in the season and not much can be done this year. But my attention has been called to the wharf at Petawawa, and it has been intimated to me that the wharf really is not necessary in the public interest. I have directed an inquiry to be made, and I can say to my hon. friend that the matter is still under consideration.

Mr. WHITE. The wharf in its present condition is practically useless at low water.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is not positively decided that this large amount of money will be expended there. I am not sure it is in the public interest.

Port Burwell—improvement to harbour, $90,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Up to the 31st of December there was $8,769 expended. Then there was an estimate for a further expenditure up the 31st of March. The dredging work is under contract.

Port Hope—repairs to pier and dredging, $15,000.

Mr. WARD. What has been done at Port Hope this year ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We propose to do some dredging at Port Hope. It was commenced in the fall of 1907, by Mr. Phin of Welland. We hope to do quite a little dredging work this year.

Mr. WARD. Will there be any repairs to the piers ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, we propose to make repairs to the pier, also to do some dredging.

Mr. WHITE.

Port Stanley—harbour improvements, $38,000.

Mr. WM. JACKSON. Is this all for the outside breakwater in Port Stanley ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is for the outside breakwater, and for dredging. The work is under contract.

Mr. WM. JACKSON. When will that work for the outside breakwater be completed ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think it will take another year.

Mr. WM. JACKSON. Who is the inspector ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My memorandum does not say, but I can get the name.

Mr. WM. JACKSON. I know the inspector has been changed, and I wanted to know the reason. I wrote the minister in connection with the inside breakwater six weeks or two months ago. I called his attention to the condition of the inside breakwater on the east side of the east pier. Unless that breakwater is extended 150 feet to the northeast, practically the work that has been done in Port Stanley will be useless. The lake is breaking in on the north side of the breakwater, and is cutting into the harbour.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will have the matter looked into at once.

Rainy river—improvements at Long Sault rapids, $50,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In reference to that, we were obliged to get the consent of the United States government, because it might be a matter for the Waterways Commission to settle. At their suggestion we have referred the matter to the American government.

Mr. BENNETT. In connection with a similar matter, is any expenditure being incurred by the department in keeping a patrol tug or tugs at a point called the Lime Kilns, near Windsor ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My engineer tells me no.

Roche's point wharf, $3,200.

Mr. BENNETT. What is that dock costing at Roche's Point ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total cost is $3,212. That has been paid for.

Mr. J. D. REID. I understand the people in that vicinity never wanted that wharf, and they are now asking the government to take it away.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Well, they have not come to the right source to get it done, because they have not communicated with me on the subject.

Mr. J. D. REID. Was there not some complaint about this wharf not being required ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief engineer says there has been some complaint, but it has not come to my notice.

Mr. J. D. REID. The wharf was never required, the people petitioned against the wharf being built, it was forced on them and now they want it taken away.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I was mistaken. I saw the chief engineer bow his head when you were speaking, but he says there has been no complaint to the department in regard to the work not being necessary.

Rondeau harbour—improvements, $50,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total probable cost of the works is about $130,000. The works consist of the construction of two breakwaters each 500 feet long, dredging of the site of the breakwaters to a depth of 23 feet, dredging and approach to the depth of 22 feet, dredging the turning basin in the inner harbour, repairs to piers, &c. The dredging is under contract to the Canadian Construction and Dredging Company whose headquarters are at Toronto. I think Mr. Bertram is president or manager.

Rossport—wharf on north shore Lake Superior, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a coal dock or wharf in connection with the Canadian Pacific. It is in Thunder Bay and Rainy River district.

Sault Ste Marie wharf—dredging approaches, $30,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The dredging contract has been given to the Great Lakes Dredging Company.

Severn river—improvement of waterway at McDonald's chute No. 1, $1,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This may be dropped.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Item dropped.

Southampton—repairs to Chantry island breakwater, $3,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This will finish the work. It is by day labour.

Toronto harbour improvements, $90,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a revote.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is it under contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The dredging is under contract to the Western Dredging Company and the protection work is also under contract.

Victoria harbour—improvements, $56,200.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Prior to 31st March, 1908, we expended here $10,331.33. We contemplated much more work this year. This is under contract to the Canadian Dredging and Contracting Company.

Mr. OWEN. Reverting to the item of which I spoke I have found the newspaper clipping. It says :

Mr. J. G. Sing, chief engineer, from the Public Works, Toronto, and Frank L. Wood, Liberal candidate for the House of Commons for East Northumberland, were here (Brighton) on Tuesday when the chief engineer made an inspection of the wharf for the purpose of making a report to the government as to the advisability of taking over the same. Our wharf should be repaired and extended, and we sincerely hope the government will grant the prayer of the large petition recently presented to them.

I asked the minister the contents of that report. This is dated May 27. I gave the name of Glass instead of Sing in speaking before.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Sing is the resident engineer in Toronto. I have no doubt he has made an inspection of the wharf, probably when visiting at Colborne, but I will take occasion to see if there is a report from him and if not to get the result of his examination.

Mr. J. D. REID. Did Mr. Sing go there on instructions from the department or on his own responsibility?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will have the files looked up to ascertain.

Mr. J. D. REID. Surely the chief engineer will understand something of the matter?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief engineer says he has no recollection of sending Mr. Sing tnere.

Winnipeg river—improvements, $10,000.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What is the nature of these improvements?

Mr. PUGSLEY. These are at Miller's rapids, north of Kenora, and Throat rapids to improve a stretch of navigation of 16 miles to the crossing of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.

Mr. MORIN. I wish for some information about the wharf which is to cost $13,000 on Lake François in the county of Beauce.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What does my hon. friend want to know?

Mr. MORIN. I will give the minister some information, because he is new in his office and I don't think I should blame everything on him for that reason. There was money voted two years ago for a wharf there and the wharf was built, and like the other public works throughout the country I presume it was left to the member for the county to look after the building of it. I do not know whether the government sent an engineer there or not, but if they did they might as well send an old grandmother. Do you hear that,

Mr. Minister? Your engineers do not amount to a row of pins. Here is an example where the engineer recommended a wharf to be built and the wharf was built, and there was no stone put into it, and away went the wharf with the ice last spring. Now, this is a small lake, about twenty-five miles long by two or three miles wide, and there is no current in it.

Mr. J. D. REID. Are there any boats on the lake?

Mr. MORIN. Yes, but they belong to the lumber company and the lumber company uses its own wharf. There was $7,000 wasted on this wharf before, and I would like the minister to explain why he wants to waste $13,000 more now.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think my hon. friend is in error with regard to the importance of the matter, because my information is there was a large petition in favour of this work, and upon investigation it was decided to be in the public interest to build the wharf. It would appear there are several steamboats plying on the lake.

Mr. MORIN. There are, but they belong to the lumber company, and they use their own wharf.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am glad to get the information from my hon. friend in regard to the alleged defects in the wharf, and I will have the matter looked into. The work is under contract, and the contractor will have to complete the work properly before he is paid.

Mr. MORIN. Who is the contractor?

Mr. PUGSLEY. John Lowry, of Ottawa.

Mr. MORIN. How long is the wharf to be?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Lambton wharf will have a total length of 350 feet extending out to 6 feet at low water. The Coleraine wharf will have a total length of 300 feet.

Mr. MORIN. The minister says there are boats plying on that lake; where do they start from and where do they go to?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am sorry to say I do not know.

Mr. MORIN. I believe you know very well.

Mr. J. D. REID. This is another case where the member for the county apparently got up a petition and the government immediately proceeded to spend thousands of dollars on a wharf without inquiring whether it was necessary or not. The facts stated by the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Morin) prove that this money is squandered for political purposes.

Mr. MORIN. I can tell the minister that I will get no thanks for what I have said in the House to-night. Well, I want none. Every time I condemn unnecessary expenditure here, next day the Grits on the other side go for me, and say: Why did you say anything against that work being done in the province of Quebec; Ontario gets so much and the other provinces get so much, and we want to get our share. Well, the government is just squandering the money, and it would seem that all the Liberal member for a county needs to do is to ask for an expenditure, whether it is necessary or not, and he gets it. That was the policy of the previous Minister of Public Works; I don't accuse the present minister, because he is new in the office, and I shall not hang him before giving him a trial. I have here estimates for the last seven years, and what do they show? Every year there is expenditure in the Island of Orleans, at St. François, at St. Laurent and Ste. Famille. At St. François the population is about 500; it is situated at the lower end of the island, and they have a wharf there and another one about half a mile distant. At St. Jean de Orleans and St. Laurent it is the same thing. The thing is getting ridiculous. The member for the county asks for the money and he gets it, right or wrong. Is that what Sir Wilfrid Laurier promised before he came to power? In my county, in 1895, he told the people that if he came to power his government would be a government of example. He just omitted that little word 'bad,' for since he has come to power his government has been a government of bad example. He found fault with the Conservatives spending $36,000,000 a year, but immediately on his coming to power in 1896 we voted $52,000,000 at the special session of that year; the next year the estimates were $58,000,000, the next year $62,000,000, the next year $70,000,000, the next year $78,000,000, the next year $82,000,000, the next year $105,000,000 and this year we have $119,000,000 in the main estimates and $9,000,000 more in supplementaries already brought down, and the minister tells us there are more to come, and God only knows how many supplementary estimates he will have. The man who found fault with the late government for spending $35,000,000 or $40,000,000 is going to spend this year $140,000,000 or $150,000,000. What does that look like?

Mr. JOHNSTON. It looks good to me.

Mr. MORIN. But you are a Grit like the rest.

Manitoba—Grand Marais harbour, Lake Winnipeg—improvement of entrance, $1,500.

Mr. STAPLES. What is the nature of this work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is to remove the sandbar to improve the entrance to the harbour.

Mr. STAPLES. What navigation is there ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Both sailing vessels and quite a large number of steamers. The navigation on Lake Winnipeg is getting to be quite important.

Lake Dauphin—lowering lake by removing obstructions from bed of Mossy river, $7,000.

Mr. STAPLES. What is the nature of that ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a revote towards the construction and equipment and installation of the plant required for removing these obstructions. It is expected to carry on the work during the present year.

Mr. STAPLES. How much has been spent there ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Nothing has been expended yet.

Mr. J. D. REID. Does the government intend building a plant and doing the work itself, or is it to be by contract ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The government will do the work itself.

Mr. STAPLES. Who is going to do the work at Grand Marais Harbour ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have not decided yet.

Winnipegosis lake—dredging channel at mouth of Mossy river, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This work will be done by the government dredge.

Mr. STAPLES. Where is that dredge working at the present time ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The dredge has been removed two or three times since the spring opened. I am not able to tell my hon. friend where it is working just at the moment.

Mr. STAPLES. I notice once more that there is no appropriation in the main estimates for the completion of the work that was begun on the harbour of St. Laurent on Lake Manitoba. Previous to the last election a wharf was built there and a dredge was sent up and for a time there was great activity ; but the moment the election was over, the work ceased, the dredge was taken away, and nothing has been done since. The work that has been done is of utterly no value to the district until it is completed. The council of the municipality has sent a petition asking the government to make the necessary appropriation to complete the work. If the minister has not that petition, I have a copy of it. I have brought this matter up at every session of this parliament, and I have always been stood off with the promise that an item would be brought down in the supplementary estimates, but that has never been done. The work, if completed, would be of great value to the people of that district. They could send wood and other products by boat to Winnipeg, but boats cannot get to the wharf until some further dredging is done. There will also have to be a road made to the wharf. At present produce cannot be taken to or away from the wharf. I would ask the minister if it is his intention to make any provision in the supplementary estimates for the completion of that work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is Lake Manitoba in the hon. gentleman's constituency ?

Mr. STAPLES. Yes, in the northern part.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I had some information that the work was not regarded as very necessary, because there was not a very large population there. I may have been mininformed as to that, and I will look very carefully into the matter.

Mr. STAPLES. It must be of some importance when the reeve and council went to the trouble of drafting a petition and sending it down here. It is of the utmost importance to the people of that district. I think I know the riding and what is required there as well as the people who may have advised the minister. There is another place up there—Delta and Lake Manitoba. Is anything being done there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There has been some dredging done at the Delta. If further dredging is required, it will be done, but I cannot say just now what will be done.

Old Man's river—diversion of stream into its original bed at McLeod (revote) $8,000.

Mr. HERRON. Has the minister any information with reference to the damage done by the recent flood? I asked him that question the other evening.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I inquired in my department and find that we have no breakwater there.

Mr. HERRON. There was an appropriation of $8,000 for the work

Mr. PUGSLEY. There was, but nothing is done, and we are now revoting that amount.

Mr. HERRON. Do the government propose spending sufficient money to protect the banks at that point?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The intention of the department is to make the work complete. If it should cost more than $8,000, we shall do what is necessary.

Mr. HERRON. It is very important that some protection should be given.

New dredging plant—maritime provinces, $100,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Are you building new dredges for the maritime provinces?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not as yet, but new dredging plant is very urgently required. This is to build or acquire one or more dredges and some tugs.

Mr. SPROULE. You have no plan in view ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have discussed the matter with the chief engineer and superintendent of dredging. They think we ought to have at least three additional dredges—one for work in the Bay of Fundy, one for work in the Baie des Chaleurs, and the other on the north shore. Then we want a number of tugs. In the operation of the dredge 'Fielding' we ought to have four tugs, and have none available. We have to hire tugs.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this $100,000 going to build three dredges and four tugs?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, that will not begin to do it.

Roads and bridges—Shellmouth bridge over Assiniboine river, $20,000.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Will the minister explain what has been done in connection with the Shellmouth bridge ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is under contract. The piers have been completed, and work on the steel superstructure is being carried on as rapidly as possible. The material I think is all on the ground. I hope the bridge will be completed during the present year. The contract was let for the steel work on the 23rd of October, 1907, to be completed a year from date.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). There has been a vote in the estimates for the last four years.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, the work was commenced in 1906.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). The old bridge has been condemned for the last four years, and the people are much dissatisfied with the slow progress.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is impossible to expedite the work any more. Our latest information is that the work is proceeding quite satisfactorily, and we expect it will be completed within the time mentioned.

Land and cable telegraph lines, lower St. Lawrence and maritime provinces, including working expenses of vessels required for cable service and Marconi wireless telegraph system at Belle Isle, &c., $120,000.

Mr. SPROULE. How is the Marconi system working ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think it is giving pretty good satisfaction. But this is a matter coming within the Marine Department.

Mr. BLAIN. Has the minister got a statement of the revenue and expenditure in this connection ?

Mr. SPROULE.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman will find that in the Auditor General's Report.

Harbours and rivers—Quebec harbour improvements, $500,000.

Mr. J. D. REID. Who has the contract there ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Dussault & Co.

Mr. J. D. REID. What is the total estimated amount this work is to cost when completed ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The work that is going on there is of very great importance. If my hon. friend will come over here I will show him the plans. It will give altogether about 3,000 feet frontage.

Port Arthur and Fort William—harbour and river improvements, $500,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What is going to be done there this year ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Just the dredging work. We are doing it as rapidly as possible There will be something done probably in the way of building a revetment wall as well. There is also a breakwater being built at Port Arthur. I may say that for several months, ever since I have been at the head of the department, and I think before that, there has been a strong pressure upon the part of business men of Winnipeg and Port Arthur, also of ship owners, and I think of the boards of trades of those cities, to build a new breakwater out further from the wharf in order to give more sea room to the large steamers which are now frequenting the port. I have decided to accede to the wishes of the people in this respect. The breakwater, when completed, will give more sea room, because further from the existing wharfs. In the meantime we are leaving a portion of the old breakwater and doing some work of a temporary character. The dredging done will give accommodation to the largest steamers on the lake.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the cost of the breakwater come out of this vote?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, part of it.

Mr. BENNETT. What portion of this vote will go to the breakwater?

Mr. PUGSLEY. When the breakwater is finally completed it will cost a great deal more than this vote. For the present year we expect the breakwater expenditure to be about $100,000.

Mr. BENNETT. How much will the revetment wall cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have not determined upon that yet. I think perhaps we will have to extend that work over a couple or three years as it will be eoo expensive to be all done in one year. By building the revetment wall as designed by the chief

engineer we shall save large expense for building the breakwater opposite the entrance to the Mission river.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it intended to spend more in these works ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think we shall have to make further provision before parliament rises.

Mr. BENNETT. That will be in the supplementary estimates?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. Dredging is going on night and day in order to hurry the work. The Grand Trunk Pacific are laying out their works on a large scale and so is the Canadian Pacific Railway, and both are eager to be able to effectively handle the grain trade this fall. We are rushing our work, believing that what we are doing will be a great national benefit.

Mr. BENNETT. Is the dredging done under contract? And who is the contractor ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. The Great Lakes Dredging Company.

Mr. BENNETT. How many dredges have they employed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think five.

Mr. BENNETT. Who is the engineer in charge?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Merrick.

Mr. BENNETT. Is any other dredging being done besides that by the Great Lakes Dredging Company?

Mr. PUGSLEY. At Port Arthur, Mr. Weddell. I think he has about completed his work.

Mr. BENNETT. How much of this is for Mr. Weddell's work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Only about 30,000 yards remains to be done at 9 cents a yard.

Red Deer—improvements at St. Andrews Rapids, $300,000.

Mr. J. D. REID. When will this work be completed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I hope this year. We made arrangements with the contractors to expedite the work. They carried it on all winter. We hope that this season it will be completed.

Mr. J. D. REID. Who are the contractors?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Messrs. Quinlan & Robertson.

Transportation facilities, Georgian bay to Montreal—survey for waterway via French and Ottawa rivers, including payments authorized notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $40,000.

Mr. BENNETT. How much has been expended on this survey so far?

Mr. PUGSLEY. According to my notes the total expenditure to 31st March, 1907, was $597,838.48. But the chief engineer tells me that the memo. must be wrong and that the date should be 31st March, 1908. It will require $40,000 more. It is expected that this vote will entirely complete the work of the survey. The survey is completed and only some verification work is being done.

Mr. J. D. REID. What is the intention of the government as to going on with this work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend will understand that it is a matter of great importance and of great interest to the country, one which will involve the expenditure of a very large sum of money. It is one, therefore, which the government will have to consider after having carefully studied the report submitted. In due course and in proper season the Prime Minister will, no doubt, announce the policy of the government.

Mr. J. D. REID. Has it been considered by the government?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not since the report came in.

Port Colborne—harbour improvements, $20,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What has the elevator there cost to date?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is being built by the Department of Railways and Canals, so I cannot give the information. We are building the breakwater.

Mr. BENNETT. How much has the Department of Public Works spent there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total expenditure of my department is in the vicinity of $850,000, probably pretty close to $900,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Has the minister any idea of what the Department of Railways has spent there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot tell.

Mr. BENNETT. I guess you have made it four millions there.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is this vote for no other purpose than breakwaters?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. J. D. REID. Who has the contract for the breakwater?

Mr. PUGSLEY. M. J. Hogan has one contract and Hogan & Macdonald have another.

Mr. BENNETT. Is the minister aware whether the elevator is finished or not?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know.

Mr. BENNETT. It was stated in the newspapers some time ago that it is all

finished. It does not matter much in any case. It will never do anything.

Militia Department—pay and allowances, $1,500,000.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). I suggest that item 71 be allowed to stand as I wish to make a statement upon it which will take some time and other members will probably wish to speak upon it.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am quite sure that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) will want to discuss several items, but he is not present and will wish to be present when the minister makes his statement.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is one reason I did not wish to make it to-night. It will be understood that any militia item may be discussed on the item we are leaving, No. 71. Item No. 72, pay and allowances, is for the permanent force. The full vote is $1,500,000. The total number of the permanent force at present is about 3,000.

Mr. WARD. What is the increase of $100,000.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There has been an increase of about 300 in the force since last year.

Salaries and wages, $85,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. There is an increase of $15,000.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Last year $15,000 was included in the supplementary estimates.

Mr. BENNETT. I would ask the minister if he has seen the following item in the Toronto 'Globe ?'

If there is any part of the provincial expenditure upon which the pruning-knife can properly be used, it is the militia estimates. We are not at war, nor likely to become so. We are threatened with bankruptcy—the only way of averting it is to reduce the expenditure—and there are comparatively few items upon which economy can be used, without injury to the public interests. If the whole militia service was suspended for one, two or three years, the injury done to the country would be so infinitesimal as to be unworthy of notice.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I had not seen it, I will look it up. I did not suppose the Toronto 'Globe' would publish anything so nonsensical as that. Is it an editorial ?

Mr. BENNETT. It is quoted in the 'Globe' newspaper of July 2nd. It is a reproduction from the 'Globe' of 1858, 50 years ago, but it is strongly ominous, it is a case of history repeating itself and I think the public will think so.

Mr. WHITE. At page Q—52 of the Auditor General's Report I find an item under Petawawa camp, Savage, W. J., painting $900. Was that work done by tender and were there any other tenders received?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. By tender called by public advertisement. In all the work at Petawawa tenders were asked by public advertisements in the newspapers.

Military properties—construction and repairs, $258,750.

Mr. TAYLOR. There is an increase of $45,000 there.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. This includes repairs and rifle ranges, barracks and ordnance stores, &c., and these requirements are annually increasing. The number of rifle ranges is increasing each year and the outlay is increasing somewhat.

Mr. J. D. REID. The permanent force is now about 3,000. How many were there eight or nine years ago ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. About 800 or 900.

Mr. J. D. REID It has increased about fourfold.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Between three and fourfold. There is an increase for Halifax and Esquimalt alone of 1,500. That is the principal increase.

Repairs to Quebec cliffs and walls, $40,000.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. This is done by day labour. It is the usual vote.

Mr. TAYLOR. I trust the minister will put in an appropriation to enable him to repair the military buildings at Kingston. There is a good deal of money spent at Quebec in one way and another, but the Kingston fortifications are allowed to go to ruin. A few years ago a comparatively small expenditure would have put the military property there in good shape.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is a matter which must be taken up very soon unless we are to allow the whole of that property to go. I found it out of repair and almost abandoned when I came to office. An unsuccessful attempt was made by General Herbert to utilize some of the rooms at Fort Henry. I have had an examination made by engineers within the last year, but I have not yet had an opportunity of looking into the report. I think there will be some small items in the supplementary estimates for some of the works at Kingston to which my hon. friend refers, particularly for the wall bordering the military property.

Mr. WHITE. I would like to know whether the lowest tender was accepted for the painting of these buildings to which I have referred. I understand that several firms in the town of Pembroke tendered, but the Kingston firm got the contract.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am quite sure the lowest tender was accepted, but I will have the matter looked up.

Warlike and other stores, $350,000.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. This is the usual vote.

Mr. TAYLOR. There is an increase of $37,000. What does this include?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Accoutrements, camp equipment, general stores, engineer's stores and medical stores.

Mr. DANIEL. What is meant by the upkeep of armament?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Ammunition both for practice and reserve supply, field and garrison artillery, ordnance stores, transport vehicles, extra parts of outfit for big guns, &c.; artillery stores of which there is a great variety.

Mr. J. D. REID. In these different items for the militia department there is an increase in the total vote of about $342,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. And then there are the supplementaries.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There will be no supplementaries except for the militia annual drill.

Mr. J. D. REID. This vote for clothing and necessaries in stores amounts altogether to $800,000 and that seems a very large amount to expend in one year. One would think that the stores and clothing would not have to go on increasing year after year. Why is there this increase?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The increase in the number of the militia is the principal reason. New corps are being formed in the new provinces of the west to take the place largely of the Northwest Mounted Police. I have a comparative statement here which may be interesting:

	1903-4	1908-9.
Total number of militia..	47,423	57,718
Total number of horses..	7,892	11,798
Number of men trained..	32,000	*46,000

*Estimated.

The very great increase of the growth of the militia between the two periods will account for a considerable increased portion of the increased cost. The men must have clothing, arms, and ammunition.

Mr. DANIEL. How often is new clothing issued?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Once in three years. There is an attempt being made to be more economical, and I think the overcoats are now issued for nine years.

Mr. DANIEL. You do not issue boots?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Not except to the permanent force.

Mr. J. D. REID. $300,000 a year for clothing seems a large amount.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It is only an average of about $6 per year for each man.

Provisions and supplies, $430,000.

Mr. DANIEL. Why the increase in this vote?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is principally for the permanent force.

Mr. J. D. REID. I have seen complaints that the goods furnished have not been up to standard in some cases.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. These supplies for the permanent force are purchased by tenders called for in the newspapers.

Mr. DANIEL. Open to everybody?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Open to everybody. As to complaints, there was a complant from Halifax by a man who did not get the contract, as his tender was not low enough. He was very much annoyed because the bacon was brought somewhere from Ontario, and endeavoured to make all the trouble he could. As a matter of fact, the food is inspected every day, and every soldier has an opportunity to make a complaint if he chooses. There is absolutely nothing in that story.

Mr. J. D. REID. I have heard of other cases; but in that particular case I understand that it was rolled bacon that was supplied. I am not in the militia, but I understand that if a militiaman were to make a complaint to the officer in charge, he would be liable to get into trouble. If the officer in charge stands in with these parties in any way, it would be useless to make a charge to him.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I can assure my hon. friend that we are not running the militia in that way. If I knew that an officer refused to take cognizance of a complaint of that kind, I should dismiss him at once. Our object is to get the very best food we can, and we always accept the lowest tender. Sometimes, when there is keen competition, and a man is foolish enough to tender below the value of the goods supplied, there may be an attempt to skimp, and deliver food which is not up to the mark; but our inspectors will detect and punish such conduct at once.

Mr. DANIEL. Has the supply officer any control over the purchase of goods?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Not over the purchasing. That is all done by tender, and is determined by the director of contracts here. But the supply officer has absolute control over the quality of the food. That is his business, and he inspects everything that is delivered every morning.

Mr. DANIEL. He is not the only one. There is another officer who goes around every morning with the supply officer and the medical officer, so that I do not think there is much chance of inferior food being provided.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. If any inferior food should have been delivered, the supply officer has the authority to refuse it and purchase good food and charge it up to the contractor.

Mr. BEATTIE. If the food is bad, the officer of the day is to blame, because he inspects it at six o'clock in the morning, and has a right to report it to the commanding officer. So that I do not see how improper food could be supplied. I would like to ask the minister, did the report that the bacon was bad come from the men?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, it came from the disappointed contractor.

Mr. J. D. REID. I do not mean to say that the food supplied was bad food; but the contract called for rolled bacon, which had been supplied for years before, and the man at Halifax who tendered supposed that he would have to supply rolled bacon. The man who got the contract quoted a lower price than rolled bacon could be supplied for. The result was that rolled bacon was not supplied. I have not seen any statement in any newspaper either by the department at Ottawa or by the officer in command at Halifax, denying the statement that was in the Halifax paper. That convinces me that rolled bacon was not supplied by the contractor. There was no investigation by the department to find out whether the statement in the newspaper was true or not. Therefore until I have further evidence, I am perfectly satisfied that the contractor did not carry out the contract, and that the men did not get the quality of food which the government intended to supply them. They were deceived and the government was defrauded so far as that contract was concerned.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. My hon. friend reverses the good old rule of holding a man innocent until he is proven guilty. If I were to occupy my time in answering all the false statements that are made in regard to the department and the way it is administered, it would take all my time. I do not propose to do that. We have a regular means, as hon. gentlemen know, by which every complaint from the humblest man in the force can reach me or his superior officer. In this case I did not think that I was called on to make an investigation, because no charge was made except one in an utterly unreliable newspaper, coming from a disappointed contractor.

Mr. WARD. Was there ever any charge made by the commander of that regiment as to the quality of the food?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. None whatever.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Did the officer of the day for inspecting the rations make any reports?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. His reports were all favourable. There has never been any question or challenge of this particular article. My hon. friend says there has been no contradiction. I have no doubt whatever that the bacon which was tendered for was delivered.

Grants to rifle and artillery associations and bands, $55,000.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). What is the basis upon which these grants are made? Does every rifle company get a grant?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The basis is $1 per head up to forty and fifty cents for every additional member up to eighty, so that $60 would be the maximum. This is for civilian rifle associations.

Royal Military College, $95,000.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There are slight increases in the professors' salaries and the general expenses are greater.

Mr. DANIEL. What salaries are increased?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The adjutant of the college gets an increase of $500; the professor of mathematics $300.

Mr. DANIEL. Is this a special increase for the adjutant?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It will be paid to his successor. It is for the adjutant of the college.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I see the caterer has resigned. What system is now followed? The system in vogue should be condemned.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The caterer used to receive 50 cents a head. He wanted 60 cents. I thought that was rather a large increase and sent an officer to investigate. I am satisfied we can do very much better by taking charge of the food ourselves within the college as at the different depots. The officers are anxious for the change.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I have heard various yarns about the officers being surprised at the stuff the boys had to eat.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. So I believe.

Mr. DANIEL. There are several military officers there, are they entitled to rations? Are any of these rations turned over to the caterer

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That has never been done.

Mr. WARD. Is this vote of $95,000 over and above any fees received ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We get the fees back and that reduces the cost very considerably.

Mr. J. D. REID. With reference to this case at Halifax which the minister said was an impossible one, I have heard other men in charge of different companies out at drill complain about the food served at the camps. They are afraid, however, to kick, because these goods were supplied by friends of the government and they would get into trouble themselves. I have heard those stories and believe them to be true. In a case like that at Halifax, although the minister states that the paper which published it is not reliable, I think that he or some of his officers would not have been doing any too much if they had at once written to the man in charge of the regiment and found out what truth there was in the statement, if any. The minister and his deputy did not do their duty when they paid no attention to that. A matter of that kind affecting all those men is a very serious matter. We shall not have time this session to find out the truth in the Public Accounts but we will next session. But outside of that case altogether, there are other cases ; and I am perfectly satisfied that the minister would, if he would state what he knows to be true, tell us that he has had complaints of the food furnished the men in the camps at different places.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. If any of these complaints are justifiable and if I were in the minister's place, the head would go off every officer in the force who had anything to do with inspecting the rations. Perhaps the hon. member does not know the routine. I have seen where quartermasters would stand in with the supply officers ; but in addition to the quartermasters, there is the field officer of the day, who has the rank of colonel or major, who has to inspect the rations every morning. Then for every regiment there is a regimental officer, and for every company, a company officer, so that the food has to go through a series of inspections. Besides there is the field medical officer and also the regimental medical officer. Unless the officers are absolutely crooked or stupid, it is impossible that stuff not fit to eat could reach the men. If the hon. member had ever been in camp, he would know that the soldiers would kick in a second if they did not get good rations. That is the reason why, when I read this thing about Halifax, I thought the officers and men must be insane to pass such rations, or else they did not know the quality of the goods. The medical officer should detect anything of that kind in a moment. I was going to speak of the Royal Military College. I give the minister notice that at another sitting I intend to discuss the commandant of that college and the system of discipline pursued there, what they used to term the commission of inquiry into conduct, but what I call the sweat-box system. It is no way to train young men to be manly and straightforward. So far as I am concerned, my vote will go against any man who maintains such a system and against the voting of any money to maintain it.

Mr. WARD. In following what the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes) has said, I wish to relieve the mind of my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid). What this committee has been told is exactly right--the men will not stand bad rations. I have had a great deal of experience in camp in the last forty years, both under this administration and under former administrations. As a rule, the rations were good. I can recall one instance several years ago when sour bread was furnished.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. In 1872.

Mr. WARD. Yes, under Conservative administration. The men had no fear of the contractor. They formed a line of three or four hundred feet long, and the bakers' apprentices who brought the bread had to run the gauntlet, the men pelting them with the bread. The next day the bread supplied was sweet. The food goes through a series of inspection, and there is very little danger that the men do not receive what is being paid for and what they are entitled to get.

Dominion Arsenal, $350,000.

Mr. J. D. REID. Where is that?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. At Quebec.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Why the increase?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is not really an increase. In other years there has been a vote in the supplementary estimates, but this year there will be none.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I ought to know, but I fear I do not. Is it the intention to continue the manufacture of the cartridge 303 as made to-day, or to adopt a modern cartridge, the sharp-pointed bullet? The United States have adopted this form, and the British government will probably adopt it, too, before the end of the century. The Canadian government should be in line and adopt the new pointed bullet. It has much greater initial velocity, lower trajectory and less windage. It is capable of much greater accuracy in firing.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I have not lost sight of the subject. We have the report of an officer who has been in England and investigated the matter.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Did he make inquiry as to what has been done in England by private parties? Private companies in England have adopted this bullet.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. This officer has seen the manufacturers there.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I would recommend him to look into what the American manufacturers are doing. If he looks into the matter, he will find in the United States a record that will surprise him.

Mr. DANIEL. I desire to call attention to a statement that was made in the public press, that at a recent camp at Niagara it was found out, just in time, that a lot of ammunition supposed to be blank was found to be loaded with slugs, and that the discovery was made just in time to prevent serious casualties.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The report in the newspapers was contradicted by General Cotton at once. There is no truth in it. As usual, before going into the sham fight, all the men were searched for cartridges of every kind, and these few were found. They would have been found in any case. They were in possession of the men for target firing. They were improperly kept, no doubt.

Mr. DANIEL. But I suppose there are no such cartridges manufactured, those loaded with slugs?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No.

Mr. J. D. REID. How much is it estimated will be paid to the Ross Rifle Company for rifles out of the estimates this year?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The item out of which the rifles will be paid for is the one reserved. The price is $25, and the annual number to be delivered under the contract is 10,000.

Mr. J. D. REID. That means a maximum payment of $25,000.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. You cannot tell exactly. A certain amount is paid as advance and a certain amount of the last instalment on the finished gun.

Mr. J. D. REID. When we reach that item perhaps the minister could have a statement showing the estimate of what will be paid to the Ross Rifle Company during the year.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The amount estimated is $250,000 in advance, with final payments of $85,500, and cost of inspection, $20,000.

Mr. J. D. REID. That is about $250,000 that is expected to be paid this year?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, if they are delivered.

Customs dues, $200,000.

Mr. J. D. REID. Why such a great increase in this item?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We are bringing in a great deal of stuff from England, large orders of guns, and everything that comes from the outside is charged duty. That comes out of our pockets and goes into the customs.

Mr. WARD. Could not the minister reconsider this regulation and allow officers' uniforms to come in free of duty? Officers purchasing uniforms in England have to pay duty.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am afraid we cannot treat officers differently from others. The only thing that can be done is to buy our uniforms in Canada. I stated in this House a year ago that I could see no reason why officers should not get their clothing made in Canada. I think that is the proper thing to do, and I do not believe it would cost them as much as it does in England.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I have always maintained for the last forty years that the officers should get an allowance, that they should be furnished a certain amount for their uniform. As soon as an officer is qualified he should get a certain amount for the purchase of a proper uniform.

Civil government—Department of Labour—salaries, $21,750; contingencies, $1,450.

Mr. BOYCE. Under this item I wish to draw the attention of the Minister of Labour to some matters in connection with the importation of foreign labour from the United States and other foreign countries. It is said, and I believe with truth, that the working of our Alien Labour law is by no means satisfactory. In the constituency which I have the honour to represent, and in every other riding where there is a coast line, the same difficulty has been found to exist, namely, that the administration of our present Alien Labour law is very lax indeed; it lacks that rigidity and that honesty of enforcement which will alone carry out the letter as well as the spirit of the Act. With regard to the condition of things in the riding of Sault Ste. Marie, I can best illustrate it by reading a copy of a petition which is now, I believe, in the hands of the minister:

To the Honourable the Minister of Labour, Ottawa.

The petition of the undersigned citizens of the town of Sault Ste. Marie in the province of Ontario, most respectfully showeth:

1. That by reason of close proximity to the international boundary, your petitioners are more than usually alive to the fact that there is no rigid enforcement of the provisions of any law in force in Canada to restrict the importation and employment of aliens, and that in consequence industries here suffer by the employment of foreign labour.

2. That your petitioners are aware of, and will draw to your attention, the fact that

across the border the law is rigidly enforced, and that on that side of the line drastic and prompt measures are taken to immediately deport any Canadian citizen who goes across to look for work, and that in that respect your petitioners believe that the powers of the United States Customs and immigration officers are exceeded.

3. That in the opinion of your petitioners, the present Act is not capable of giving prompt and adequate remedy which will meet the conditions which your petitioners know to exist, and your petitioners believe that more drastic and less cumbrous legislation should be enacted so as to enable prompt action to be taken by way of deportation of any aliens or foreigners seeking to enter Canada to work therein under contracts made out in Canada, and so as to meet the condition of the things and the method in which the law in the United States is enforced against Canadians.

4. Your petitioners further would draw to your attention that there is no immigration inspector or other officers located here, whose duty it is to see that the provisions of the Act in force are enforced, and the consequence is both from the nature of the Act itself and from its non-enforcement, that the Canadian workmen are not adequately protected against foreign labour.

5. Your petitioners therefore pray:

(1) That the present law may be so changed as to secure efficient and drastic measures to be taken for the protection of Canadians against importation of foreign labour; and

(2) That an immigration inspector or immigration officers may be appointed for this port, whose duty it will be to see that the provisions of such Act be rigidly and effectively enforced so as to obtain the results in the way of protection to which your petitioners claim to be entitled as Canadian citizens; and

(3) That such further measures may be taken for the protection of Canadian citizens as are equivalent to the measures used against them on the other side of the line.

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

Now, the present law will not meet the evil from which the labouring classes of Canada are suffering, it does not give them the protection to which they are entitled. It is altogether too cumbrous and unworkable. For instance, the spirit of alien labour legislation is either reciprocal or retaliatory, and must be from its very nature. Now, the Alien Labour law that we have at present is neither reciprocal nor retaliatory. When our workingmen try to go over from Canada to the United States they are met with the drastic enforcement of a very strong law which forbids them to cross the boundary line, and unless they can give a satisfactory account of themselves they are forthwith deported. There is an immediate remedy for the protection of the labouring classes of the United States. The converse is the case as respects our own Alien Labour law. When aliens come across from the United States they are not met by any inspector, there is no tax upon them, there is no law, the enforcement of which will permit of these men being immediately deported. The only remedy we have in our hands to protect the labouring classes of our own country lies in our ability to do one of two things, both of which can only be done after the damage has been inflicted. In the first place, if you want to sue for a penalty, you can go before a judge of the court of record and get from him a fiat to entitle you to sue, and then proceed with a cumbrous and expensive litigation, not to procure the deportation of the alien, but to get a penalty against him, or against the person who brings him in, if you can find him. You may get a penalty with costs from the man who brings the alien in, as a sort of exemplary damage for the injury that is done by bringing him in. Or if you want to proceed by prosecution, you have to go through a more cumbrous procedure still, that of obtaining a fiat of the Attorney General of the province in which you are situated, in order to prosecute. If you are successful in getting a conviction, the informer gets a certain sum to indemnify him against loss and expense, a sum not exceeding one-half the penalty. I trust the Minister of Labour is fully alive to the necessity for some more drastic and more easily enforced law than we have at present. On the other side of the border, there is a very drastic law being enforced against us, and that should justify some more rigorous legislation being taken for the protection of Canadian workingmen.

Take the situation, for instance, at Sault Ste Marie. During last November and earlier when there was a slump in the labour market men came over by hundreds, possibly thousands without the slightest restriction into Canada and took the places or underbid the places which properly belonged to Canadian workmen. How can that remedy be effected? Surely by providing for a labour inspector at the port of entry who will exercise for the protection of Canadian labouring men just the same functions that the labour inspector of the United States exercises with regard to importations of Canadian labour. There you have in the true sense and spirit of the word a reciprocal or retaliatory law. It is worked by one country against the other. I know that in my own district very earnest efforts have been made to enforce the Alien Labour law and to secure the punishment of offenders. It has been to my knowledge found to be absolutely unworkable, and this petition is the result of the discovery by the labour classes there that they cannot get relief through the existing law, and they therefore are very earnest in their indeavours to satisfy the minister that more immediate remedy should be given and the law should be so amended that these matters can be dealt with immediately in the same manner as they

are on the other side of the border. I feel sure that the minister will approach the consideration of the matter in that sense of fairness which characterizes his treatment of such questions.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I thank my hon. friend for bringing this matter up this evening. His remarks as they appear in 'Hansard' will serve me to-morrow as a brief for the Minister of Justice. It is true that practically the administration of the labour law is in the hands of the Minister of Labour, but when these cases are taken to the Attorney General of Canada, that is the Minister of Justice, he acts jointly with me. My hon. friend says we should have a law similar in its effects to the law in the neighbouring republic. I believe in retaliatory measures, we should favour the doctrine of an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth. The Alien Labour law, we must all admit was less workable a few years ago than it appears to be to-day. Some years ago, as my hon. friend knows from his professional experience, the only remedy that the parties had was to address themselves to the Attorney General for Canada, the Minister of Justice, and obtain his good pleasure for the fiat. Since then, under the administration of the Department of Labour by Sir William Mulock, and of the Justice Department by Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, the present Chief Justice of Canada, the law has been so amended as to give the parties the right to obtain a fiat from the Attorney General of each province or from a judge of the Superior Court or a county court judge. The penalty also has been modified in degree. Some years ago the only penalty which could be imposed was a fine of $1,000, and in the application of the law, as the penalty was so severe and the law by its nature so drastic, the judges were inclined to be conservative in its application and in 99 cases out of 100 would give the benefit of the doubt to the defendant. An amendment to the law has been adopted by which the judges are at liberty to impose a penalty ranging from $50 to $1,000. I admit with my hon. friend that we might go a step farther and make the penalty more severe in this sense, that if the penalty is not paid and if the deportation does not take place we might be more drastic and severe. However, as this is something of an international character, for in fact our law applies only to the United States and such United States possessions as are near our boundary, I will not say what other more drastic penalty we will impose, but my hon. friend can surmise what it is. I know that from his district the department has been notified on two occasions, first by the Sault Ste. Marie labour element and then by the Port Arthur people, of trouble under the existing law. We received a message in April, I think, from the mayor of Port Arthur complaining that labourers were imported from Duluth whilst there were plenty of people in Port Arthur to do the work. We immediately put ourselves into communication with the parties and since then the matter has been dropped. At all events the department will be always disposed to help those who will invoke the law. I may say it has not been a dead letter on the statute-book. If my hon. friend will read the report of the Department of Labour for this year he will find a series of cases reported there. This Alien Labour law, as he stated a moment ago, being retaliatory in its nature, has been subjected to many checks by the courts. For instance we all remember the famous judgment of Mr. Justice Anglin. During the period between the judgment of Mr. Justice Anglin and the final judgment of the Privy Council reversing his decision, nearly all cases were stopped. However, since that time the law has been applied and judgments have been rendered which show the law is not ineffective and has been applied in many instances. I have no doubt the remarks of my hon. friend which have been made in a fair spirit will have weight. I shall communicate with the Minister of Justice and see what better provision can be made to render the law more pliable and more effective in protecting our own people against the alien labour.

Charges of management—offices of the Assistant Receivers General—

Toronto	$7,800
Montreal	5,700
Halifax	8,800
St. John	7,700
Winnipeg	7,000
Victoria	5,900
Charlottetown	6,000

Mr. FIELDING. It will be noticed that there are a few decreases which are largely due to readjustments of the offices, as where an old officer passes away and in the rearrangement of the office the expense is somewhat less. The only item of increase of any importance is in regard to the expense of printing Dominion notes. That will probably increase every year with the increased volume of business and with the desire that has been expressed by members on both sides for cleaner currency.

Superintendent of Insurance, to meet expenses in connection with this service, $23,450.

Mr. FIELDING. The salary of the superintendent is fixed by statute and we are proposing a resolution concerning it. This is for the ordinary expense of the department which is enlarging all the time in a small degree.

Some resolutions reported.

RELIGIOUS FANATICS IN MANITOBA.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. J. D. REID. I wish to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Finance to

an article which appeared in the papers to-day, which reads as follows:

Pierson, Manitoba, July 6.—A horde of religious fanatics struck town on Saturday. They were all armed with Winchester rifles and revolvers, and knives, and declared they would not abide by the laws of sinful man, and would shoot anybody that interfered with them. The leader of the gang, a grizzly-faced looking veteran, claimed he was 'Jesus Christ,' and that he was going to Yorkton to look after the Doukhobors there, who were wandering without a leader. They were a very tattered looking outfit, as if they had tramped a long distance, and claimed to have come from Missouri, where they were persecuted by the United States authorities.

Constable Macfarlane, of the Manitoba Mounted Police, who happened to be here, had rather a warm time. On his demanding from them where they were going, and advancing towards them, they pointed their rifles at him, and told him if he made another step they would fire.

After a harangue from the leader, to which the rest joined in with loud 'Amen,' they proceeded west. It was not thought wise to interfere with them.

I would like to ask the hon. minister if this matter has been drawn to the attention of the government, and if they are allowing these people to come into our country from the United States without taking any action?

Mr. FIELDING. I have no information on the subject. Possibly some of my colleagues may have received some information, but I think we might trust matters of that kind to the tender mercies of the Attorney General of Manitoba.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I think these men will be found not to be of the better class of American citizens, but what I call galvanized Yankee anarchists, like the men who were cutting each others' throats a short time ago in the neighbourhood of Medicine Hat. The United States immigrants who come into the country will not be found to be of that type at all.

Mr. J. D. REID. In a case of that kind does the Dominion government not interfere, but leave it entirely in the hands of the local government?

Mr. FIELDING. I speak on the general principle that the preservation of law and order is in the hands of the local authorities.

ACCIDENT TO THE CORNWALL CANAL.

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM. It will be of interest to the House to know that in all probability the Cornwall canal will be open for navigation on Saturday next.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

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

Mr. FIELDING. The Prime Minister intimated to me early in the evening that it had been arranged that what is called the Hodgins matter would be taken up in the morning, but I have been informed quite recently that some hon. gentlemen who are anxious to discuss that matter had arranged that it would not come on until the afternoon. We may assume that either that or the Civil Service Bill will be taken up in the morning and both during the day, and, if we reach Supply, we will take up the estimates of the Minister of Railways and Canals.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, July 7, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

SALARY OF SUPERINTENDENT OF INSURANCE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved that the House go into Committee of the Whole to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to provide that the Superintendent of Insurance be paid such salary, not exceeding five thousand dollars per annum, as the Governor in Council may from time to time fix and determine.

He said: His Excellency having been informed of the subject matter of this resolution recommends it to the favourable consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

BOUNTY ON CRUDE PETROLEUM.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved that the House go into Committee of the Whole to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to provide that the bounty of one-half cent per imperial gallon payable on crude petroleum from Canadian wells authorized by chapter 28 of the Act of 1904 shall apply also to crude petroleum produced from shales or other substances mined in Canada.

He said: His Excellency having been informed of the subject matter of this resolution recommends it to the favourable consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

THE ALL-RED LINE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I intended to move this morning the resolutions of which notice has been given, but other arrangements have been made. I will move them to-morrow.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have to inform the House that the measures the government intend to introduce are the following. The Supplementary Estimates are ready, and will be brought down in a day or two. There will be railway subsidies, the Quebec Bridge legislation, some legislation necessitated by the creation of new courts in Northern Ontario, and some resolutions for extending the boundaries for the provinces of Manitoba, Ontario and Quebec. These resolutions will be brought down to-day, it is expected.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of course any early date in the present stage of the session is a pretty late date. I trust all these measures will be brought down at the earliest possible moment.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I stated that. The estimates which I said would be brought down at a very early date, are ready.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT—AMENDMENT.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 189) to amend the Civil Service Act.—Mr. Fisher.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). The third section in the reprinted Bill requires to be changed. The amendment proposed has been printed, and I think is in the hands of members. The proposal is to strike out section 3 in the reprinted Bill and substitute the following:

3. The Civil Service shall be divided into two divisions, namely, the inside service which shall consist of that part of the public service in or under the several departments of the executive government of Canada and in the offices of the Auditor General, the clerk of the Privy Council and the Governor General's Secretary, employed at the city of Ottawa, or at the experimental farm station or the Dominion astronomical observatory, near Ottawa, but not including the officers, clerks and employees employed at Ottawa in the second or outside departmental division as defined by paragraph (b) of section 4 of the Civil Service Act or in any office of a purely local character; and

The outside service which shall consist of the rest of the public service.

2. So much of this Act and of the Civil Service Act as relates to appointment, classification, salaries and promotions shall apply to the permanent officers, clerks and employees of both Houses of parliament and of the library of parliament.

This amendment is in line with what I think was the consensus of opinion in the general discussion upon this clause. The practical difference is that the general Act does not apply to the permanent officers, the clerks and employees of both Houses of parliament, and of the library of parliament, but only such parts of it apply to them as relate to appointments, classification, salary and promotion. There are other slight changes which were suggested by the Department of Justice to make it clear that the inside service does not include the outside service under the old Act in Ottawa.

Mr. FOSTER. What is subsection b of section 4?

Mr. FISHER. That is the definition of the outside service.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the reason for changing the word 'civil' to the word 'public' where public service is used?

Mr. FISHER. I found in discussing the matter, what I did not realize before, that the words 'civil service,' are used in a restricted sense, and only include those under the old Act who are defined to be civil servants.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is provision, is there not, that the operative sections of the statute shall not apply to the outside service?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then there is this special provision that a certain portion of the Civil Service Act shall apply to the permanent officers, clerks and employees of parliament?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister intends then that section 2 shall operate as concerns all exceptions to the rest of the Act which declares that the outside service shall not be included in the operation of the sections of this statute?

Mr. FISHER. That is what I should say.

Mr. FOSTER. Should the word be 'or' or 'and' after 'the city of Ottawa,' in the fifth line of the amendment? It seems to me that it should be 'and.'

Mr. FISHER. I think the word 'or' includes them all.

Mr. FOSTER. 'At the city of Ottawa' or at the 'Experimental Farm.'

Mr. FISHER. They are not in the city of Ottawa.

Mr. CLEMENTS. While there is provision made for the deputy ministers, what provision was made for the classification, for instance, of the Superintendent of Immigration? I know that personally he has a very heavy department and a great deal of work.

Mr. FISHER. Of course, I could not state positively because he is in the Department of the Interior, but I should consider that he would come under subdivision (a) of the first division, in which subdivision the salary ranges from $2,800 to $4,000. I know, as a matter of fact, that he is getting

$3,000 at present. He would be eligible to rise to $4,000.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

Mr. FISHER. I have also an amendment to section 13.

Mr. FOSTER. Before going to section 13 would the minister look at sections 6 and 7? You will remember that the question was raised as to the method of classification. Here the classification seems to be entirely mechanical. It is based on what the present salary is, but it would seem to me that a better rule would be that the classification should be according to the duties rather than to the accidental range of salaries. The duties of the office and the capabilities of the clerk to perform those duties ought to be the proper basis of classification and to make it simply a matter of salary works a great deal of injustice. Practical injustice will be done to a great many in this regard. The government found a civil service in 1896, when it came into power and it has been administering affairs from that time up to this. A great many new clerks have been put in and it is well known that in the matter of salary many have been advanced away over and above the older clerks. These older clerks have been doing efficient work from 1896 up to the present and they have been passed over, while many new men have been brought in and inordinately advanced, as it might be contended. The older clerks are left entirely out whilst the newcomer, by having, from one circumstance or another, his salary advanced largely from time to time will be graded under the new Civil Service Act above the older officers. I think there is a considerable portion of the civil service which may be unjustly dealt with in that respect.

Mr. FISHER. I appreciate what my hon. friend is aiming at, but I do not really see how it can be avoided in any way. Section 8 provides for an organization declaring the standing and classes of the officers in the service and their standing in the classification. This gives an opportunity, where a man is doing a high class of work, to put him in the clasification which that work would entitle him to be in. I do not see how we can very well declare by the Act that a certain work that a man may be doing shall entitle him to be put in a certain division.

Mr. FOSTER. You could not declare that by the Act, but you could declare by the Act that the classification should be made according to the duties of the office and then the grading authority would have a basis of principle upon which to work. Here, you lay it down as the salary.

Mr. FISHER. Section 6 provides for really a transference of the present staff into new divisions, and I do not see how my hon. friend's suggestion could be adopted unless every individual piece of work were specified. I do not see how that would avail unless every individual piece of work was specified. I had supposed that section 8 would provide for that. Section 8 provides for an order in council being passed defining the organization of the department and my own interpretation of that was that in that order in council certain work would be declared to be done by such an officer in such and such a subdivision of such and such a division of the general classification. Then if that work was being done today by a certain officer I take it that that individual would continue to do that work, and that that work would be put into that classification and that place. I do not see how it could be done in any other way The passage of the present clerks into the new classifications seems to be necessarily a matter of their salaries for the time being, that is their class. My hon. friend is aware that as a general rule important work ought to be done by clerks of a class which is receiving pay commensurate to the importance of the work. That does not always occur, I grant you. I have in my own mind an instance where a young man who has been in the service only a short time and who is only a junior second class clerk is doing far more important work than a first class clerk in my department. It is wrong but the first class clerk was a junior and crept up until he is now a first class clerk. Really his work could be done by a junior clerk, he is not capable of doing important work. If I gave him responsible work to do he would simply fall down and the work would not be done. There are instances of that but I do not think they are common and I do not see how we could accomplish what my hon. friend suggests.

Mr. BLAIN. The outside service is defined in the Bill as introduced in these words:

The outside service shall consist of the rest of the civil service.

The amendment proposed is:

The outside service shall consist of the rest of the public service.

I have heard the minister's explanation of this change which I understand was suggested by the Justice Department. It is a matter which should receive some consideration by the minister before its adoption. There will be a great deal of trouble in the classification of the civil service under this Bill. There is some disappointment that the outside service has not been taken in. There is provision of course for taking in the outside service at some future time by order in council and I rather think there will be some trouble about classification, there must be a pronouncement upon it by the new Board of Commissioners who are necessarily new men at this work. It may

cause trouble and inflict hardship on good officials in this House. I rather think it would be better for the minister to give it further consideration before asking the committee to adopt it.

Mr. FISHER. I cannot conceive of any such trouble as my hon. friend alludes to. This change has not been made without consideration and it applies to the public service. The civil service has been a restricted term and the intention is to include all employees of the government, whether in the inside or outside service, for the purposes of this Act, I do not see where any danger can occur.

Mr. CONMEE. In the classification of the civil servants who are being brought under this Act the minister has said that the determining factor will be their present salaries, what consideration will be given to the merits and abilities of the several clerks in their classification and promotion ?

Mr. FISHER. Section 6 provides for the present clerks being put in the new classification according to their standing to-day.

Mr. CONMEE. I asked whether in that regard salary alone or record and ability will be considered in making the classification. I understand it is not to be a competitive test.

Mr. FISHER. As a matter of fact if a clerk is to-day a first class clerk, whatever he is doing, he will go into a certain subdivision. If he is a second class clerk he will go into another subdivision. It is not a question of his work or anything but his position in the service.

Mr. FOSTER. I would call attention to subdivision 4 of section 6. You will remember my contention was that a large number of temporary clerks who had not passed any examination at all would be by that section drafted into the civil service, because whilst it is a rule that civil government contingencies should only be used for those who have passed the examination it is also a fact that quite a large number are being paid out of civil government contingencies who have not passed the civil service examination.

Mr. FISHER. I asked the Auditor General that question and his answer is :

With reference to those charged to civil government contingencies who have not passed the examination I find there are four in the Finance Department and one in the Governor General's Secretary's, five in all.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that all ?

Mr. FISHER. That is what the Auditor General informs me.

Mr. FOSTER. My information goes a good deal farther than that.

Mr. FISHER. I asked the Auditor General to refer to the hon. gentleman's questions in the House and send me the facts.

Mr. BLAIN.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it would be an injustice to place any who have not passed the examination, by the mere fact that they have been employed contrary to the Act as we might say, into the civil service permanently. Any such clerks should pass the civil service examination before they are allowed to enter the permanent service.

Mr. FISHER. In view of the fact that we have been pretty constantly for many years admitting people into the service contrary to the Civil Service Act, I do not think it is worth while for the sake of these five to make any amendment to the Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Coming back to section 3, I am not very well satisfied, so far as my personal opinion goes, with the present form of it. The expression 'civil service' was defined by the Civil Service Act and therefore had a definite meaning. The expression 'public service' is not defined either by this Act or by the Civil Service Act. The exact meaning will have to be determined by some proper authority at some time if any question arises respecting that meaning and it seems to me that questions might very readily arise. Then, so far the employees of the Senate, the House of Commons and the Libary are concerned, I am no more in favour of placing them in the outside service than I was in favour of placing them in the inside service. The Governor in Council could at any time include them by order in council in the inside service, and make every section of the Act apply to them.

Mr. FISHER. I would like to interrupt my hon. friend to say that by another amendment later on I propose to provide that whenever the Governor in Council may do anything, the Senate as to the officers of the Senate, the House as to the officers of the House, and both Houses as to the officers of the Library, would have to act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That would perhaps answer that objection, although I think we shall be obliged to pay a little attention to section 47 as proposed to be amended. Then I would like to express once more my own personal opinion that the best way to deal with the officials of both Houses and the officials of the Library would be to provide in the statutes that each House could bring them in when it saw fit to the extent it saw fit.

Mr. FISHER. I think the amendment I am proposing does that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If it does, then my criticism falls to the ground.

Mr. FISHER. I think practically I am carrying out the suggestion of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If it carries that out, I ought to be fully satisfied, and I will say no more about it until we come to section 47.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister will remember that on section 10 I proposed that there should be some extension of (b), and I thought the minister was favourably inclined to that. The suggestion I made was to add these words

Of its own motion to investigate and report upon all matters relating to the enforcement and effects of the Civil Service Act or of any regulations made thereunder.

That would cover subjects on which the commission, with their constant working and familiarity with them, should be at full liberty to look into and express their opinion upon at any time; so that the government, and especially the House, might have the benefit of their experience and recommendations.

Mr. FISHER. I do not know the whole bearings of what my hon. friend suggests. I would rather be disposed to suggest that the clause be left as it is, and if we find that there is any restriction on the work of the commission such as my hon. friend seems to fear, it will be very easy to amend that so as to give them power, which may be more clearly in our mind when they make their report. We shall probably appoint the commission immediately after the Act comes into force, and if they indicate in their report in any way that they want further power, it will be very easy on their suggestion to make the necessary amendments.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think they would make any suggestion unless they had the power given them here. I do not think they would go outside of their legal power. What I wanted to give them was a basis for exercising that power. Under this section they would have power to look into any violation of the Act which might be brought to their notice or which they might notice themselves, but they could not go any further. We ought to give them the right to express their views on that matter.

Mr. FISHER. We might go on with another section in the meantime, and I will consider that.

Mr. CONMEE. Is it intended that the commission shall have power to regulate discipline?

Mr. FISHER. No. I think the question of discipline in the departments would have to be left to the officers of the departments. I do not think it would be a good thing for an outside body to go in and discipline a department. For instance, the authority of a deputy minister over the clerks under him would not be complete if the commission, who could not know the personnel or the duties of the officers as well as the deputy minister, could exercise discipline in the department. I think it would be very detrimental indeed.

Mr. CONMEE. There is the other view, that there might be partiality in the department in the assignment of work. The English commission has power to regulate discipline. One of the objects of appointing a commission is to improve the service in the departments. Otherwise the head of the department might, in the interest of his friends, do many things not in the public interest. If my information be right, that sort of thing has often been done in times gone by.

Mr. FOSTER. I would be very doubtful about authorizing the commission to discipline any branch of the service. The commission should be given full powers to make suggestions and to make any examination they consider necessary before making suggestions, and then throw the responsibility for action on the minister and parliament. That is as far as we could go, and I have been labouring with the minister to let us go that far. We have gained a little step. The commission can look into any violation of the rules and duties and report, and it will be for the minister to act, subject to his responsibility to this House. But for the commission to go into a department and attempt to discipline A, B or C would derogate entirely from the control and foremanship of the deputy minister who ought to be a vital force. I agree with my hon. friend that under most human conditions there will be occasions of favouritism probably, but those will have to be watched by the minister. If they are gross, they can be pointed out by the commission and the minister held responsible.

Mr. CONMEE. If my information be correct, there may be a good deal more onerous duties imposed on one officer than another who may receive less pay.

Mr. FOSTER. That is true.

Mr. CONMEE. Of course the commission have the power to report, but considering the hon. gentleman's amendment as far as I can grasp it, I do not think it goes as far as the proposition he submits.

Mr. FOSTER. My trouble is I cannot get the minister to go any further. If I could get him to go that far, I would be satisfied for the present.

Mr. FISHER. In any case such as the hon. gentleman speaks of, the head of the department might ask the commission to make a report.

Mr. CONMEE. My object is not to leave it to the head of the department. I think the head of the department requires discipline just as much as some of the officers under him.

Mr. FOSTER. A good deal more.

Mr. FISHER. He is amenable to parliament.

Mr. CONMEE. It is a pretty long road to drag him through the operation of parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. It would not be if the members supporting the government did their duty.

Mr. CONMEE. I was assuming, when I made my reply to the minister, that the members of the government were doing their whole duty. But even then it is impossible to reach the deputy head.

On section 13—competitive admission examination.

Mr. FISHER. I want to move an amendment that after the word 'to' in line 10 the words 'position in' be added; and after the word 'service' in line 11, the words 'under that of the deputy head' shall be added. There seems to be a doubt as to whether the entrance to the position of deputy head will not be by competitive examination. I wish to make it clear that it will not.

Mr. FOSTER I do not know whether it is practicable or not, but I would almost like to have seen the whole service open to a deserving person.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend would not suggest that the appointment of deputy minister should be opened to competitive examination.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps not.

Section as amended agreed to.

Mr. FISHER moved that section 24 and 25 be struck out.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to have a word to say about sections 21 and 22. I was not here when they were discussed. Section 21 reads:

If the deputy head reports that the knowledge and ability requisite for the position are wholly or in part professional, technical or otherwise peculiar, the Governor in Council, upon the recommendation of the head of the department, based on the report of the deputy head, may appoint a person to the position without examination and without reference to the age limit, provided the said person obtains from the commission a certificate, given upon evidence satisfactory to it, that he possesses the requisite knowledge and ability and is duly qualified as to health, character and habits.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is moved that section 21 be amended by inserting after the word 'report' in line 29 the words 'in writing.'

Mr. FISHER. It was understood that wherever the deputy minister was required to make a report, the words 'in writing' would be put into the Act all through. In the reprint that has not always been done. I suggest that the same words should be added in sections 23 and 28.

Mr. FISHER.

Mr. FOSTER. We have a large number of persons in the department who might be called technical or professional. In fact the definition of the first three divisions is technical or professional or executive officers. This opens a very wide door. If a deputy head reports that the knowledge and ability requisite for the position are 'wholly or in part professional, technical or otherwise peculiar.' What meaning might be given to that I do not know. I should think that technical or professional ought to be sufficiently wide. To add to that 'or otherwise peculiar' opens up a very wide debatable field. Suppose it is brought down to professional or technical, that gives a very large power of nomination and patronage to the government and you have a great many men in the service whose qualifications are partly or wholly technical or professional, and you may thus nullify to a considerable extent the Civil Service Act. Whenever the departmental head wants to get in a certain person, if he has at all professional or technical abilities, it will be quite easy to bring him in under this report without any examination or intervention by the commission. I should think in the first place that the words 'or otherwise peculiar' might be left out and the discretion given by the section limited to the cases of professional and technical. In the second place it is worth while considering whether you should not insert there the qualifying clause 'and which, in the opinion of the commission, cannot be provided for under the preceding sections of this Act.' There is really no case which cannot be met under the preceding sections of the Act. If you want a packer, the commission can examine on packers, duties. If you want a professional man, the commission can examine on professional qualifications. In such cases, the patronage is eliminated, and this is the object of the Civil Service Act. If you allow this to go in, the patronage is not eliminated, and there is full power of nomination given to the Crown and to the minister who represents the department. But there might be, occasionally, some cases in which the commissioners themselves might prefer that an examination should not be held. Let that be left to the good sense of the commissioners and not with the whim or caprice, or it may be, even well founded opinion, of the minister. If the opinion is reasonable, the commissioners can be depended upon to agree with it. But if it is a case of patronage and ought not, in good reason, to be adopted, the commissioners will say so. But when you do not interpose the commission, it becomes mere nomination and patronage. When you have the competitive examination, it is not nomination nor is it patronage, because the list is there, prepared, not by the minister or his deputy but by the commission under

its method of operation, and from that list the appointee is to be selected. I venture to say that in nine hundred and ninety-nine cases out of a thousand, under these conditions, the commissioners would be able to supply the man the department requires, and abuses would be avoided.

Mr. FISHER. All the Civil Service Acts have had a clause of this kind. The English civil service regulations have such a clause; not exactly in the same words :

Mr FOSTER. No the commission have power.

Mr. FISHER. The word 'peculiar' is in the provision of the English law and I took this right out of the English Act.

Mr. FOSTER. That may be with regard to 'peculiar.'

Mr. FISHER. That is what I am talking about. With regard to the word 'peculiar' it is there and the clause is taken verbatim. In the American regulations exactly the same power is given. In the English regulations the appointing power may take a person of these qualincations from outside, and my hon. friend, I am satisfied, is absolutely wrong in saying that the commission regulates it. I am certain I speak correctly of the English system. In regard to the American system, numberless appointments have been made under an exactly similar provision. In this clause we go further than either the English or Americans do, for we provide that the appointee must have a certificate of qualification from the commission. Now, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) would limit 'peculiar' qualifications to professional and technical. But there are officers whose qualifications are 'peculiar' and yet could hardly be called either 'technical' or 'professional.' For instance, take one to be employed in a library. There is a regular system of training librarians, and some of our universities have courses of study in that line. But the qualifications so acquired could hardly be designated as technical or profession, because there is no profession of librarians yet. Take another case : My hon. friend the Minister of Customs may require an appraiser, a man peculiarly versed—and I used the words advisedly 'peculiarly versed'—in a particular class of goods. The qualifications of such a man would not be professional or technical——

Mr. FOSTER. I think they would be technical.

Mr. FISHER. It seems to me that in the interpretation of the word they would not be technical. I am satisfied—I know— that in the English service such words are used to meet such cases as I have indicated, and I have no hesitation in saying that it is necessary that a provision of this kind must be inserted in any Civil Service Act. It is especially wise when we find that, as in this clause, it is provided that the commission must give a certificate of qualification on grounds which they think best, whether by examination or otherwise, before an appointment is made. I think we have safeguarded it as much as possible, consistent with the successful working of the provision.

Mr. FOSTER. In the British service it works this way : Where a case of this kind arises there is a request for the kind of officer required ; then the Civil Service Commission may, if it thinks proper, wholly or partially dispense with the written examination and give their certificate on qualification.

Mr. FISHER. That is what we do.

Mr. FOSTER. There it is left to the Civil Service Commission to say whether they shall wholly or partially dispense with the examination.

Mr. FISHER. That is the case here ; we leave it with the commission to give its certificate 'upon evidence satisfactory to it.'

Mr. FOSTER. But it does not leave it to the commission to examine partially or wholly ; it is prohibited from examining, but still is asked to give a certificate.

Mr. FISHER. Yes—'upon evidence satisfactory to it.' It is absolutely within its own control how it shall get its evidence.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think you can force the language that way. It does not mean that they can examine the person.

Mr. FISHER. I think so.

Mr. FOSTER. I would have no objection to it if it were simply to leave the matter to the commission to dispense with the examination where they think reasonable.

Mr. FISHER. I am willing that this should be made to read the same as section 26. I would move that the words 'given upon evidence satisfactory to it' be struck out and these words substituted : 'to be given with or without examination as is determined by the regulations of the commission.'

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 22—appointment of messengers, porters, sorters and packers.

Mr. FOSTER. I consider this section is a very faulty portion of the Act. Appointments to these positions, and to such other positions in the lower grades as are determined by the Governor in Council, may be made by the Governor in Council on the recommendation of the head of the department. That absolutely gives to the government the power of nomination.

Mr. FISHER. With the condition that the appointees have to have a certificate of qualification from the commission.

Mr. FOSTER. But with that condition it gives absolute power of nomination to the government. That is a power that the English civil service reformers in 1855 started out to fight against and to put down. That was the dominant evil, and the basis of the proposed legislation to-day is to do away, as far as possible, with nomination by the Crown, that is, nomination by the minister, or by members of parliament supporting the minister. Now, take this large class of appointees, including messengers, porters, sorters, packers and such other positions in the lower grades as are determined by the Governor in Council. That is a very important part of the public service, and you absolutely shut out from it the beneficent features of this legislation. You fill these positions entirely at the nomination of the party, and you exclude the Canadian citizen from the free right of entrance into that part of the service. I think that is a great blemish in the minister's Act, as well as a great trouble to everybody who hates the power of patronage, and believes that in the end it is not beneficial, even from a party point of view. Take my hon. friend the member for Ottawa, does he look upon the patronage power as he finds it developed in his daily life as a desirable thing? Are his hours his own? Is he not pestered almost unbearably by applicants of every kind for office? Is not nine-tenths of his public time taken up with looking after, or pretending to look after, matters of patronage. Now, if he proposes to sit after the next election for Ottawa, does he not see what he is storing up for himself by supporting the minister in passing this section? And does he not see what great trouble he would avoid if he supported me in inducing the minister to give up this power of patronage? There are hundreds and hundreds of this class, and with every one of them it will simply be pitching upon the representative, the representative pitching upon the minister, and the minister and the representative fighting it out so as to get the best results they can from the party point of view. In Great Britain it is not so, in the United States it is not so; they have put these positions entirely out of the power of nomination and patronage, and it can be done here in some such way as I will suggest. I will read what I have drawn up:

After the words 'deputy head' insert 'and such appointments shall be made in order of merit from a list of successful applicants determined by the commission through examination and inquiry, to be provided for under regulations made by the commission and approved by the Governor in Council.

That allows the commissioners to proceed upon proper businesslike plans and, after competition and examination, to prepare a list, and the applicants in their order of merit shall be placed upon that list. Then when the minister requires such an one all he has to do is to apply to the commissioners, and from that list they select the person who is fitted for the kind of work the minister requires, according to his order of merit in that particular line. Then the member for Ottawa has nothing to do but to say to the applicant: That is all in the hands of the commissioners. Show your capability to go on that list, and you will get fair and equal treatment.

Mr. BERGERON. But how can he get votes?

Mr. FOSTER. I venture to say that the experience of every member is that he has lost more votes than he has gained.

Mr. FISHER. I do not think I can accept that proposition. I agree that the idea of competitive examination must be extended to all entrants to the civil service. But at the same time such a proposition as my hon. friend outlines there is one which would have to be worked out with the greatest care, because it does not mean an ordinary competitive examination.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say it did, and I would not have it so.

Mr. FISHER. He would not have it so; in other words, he wishes to provide a machinery which I should think, from his description of it, would be a very unworkable one. My hon. friend wants to put that into the statute now so that in future the commission shall do such a thing whether they think they can make regulations to accomplish it or not. It is a continuation of the reform which, if the commission recommends it, may be adopted. But until it is in a complete form before the House, and before those who are responsible for the working of this Act, I do not think it would be advisable to accept it. I take direct issue with my hon. friend on that point. I am as desirous as he is of taking away from the government and from members of parliament this class of patronage. I appreciate it perhaps more than my hon. friend does, because my experience has been much more recent than his. The whole object of this Bill is in that direction, but at the same time I do not want to undertake to do something the successful working out of which I cannot perceive. What my hon. friend proposes would require a great deal more consideration than can be given to it here on the reading of the amendment before the committee, and until the commission has been consulted, have discussed it and have outlined some scheme after their experience and observation of the working of the Act, I would not undertake to accept it.

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot follow the minister in his reasoning. What he proposes

as a possibility is just exactly what is indicated in this amendment. It will be for the commission, in consultation with the Governor in Council, to work out a proper scheme. If the commission are able to do it for third-class clerks and for the writer class——

Mr. FISHER. They have a clear cut way of doing that by competitive examination.

Mr. FOSTER. But it is infinitely more difficult for the commissioners to prepare the right kind of examination, to make it practical and effective and to keep it from being academic for the other grades of clerks than it is to prepare forms of examination for a messenger, packer or sorter. This is of the most elementary description. What Great Britain and the United States have carried out without the least trouble my hon. friend could work out through the commission here. The difficulty with the minister is that he does not want to give up the patronage.

Mr. FISHER. No, it is not.

Mr. FOSTER. And he is putting a blot upon his whole Civil Service Act when he takes hundreds of public positions on one hand and says to the people: You shall not have your entrance into this part of the public service without a competitive examination, and then says: We shall keep the nomination and patronage in respect to another large branch of the public service in our own hands. Why not cut it off when the minister is at the process and has his knife already into the evil which he has so strongly denounced? Why not go to the whole length especially as it is the easiest portion of the length to go? The minister says that there is no time to consider it now. No, because legislation is chucked into the House in the seventh month of the session, we have not time to do anything. We are worn out any way. However, I will move the amendment.

Mr. BERGERON. I would like to ask my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) if the nomination of a page would have to be made by the Governor in Council?

Mr. FOSTER. If the proposed resolution is adopted the House shall exercise just the same authority it now exercises in connection with its officers. There will be no change at all.

Mr. BERGERON. I understand that it says that the nomination of an officer of the House of Commons shall be through the clerk, or the deputy head or the Speaker, and that it will have to be done by the Governor in Council. Where is the difference?

Mr. FISHER. We are coming to a clause which I am proposing to insert in the Act to define that everything that is done under this Act where it relates to the House of Commons shall be done by the House. In a department the Governor in Council can make appointments, but it is provided that appointments to the staff of the House of Commons or the Senate shall be outside of the Governor in Council.

Mr. BERGERON. Then there will be no change?

Mr. FISHER. No. With regard to what my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) says about my desire to retain the patronage, I think that is an entirely unfair statement. I do not wish to accept this amendment because I do not think it is feasible to carry out such a competitive examination as applies to the rest of the service. Where it is cut and dried work it can be carried out with definite results, but in such a case as this it would necessarily be very loose and I do not consider that it would work. Therefore, I am not prepared to accept the amendment. The statement of the hon. gentleman that my reason for not accepting it is that I want to keep the patronage, is not correct.

Amendment (Mr. Foster) negatived.

On section 21—professional and specially qualified officers.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It seems to me that the word 'competitive' should be placed before the word 'examination' in the 30th line. You have 'without examination' in one place and 'with or without' in the other.

Mr. FISHER. I will accept that amendment.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is evidently the intention.

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 22—messengers, packers, &c.

Mr. FISHER. I would also suggest in section 22 that we make the same change as was made in section 21 as to the way in which the certificate of the commission should be given. In lines 41 and 42, I would move that the words 'given upon evidence satisfactory to it' be stricken out and that the words 'to be given with or without examination as is determined by the regulations of the commission' be substituted.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 23—temporary clerks.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, may I suggest to my hon. friend that he also carry that out in section 23?

Mr. FISHER. Yes. I propose that in subsection 2 of section 23 we shall also strike out the words 'given upon evidence satisfactory to it' and substitute the words 'to be given with or without examination as

is determined by the regulations of the commission.'

Section as amended agreed to.

Sections 24 and 25 reconsidered.

Mr. FISHER. I propose that sections 24 and 25 be struck out altogether.

Motion agreed to.

On section 29—salary of deputy head.

Mr. FISHER. I would ask the committee to now take up section 29. I propose to strike out the words from 'deputy head' down to the word 'parliament,' these words being 'administering a department, and of the clerks of the Senate and House of Commons, and of each of the librarians of parliament.' I find, on the statement of the law clerks, that these words are not needed with the definition of 'deputy head' in the second section of the Act.

Mr. BERGERON. Does this increase the salary of the Speaker too ?

Mr. FISHER. No, the Speaker's salary has nothing to do with the civil service.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the present salary of the clerk of the Senate ?

Mr. FISHER. I think $4,000.

Mr. BERGERON. In the Senate they have a clerk, a deputy clerk and a second deputy clerk, have they not ?

Mr. FISHER. I do not know.

Mr. BERGERON. Mr. Evanturel has been appointed second deputy clerk.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Mr. Evanturel succeeds a previous clerk.

Mr. BERGERON. They have more employees there than we have, but they have not the work or the long hours. We used to have two clerks here but now there is only one. I do not think even if the Senate do appoint them we are called upon to vote the money to pay them.

Mr. FISHER. I think my hon. friend should bring that up in Supply on the items for the Senate legislation.

On section 37—status preserved.

Mr. FISHER. I move to amend this section by adding the following subclause ?

2. Any person (whether permanent or temporary) who is in receipt of the maximum salary, as heretofore established, of the class (permanent or temporary), in which he is then serving shall, on the expiry of one year from his having first been in receipt of such salary, be eligible for the increase of salary provided by this Act.

This clause is taken from the Act of 1903 and simply provides that a clerk who is today at the maximum of his class and consequently could not get an increase, but the maximum of the corresponding subdivision being raised is eligible for an increase, may be paid that increase on the expiry of a year.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the annual increase ?

Mr. FISHER. The maximum being raised he ought to get a statutory increase, but he cannot get it until a year after his last increase.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I confess I do not understand the verbiage of this amendment. What have we here to do with 'salaries as heretofore established' ?

Mr. FISHER. I have explained the condition to which this applies. This provides that a civil servant situated as I said shall not be eligible for an increase until a year from the time he received his last increase, to the salary he is now drawing.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If that is the intention why does not the amendment say so ? It confuses the matter and I confess I am unable to understand it. I appreciate the intention and I agree with it, but the verbiage is open to objection. I cannot make out whether the word 'then' refers to the past or the future.

Mr. FISHER. I asked the clerk whether that ought not to be 'now,' but he said that the word 'then' was the usual form, meaning at the time when the last increase took place.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then it should read: 'was then receiving.'

Mr. FISHER. The next amendment I propose is to insert the following as section 38, to meet the change in section 3 :

38. Except as herein otherwise provided, the salary of any person placed in the inside service by or under this Act or to whom the provisions thereof are made applicable, shall be that which he is then receiving, and the said salary shall determine his classification, provided that where the amount of the salary is common to two subdivisions or positions, the classification shall be determined by the Governor in Council.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I admit that the work of regrading and reclassification is a difficult one in so large a service, with so many interests to be considered, and I presume from the remarks of the minister this morning that it is intended to accomplish something of the reclassification under section 8 of the Bill. I am not clear as to how it can be effectively worked out under the provisions of the Bill as they are presented to the committee. That, however, is more a subject for the consideration of the government, who will have to put the Act into practical working. My own views with regard to it have already been expressed and I need not dwell upon them again. Summarized in a few words they are these : When you do come to re-

classify the service, you must necessarily of course have some regard for the salaries and positions of the various members of the service, but any reclassification or regrading which will be worthy of the name, which will tend to increase the efficiency of the service, must be based on the ability of the different members of the service and their fitness for the particular work to which they are to be assigned. If some regard is not had to these considerations, the reclassification or regrading will be entirely mechanical, and will leave the service, so far as efficiency is concerned, in very much the same position as it is in to-day. In saying this, I do not for one moment desire to minimize the difficulties which lie before any government which will undertake to deal effectively with this question, but if the service is to be increased in efficiency and if the reclassification is to have any beneficial effect, something will have to be done along these lines.

Mr. CONMEE. It seem to me that the board should have some jurisdiction over grading, promotion and regulating discipline. The grading should not be based entirely on existing salaries. In his book on the 'Civil Service in Great Britain,' Dorman B. Eaton in the chapter on 'The Merit System in the Great Departments' says :

The board has the right of promotion and authority for discipline without interference from any other quarter, but cannot increase salaries or expenses. Promotions are for merit. In certain parts of the service they are based on examinations, and in other parts on official records kept in the offices, and almost without exception all the higher places are filled from those below. Personal records of the conduct of all officers are kept by the board. . . . The circumstances of all promotions stand recorded in the official books, and may be referred to in the event of any complaint or inquiry being made into the matter.

As I understand it, the English system recognizes that the public has an interest not only in the efficiency of the service and in the discipline maintained, but in the justice that may be meted out to the various individuals in the service. Not only is the evil of political patronage, so far as it is an evil, to be done away with, but social influence, clerical influence and a great many other kinds of influence, which in my humble opinion are as vicious in principle as the so-called political influence, under the British system the heads of departments are unable to advance by favouritism any person who may be a relative or a friend. The man in the service relies on his ability and his record. Surely it is an injustice that a man should do departments are unable to advance by fadrawing a higher salary. I think the commission ought to have some power to regulate these matters. It would be in the public interest, in the interest of elevating the public service and be simple justice to those who have entered the service on the competitive basis.

Mr. FISHER. This clause only applies to people who are at present in the service. These people have attained the positions they occupy under the present law, and I do not think we should undertake to alter their conditions, even at the recommendation of the commission. When there is a question of promotion these people will have to undergo the necessary examination, but I do not think it would be right to undertake to degrade them now.

Mr. CONMEE. I have no idea whatever that any one should be degraded in the service, but I do think there should be some examination as to whether a man is fit at all to occupy a position in the service. That was done in England when the English Act was brought into force. A large number were discarded there on the ground that they had not sufficient general knowledge or ability to fill any position in the service in the rank in which they were. Men who have been long in the service and who have acquired a certain efficiency should not be disturbed ; but if there are any who are absolutely useless, they should make room for others. I do not say they should be turned on the street. It would be better for the government to give them an annuity now than retain them in the service when they are utterly incompetent. If you are going to introduce the competitive principle, you should start, as the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith) has said, with some regard to that principle in the case of those now in the service.

On section 39—annual increase.

Mr. FOSTER. I would call attention to subsection 4. Is it meant that the increase of $100 annually in the first paragraph is to be conditioned by subsection 4?

Mr. FISHER. No, I think that applies to subsection 3.

Mr. FOSTER. As it reads, it would apply to all.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend will notice the thirty-third line, 'and in the case of officers, clerks and other employees of the second and third division to whom a further increase is recommended, accompanied by a certificate of merit from the commission.'

Mr. FOSTER. What you do is omit the first division from the clause requiring that certificate.

Mr. FISHER. The intention is that the usual increase shall be given without a certificate from the commission. It is only the exceptional or merit increase,

and that does not apply to the first division.

Mr. FOSTER. When there is an extraordinary increase in the first division——

Mr. FISHER. There is no provision for that.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. gentleman still persist in the $100 increase for the higher division instead of $50?

Mr. FISHER. I think so.

On section 44,

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend from North Toronto proposes an amendment which he handed me across the floor. I examined the wording and it did not strike me as satisfactory. I have here an amendment which is more in the form of enactment. His was more in the form of a resolution or declaration. This is the amendment which has been drafted by the Justice Department, and of which I think my hon. friend will approve:

No officer, clerk or employee in the service shall be debarred from voting at any Dominion or provincial election if, under the laws governing the same, he has the right to vote, But every such officer or clerk is prohibited from engaging otherwise in partisan work in connection with such election.

Mr. BLAIN. Under that can an employee take the position of a deputy returning officer?

Mr. FISHER. I do not consider that a partisan position.

Mr. DANIEL. What is the object of the words 'or otherwise'?

Mr. FISHER. Because he is already authorized to vote.

Mr. LENNOX. That is not partisan.

Mr. FISHER. It might be so construed.

Mr. LENNOX. Would the hon. gentleman not consider a returning officer partisan?

Mr. FISHER. No, the work of the deputy returning officer is strictly judicial, and he takes an oath to discharge the duties without partisanship.

Mr. DANIEL. Would it not be an improvement to strike out the words 'or otherwise'?

Mr. FISHER. There would be a doubt as to whether he was allowed to vote?

Mr. DANIEL. It plainly states that he is allowed to vote.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Is there any penalty in connection with this?

Mr. FISHER. The Criminal Code provides a penalty.

Mr. BLAIN. I understand the minister to state that the position of deputy returning officer is non-partisan.

Mr. FISHER. I do.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman emphasizes it. But, if he would read the history of politics in the province of Ontario and especially the history of the party with which he himself is identified, he would learn that it is a strictly partisan position in many respects and in a great many counties in that province. But I am not going to debate that or enter into a discussion about it; I want to express my opinion that it is a serious blunder to regard the position of deputy returning officer as a non-partisan position. I am very much surprised that the minister, when he is making provision to remove the civil service from political influence, should think it his duty to allow these men to occupy the position of deputy returning officer.

Mr. SPROULE. I agree with every word that the hon. member (Mr. Blain) has said. We have had an experience of deputy returning officers for many years past that justifies the strongest suspicion that you cannot put a government employee in that position without the danger that he will act as a partisan. I regard it as a great impropriety to have such a provision in the law.

Mr. CONMEE. It seems to me that an officer of the civil service would be a proper person to appoint as a deputy returning officer. The position is more or less that of a judge, for the deputy returning officer may have to rule upon questions affecting the rights of a voter. If you appoint a responsible officer, for instance, a customs officer or in the provincial field, a deputy sheriff or clerk of the court, in my humble opinion you have the best material to make a deputy returning officer. The hon. gentleman shakes his head. But I have had some experience, and my experience is that that class of men are more apt to discharge fairly the duties of such an office than others of less experience and ability.

Mr. SPROULE. The civil service are under the government; is it in the nature of things that they should act with strict impartiality as between a government candidate and a candidate opposed to the government? It is not human nature and it is unreasonable to expect it. Therefore, a civil servant is by no means the man who would be most likely to act impartially when employed in such a case. The appointment of such men to positions of deputy returning officer by the government that regularly employs them in their official capacity must create a grave suspicion that it is most unlikely that impartiality will be shown in the work of the deputy returning officer.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would ask the minister or the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) to tell me the name of a deputy

returning officer who served in the last election who was not a political friend of the government. He cannot name one. They are all partisans appointed——

Mr. FISHER. There is one in my county, Mr. Nelson Emmerson, deputy returning officer in North Sutton, who is a well known Conservative.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not pretend to recall the names now, but, if a little time were given me, I am sure I could name fifty in Nova Scotia.

Mr. BLAIN. In the discussion the other day the Minister of Finance stated that, in his opinion, 95 per cent of the deputy returning officers appointed belonged to one political party——

Mr. FIELDING. I did not say that.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman endorsed the position that I took in making that statement to the House.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman is mistaken ; I did not say that.

Mr. FISHER. I think the hon. gentleman is attributing to the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) his recollection of something that I said.

Mr. BLAIN. Then, we have it from the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher). But may I ask the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) if he does not think that 95 per cent of the deputy returning officers in the federal election were of the same stripe of politics?

Mr. FIELDING. In Nova Scotia, emphatically, it is not so.

Mr. BLAIN. What percentage, then ?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not know. In the county of Halifax, which I represented for some years, and I think the same is true of my present constituency, the practice was to appoint gentlemen on both sides of politics. I think that the position taken by the sheriff of the county of Halifax, a gentleman whom I had the honour to appoint, invariably appointed men irrespective of party. And I am confident that the same was true of Nova Scotia generally. I do not speak of the other provinces. We have little or no complaint with us about the deputy returning officers.

Mr. BLAIN. The sheriff is appointed returning officer, and one would gather from what the hon. gentleman says that the sheriff makes the appointments. But it is well known that the deputy returning officers are appointed on the recommendation of the candidate.

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is by your crowd.

Mr. FIELDING. In my own province it is not so. I do not recommend or make nominations of deputy returning officers.

Mr. JOHNSTON. My hon. friend has reference to what transpired in Ottawa lately.

At one o'clock, committee took recess.

Committee resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. BLAIN. In regard to clause 44, I wish to add a few words to what I said before one o'clock. I think that on due consideration the minister will feel that he made a mistake if he allows this Bill to go through with the permission to civil servants to accept positions as deputy returning officers in political elections. I have under my hand several cases with reference to the deputy returning officers taking part in certain elections in the province of Ontario. If my hon. friend will read the history of provincial elections in the province of Ontario, he will come to the conclusion that at this time, when he is trying to reform the civil service, he should add a clause to this Bill that will prohibit civil servants from acting as deputy returning officers. We have had a case in the province of Ontario where a deputy returning officer, at the close of the poll, took the ballot box to his house and kept it there over night, and that ballot box was opened in his house and the ballots tampered with. When the election trial came on they made an effort to subpœna the deputy returning officer to give evidence in that trial, and he could not be found, he had gone to the United States, and I am not sure that he has returned to his home yet. That was in the county of North Grey. I have under my hand a statement showing that a returning officer appointed a deputy in an election in the province of Ontario, who did not reside in Canada at all, he came in and gave another name.

Mr. FISHER. Was he a civil servant ?

Mr. BLAIN. No, he was not, but I am pointing out that under this condition of things the people of Ontario are naturally suspicious of the conduct of deputy returning officers. I am not going into the question very fully, because this is not an opportune time. But I wish to say to my hon. friend, and to say it with all possible emphasis, that when he is endeavouring to frame a Bill that will receive the approval of both sides of this House, he should endeavour to remove the civil service entirely from political partisanship, and to that end he should insert a clause providing that no civil servant shall accept the position of deputy returning officer in any political election. If my hon. friend permits this Bill to go through without such a clause as that, it will not receive the respect that he wishes it to receive, because it will be open to some suspicion, and he himself will be open to suspicion if the allows this Bill to go through without a provision of that kind.

Mr. FISHER. I hold that the position of deputy returning officer is not a partisan

position, whether the deputy is a civil servant or not. But if a civil servant shows partisanship while acting as deputy returning officer, he is violating his oath of office when he accepted the position, and so far as I am concerned, if a civil servant should do that he would be removed from the service, if I had the power. But that is a question that should be dealt with in the Election Act rather than in a Civil Service Act. The suggestion that the civil servant should not be allowed to act as deputy returning officer is one that I cannot accept.

On section 47,

47. Wherever under sections 5, 8, 10 (b), 21, 22, 23, 26, 28 (2), 34, 35, 38 and 39 (4), any action is authorized or directed to be taken by the Governor in Council or by order in council such action with respect to the officers, clerks and employees of the House of Commons or the Senate, shall be taken upon a resolution of the House of Commons or a resolution of the Senate as the case may be, and with respect to the officers, clerks and employees of the library of parliament, and to such other officers, clerks and employees as are under the joint control of both Houses of parliament, shall be taken upon a joint resolution of both Houses of parliament.

Mr. FISHER. I wish to add to the original Bill this new section, as No. 47, which refers to employees of the Senate and House of Commons, and of the library of parliament.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think this is a step in the right direction, but I would suggest that as this amendment is drawn, it will still be the Governor in Council who will take the action with regard to the officers, clerks and employees of the Houses of parliament; although he will do it upon resolution of the House, it will still be the Governor in Council who will do it. The difficulty in that case would be that the House could never make any change without going to the Governor in Council, who will control the situation. I think the language bears out what I say :

Whenever under sections (those enumerated) any action is authorized or directed to be taken by the Governor in Council or by order in council, such action with respect to the officers, clerks and employees of the House of Commons or the Senate shall be taken upon a resolution of the House of Commons or of the Senate.

That is to say, the order in council shall be passed upon a resolution of the House of Commons ; that is obviously what it means. Instead of that, I suggest tha the section should read this way :

Whenever (under the sections enumerated) action is authorized or directed to be taken by the Governor in Council or by order in council, such action with respect to the officers, clerks and employees of the House of Commons and of the Senate, shall be taken by the House of Commons or by the Senate, as the case may be, by resolution, and with respect to the officers, clerks and employees of the library of parliament, and to such others as are under the joint control of both Houses shall be taken by both Houses of parliament by joint resolution.

Mr. FISHER. I think my hon. friend is right, and that the words should be : 'Governor in Council upon a resolution of the House.' That was the intention. There is another point with regard to the employees of the House of Commons which was brought up and which I promised to take into consideration. I proposed to provide for that by the following amendment :

48. Nothing in this Act or the Civil Service Act shall be held to curtail the privileges now enjoyed by the officers, clerks and employees of the House of Commons or of the Senate or of the library of parliament with respect to attendance, office hours, leave of absence or with respect to engaging in such employment during parliamentary recess as may entitle them to receive extra salary or remuneration.

I think this will conserve to the employees of the House of Commons all privileges and rights they now have outside of the session of parliament.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are the words 'extra salary or remuneration' intended to refer to salary outside of the salary or remuneration which they receive from the government ?

Mr. FISHER. To anything ; to any employment. They include that. This provision is intended to meet the case of 'Hansard' reporters especially who often work for commissions which work would probably be under the government.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The words 'in any other employment during the parliamentary recess,' it seems to me, would meet the case.

Mr. FISHER. I do not think that would do, if they were employed by the government and had to be paid by the government, because there is another section which would prevent them from getting paid by the government for any work of that kind. These words were put in to cover that.

Mr. BERGERON. As it is now can they work for some other department of the government and get paid for it ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, and this conserves that.

Motion agreed to.

Section 10 reconsidered.

Mr. FISHER. Section 10 was asked to be allowed to stand so that I might consider a suggestion of the hon. member for North Toronto. I have examined the wording of his proposed amendment which I do not think fits in very well. I would be will-

ing, which is largely on the line of what he proposed, to put in the words 'the operation of the Civil Service Act or of this Act.' I therefore move to insert after the word 'upon' in the eighteenth line, the words 'the operation of the Civil Service Act or of this Act and upon.' That puts it in their power to take action upon the operation of the Civil Service Act.

Section as amended agreed to.

Mr. STEWART. There is a matter which was referred to this morning, having reference to a section already adopted, which has given rise to considerable discussion and which I would like to bring to the attention of the committee before the Bill is reported. We have arranged by this Bill that the clerks of the House of Commons shall be subject to the commission on the question of promotion. I do not know how it strikes other hon. members of the House, but it seems to me that the clerks of the committees are splendidly qualified to fill the positions which they have been occupying by reason of their many years of service and experience, and that the clerk, the Speaker and the committee on internal economy are the best judges as to the question of which of these clerks deserve promotion. It should be left in their hands. The amendment which has been suggested is this:

26a. No certificate of qualification from the commission shall be necessary in the case of a promotion to any vacancy in the staff of either House of parliament, when the recommendation of the clerk of the House and the approval of the Speaker have been given.

This is the unanimous desire of the clerks of the House.

Mr. BERGERON Is the Commission on Internal Economy abolished by this Bill?

Mr. FISHER. No. I think we have pretty well threshed this out. We simply subject the employees of the House of Commons, the Senate and the library to the same requirements that other clerks must submit to of receiving a certificate of qualification from the commission when they are promoted. That certificate may be based on information which the commission can get in any way they see fit, and I think there will be no danger with regard to the promotion of any official. I think it would be unfortunate if we were to change this provision and adopt a rule with regard to the clerks of the Houses of parliament different from that which is applied to the rest of the service.

Amendment (Mr. Stewart) negatived.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY—APPOINTMENT OF JUDGES IN QUEBEC.

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

Mr. BERGERON. The right hon. first minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) promised me the other day that he would tell me whether there would be any appointments by the Dominion government of judges in the province of Quebec in accordance with the legislation adopted by the legislature of Quebec.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). We have come to the conclusion that we will not bring down any legislation this year for the purpose of appointing more judges in Quebec. The legislature has passed one Bill to authorize the appointment of a new judge in the district of Quebec and three new judges in the district of Montreal. We have received a communication from Hon. Lomer Gouin, the Attorney General of the province, who has sent us some statistics, and we think it is our duty rather than pass this legislation to invite the attention of the local legislature not only of Quebec but of other provinces also, with a view to, if possible, so amend their system as to take advantage of the present judicial force and concentrate it in certain districts so as to avoid the necessity of more appointments. The Minister of Justice is of opinion, and that opinion is shared by a good many, that there is at the present time in Quebec a sufficient judicial force to satisfy the wants of the province if they were distributed otherwise than at present, if all the judges, for instance, who have very little to do in the outside districts were called upon by legislation to discharge the duties of their office in Montreal and Quebec, we would thereby avoid the necessity of making new appointments. Therefore we have come to the conclusion to make this representation to the Attorney General and for this session not to bring in legislation such as was contemplated.

Mr. BERGERON. I believe that my hon. friend is right, but I would remind him that such a reform was tried before by a Bill known as the Casgrain Bill, but it did not carry. Of course we have here practically to follow the dicta of those legislatures in this matter. I have heard my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) under other circumstances say that we could not discuss it but that we had to act. There is no doubt that something might be done along the lines suggested by the Prime Minister. I believe there are enough judges in the province of Quebec, if the system was changed, but if the local legislature does not desire to change the system what position are we in? Suppose they pass a law, as they have authority to do, we here can only act and appoint judges.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The present system under the British North America Act is absolutely unsatisfactory and it cannot continue much longer, we shall have to do something in that respect. In the meantime

it is quite true that in Quebec an attempt at reform was made and failed, but it is I think proper that we should call the attention of the Attorney General of the province to the fact that at the present time another effort should be made to see if the condition cannot be improved. I think the consensus of opinion exists everywhere that if the judicial forces, instead of being scattered as at present, some being overburdened in Montreal for instance and to some extent in Quebec, while in other districts they have absolute sinecures, if it were possible to concentrate the judicial forces we would obviate the necessity of making new appointments. I appreciate the difficulties of the Prime Minister and Attorney General of Quebec and that he may not be able to make the arrangements we suggest. Then it shall be our duty to consider our own position. I have taken the position formerly and it is a position we cannot avoid, that the Dominion parliament has no opinion of its own, that is, no alternative of acting or not acting; but my hon. friend will agree that if we are reduced to the position of not being able to secure reform in a province of what we consider to be an evil it may be that we will have to reconsider the whole system of judicial appointments and assign that work to the provinces or adopt some other device whereby such a condition as we have at present might be avoided. For my part I think it might be possible to avoid the necessity of more judicial appointments—no one wants to have more judges appointed than are necessary for the proper discharge of the business of the country. In the meantime we think it only right and proper that we should call the attention of the Attorney General to what we consider to be a very serious condition.

RAILWAY ACT—AMENDMENT.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara) moved :

That all the words after the word 'that' in the proposed motion be struck out and the following inserted in lieu thereof:

Order No. 36 in public Bills and orders, being consideration of the amendment made by the Senate to Bill (No. 3) to amend the Railway Act.—Mr. Lancaster—be now called and proceeded with.

He said : I desire to move this amendment to the motion for Supply, although I know it is not altogether usual, I placed in the hands of the Minister of Railways a copy of the proposed amendment. I am sorry to say the minister does not see his way to consent to it. This is the Bill commonly known as the Bill for the protection of the people at level crossings. It was passed unanimously by this House and was sent to the Senate on December 12 last. The Senate did not deal with it until nearly four months later, on March 31, with an amendment which I cannot discuss now, but which, in my opinion, destroys the principle of the Bill. My contention is that we should consider that amendment to this important piece of legislation before we grant any more Supply. When the Bill came back from the Senate on March 31, all days but Mondays had been taken by the government for government business, the very next Monday was taken for government business and the Bill has not been reached since it came from the Senate. Of course I do not criticise the government for taking these days, but had the Senate dealt with the Bill earlier in the session it would have been called as a public Bill. Owing to their delay it has never been reached or I am sure the House would have rejected the amendment and insisted on a conference with the Senate to try to induce them to agree to what we considered in December proper legislation.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). I think it would be unwise at the present stage of the session to open up the public Bills and Orders. There are several Bills on the Order Paper which it had been hoped to proceed with this session but they will all of necessity be dropped and I think it would be unwise to make an exception for this particular Bill. Therefore I ask the House not to accept the motion.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Lancaster).

YEAS:

Messieurs

Alcorn,
Avery,
Barr,
Beattie,
Bennett,
Bergeron,
Blain,
Borden (Carleton),
Boyce,
Chisholm (Huron),
Clements,
Cockshutt,
Crocket,
Daniel,
Elson,
Foster,
Ganong,
Haggart,
Kemp,
Lake,
Lancaster,
Lennox,
Lewis,
Martin (Queens, P.E.I.),
Monk,
Morin,
Northrup,
Owen,
Paquet,
Perley,
Porter,
Pringle,
Reid (Grenville),
Roche (Marquette),
Schaffner,
Stanfield,
Staples,
Taylor,
Tisdale,
Ward,
Wilson (Lennox & Addington),
Wright (Muskoka)—42.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Aylesworth,
Borden (Sir Frederick),
Boyer,
Brodeur,
Brown,
Caldwell,
Calvert,
Lemieux,
Loggie,
Macdonald,
Maclean (Lunenburg),
Macpherson,
McColl,
McCool,
McIntyre (Perth),

Carvell,
Cash,
Clarke,
Conmee,
Copp,
Crawford,
Cyr,
Demers,
Desjardins,
Devlin,
Dugas,
Ethier,
Fielding,
Finlayson,
Fortier,
Galliher,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,
German,
Girard,
Gordon,
Graham,
Greenway,
Harty,
Hughes (Kings, P.E.I.),
Hunt,
Jackson (Selkirk),
Johnston,
Kennedy,
Lanctot (Richelieu),
Lapointe,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Lavergne,
Law,
McIntyre (Strathcona),
McKenzie,
McLean (Huron),
McLennan,
Marcile (Bagot),
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Martin (Wellington),
Mayrand,
Miller,
Pardee,
Paterson,
Parent,
Pickup,
Proulx,
Pugsley,
Reid (Restigouche),
Roche (Halifax),
Ross (Cape Breton),
Ross (Rimouski),
Ross (Yale-Cariboo),
Savoie,
Schell (Glengarry),
Sinclair,
Smith (Oxford),
Talbot,
Telford,
Templeman,
Turcotte,
Turgeon,
Turriff,
Verville,
Watson,
Wright (Renfrew),
Zimmerman.—85.

PAIRS:

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Beland,	Ames,
Bickerdike,	Armstrong,
Bureau,	Barker,
Burrows,	Brabazon,
Carney,	Bristol,
Caron,	Broder,
Dyment,	Christie,
Emmerson,	Clare,
Beauparlant,	Forget,
Finlay,	Fowler,
Fisher,	Henderson,
Grant,	Herron,
Guthrie,	Hughes (Victoria),
Hall,	Jackson (Elgin),
Knowles,	Lalor,
LeBlanc,	Leonard,
Logan,	Lefurgey,
McCraney,	Macdonell,
Oliver,	MacLaren,
Ratz,	Maclean (York, S.),
Black,	McCarthy (Calgary),
Schell (Oxford),	McLean (Queens, P.E.I.),
Sloan,	Marshall,
Sifton,	Osler,
Smith (Nanaimo),	Seagram,
Stewart,	Smith (Wentworth),
Tobin,	Thompson,
Tolmie,	Walsh (Huntingdon),
McLean (York, C.),	White,
Chisholm (Antigonish),	Wilmot,
Parmelee.	Worthington.

Amendment negatived.

THE RAILWAY ACT.

Mr. A. C. BOYCE. Mr. Speaker, before you leave the chair I wish to ask the Minister of Railways if it is his intention to carry out the promise he gave to me on the 30th of June last in reply to some remarks which I made in regard to section 415 of the Railway Act, that before the close of this session an amendment would be introduced along the lines I suggested?

Mr. GRAHAM. The Minister of Justice has the matter in hand, and a Bill will be brought in to cover that point.

THE RECENT CANADIAN LOAN.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to ask the Minister of Finance if he can give any information to the House as to the loan which he has lately placed upon the London market. I have seen some reports in the newspapers about it, and I think we should have a statement from the Minister of Finance himself.

Mr. FIELDING. The information contained in the public press is substantially correct, and I shall be glad to give any further details that are desired. On what particular point does my hon. friend desire information?

Mr. FOSTER. I want to get the rates at which the loan has been placed, and by whom it has been taken up. I do not mean any individual details, but such information as is generally given.

Mr. FIELDING. The loan was a short loan, to run between four and five years, and it was underwritten at par at 3¾ per cent. It is designed chiefly, though not wholly, to refund a loan maturing in November next, though some portion of it is for other purposes. The loan was underwritten by the usual circle of people in London who do business of this kind, and, so far as the government are concerned, it was entirely successful. The papers have stated, I believe correctly, that the public at large did not subscribe very fully to the loan. That, however, is not remarkable, because, as was stated in a telegram which I saw in the Montreal 'Star,' having regard to the reception recently accorded to other loans in the London market, the reception of the Canadian loan was very satisfactory. The circle of finance for Canadian loans, by municipal corporations and others, has been of late pretty well filled up with securities, and the difficulties of floating any securities are considerable. However, that is the statement: we placed a short term loan of £5,000,000, or $25,000,000 in round numbers, at par at 3¾ per cent.

Motion agreed to and House went into Committee of Supply.

Canals, chargeable to capital—Welland canal—electric lighting and power plant, $50,000.

Mr. BERGERON. I suppose this would be a good time to ask my hon. friend if a report published the other day in the papers is correct, that in a speech delivered somewhere in Ontario he stated that the government intended to deepen the Welland canal to 25 feet and to build the Georgian Bay canal and the Hudson Bay Railway.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). What I said was that these were three projects that would need and would deserve the attention of the public of Canada at no distant date. I was dealing with the transportation problem, and placed those three portions of the problem before the public. I did say that the Hudson Bay Railway would be constructed without delay, and I repeat that. I discussed the other two projects in a general way, pointing out that if Canada was to compete with a deepened Erie canal it would be necessary to deepen the Welland canal to 25 feet.

Mr. LANCASTER. Did the hon. gentleman say anything at St. Catharines about the Hudson Bay Railway?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend was asking me about a later speech, and possibly a better one.

Mr. LANCASTER. I agree that the speech made at St. Catharines by the hon. gentleman was not a very good one in respect of getting his candidate elected.

Mr. GRAHAM. We cannot tell that yet.

Mr. LANCASTER. The Reform papers reported the hon. minister as saying at St. Catharines that the government were going to deepen the Welland canal. That is where the Welland canal is, and he may have had some other reason for saying that at that particular place. If the minister states that the government are only considering the three projects, that is one thing; but the people of the county of Lincoln understood the minister to say that the government was going to deepen the Welland canal.

Mr. FOSTER. What is proposed to be done with this vote?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is for the purpose of lighting as well as handling the locks by electricity.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this an amount in addition to other amounts heretofore voted in order to finish the work of electric lighting the canal, and I suppose instituting a plant necessary to do it?

Mr. GRAHAM. This vote is really to complete the plant.

Mr. FOSTER. What the minister is doing is making his own plant for the electric lighting and working of the whole canal.

Mr. GRAHAM. What is being done is we purchase the electricity and are using it for the purpose of opening the locks and lighting the canal.

Mr. FOSTER. You are not producing your own power?

Mr. GRAHAM. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Where does the hon. gentleman get that?

Mr. GRAHAM. From the Cataract Power Company.

Mr. FOSTER. In what way?

Mr. GRAHAM. $14 per horse-power.

Mr. FOSTER. By ten year contract?

Mr. GRAHAM. A ten year contract.

Mr. FOSTER. What power plant does the minister refer to?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is what is known as the distributing plant.

Mr. FOSTER. Why not say so in your estimates? You speak of it as power plant. Is the whole canal lighted by electricity now?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. What will be the cost?

Mr. GRAHAM. The entire cost is estimated at $450,000.

Mr. FOSTER. For erecting the plant necessary to distribute and light the canal?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, we operate all the gates and bridges with electricity. This covers the opening and shutting of all the lock gates and bridges.

Mr. FOSTER. But this does not include anything for operating. It is on capital account and is for installation.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, but we install the machinery for opening the gates. It is not merely a transmission plant for lighting.

Mr. FOSTER. Then all the plant necessary to light the canal and operate the different gates and bridges is to cost $450,000. From whom has the plant been obtained and in what way?

Mr. GRAHAM. From different companies and all by tender and contract.

Mr. FOSTER. What will be the cost of maintenance when the whole installation is completed?

Mr. GRAHAM. About $15,000 will cover the operation.

Mr. HAGGART. Will that be any saving on the old plan?

Mr. GRAHAM. It ought to be some saving when we do all the work by electricity.

Mr. BERGERON. How many men were employed before?

Mr. GRAHAM. We paid $20,000 a year for gas to start with.

Mr. LANCASTER. No, the gas was supplied at $10,000 a year for the whole canal without any expenditure on capital account.

Mr. BERGERON. Now that you are running the canal by electricity, you do not want so many men. How many are employed now and how many were employed before?

Mr. GRAHAM. Practically the same number of men—two men at a lock. It is impossible to get along with any less. It may not be any great saving, but it is a great advantage to the shipping.

Mr. BERGERON. The first time the question of using electricity came up before parliament, one of the arguments in its favour was that it would require many less men. On the Welland canal you used to have eight men per lock.

Mr. GRAHAM. No, two day men and two at night.

Mr. BERGERON. Besides the lockmaster.

Mr. GRAHAM. That includes the lockmaster.

Mr. BERGERON. If these three men and the lockmaster were doing the work formerly and now it is done by electricity, what are these men doing?

Mr. GRAHAM. We cannot very well run a lock without a man on each side, even if they do not open them by manual labour. You could not do without two men in the day and two at night.

Mr. J. D. REID. How many locks are there on the Welland?

Mr. GRAHAM. Twenty-six locks and a guard gate.

Mr. J. D. REID. How many on the Cornwall canal?

Mr. GRAHAM. Six or seven.

Mr. J. D. REID. Do I understand that after this plant is completed it will cost $15,000 per annum to operate and maintain it?

Mr. GRAHAM. That would include the cost of the electric power as well.

Mr. J. D. REID. There would not be any other expenditure necessary to supply the light and maintain this plant and furnish the power?

Mr. GRAHAM. That would only include the men directly connected with the electric working. It does not include the lockmen.

Mr. J. D. REID. Will that include everyone connected with the electric plant, and will the government have to pay in addition the same number of men as are now on the plant?

Mr. GRAHAM. Practically the same.

Mr. J. D. REID. The government will be paying $15,000 per year extra over and above what they are doing now. In addition there will be the annual outlay of interest on this $450,000 permanently. Even at 3 per cent that would be another $13,500 per annum. So that we will be paying on the Welland canal an addition annual expenditure of $28,500. How does that compare with the Cornwall canal? There are only six or seven locks on the Cornwall canal and the government have guaranteed for 89 years to pay about $50,000 for light and power on that canal. Judging by the Welland, there must be something wrong on the Cornwall canal. If the Welland canal cost only $30,000 a year more than they have been paying, why does not the minister try to save something for the people on the Cornwall canal? With only six or seven locks it should not cost more than $10,000 or $12,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. I understand that the lighting on the Cornwall canal has been under contract for years.

Mr. J. D. REID. A contract for eighty-nine years.

Mr. GRAHAM. Well, it is under contract. That is the reason why I cannot make the same arrangement for the Cornwall canal as for the Welland canal. The hon. gentleman says that we pay $15,000 for the Cornwall canal. But this was $10,000 for gas for lighting, and that did not handle the locks.

Mr. J. D. REID. But the minister is keeping the same number of men, and he spends this $15,000 more, besides $13,000 or $14,000 of interest, making a total of $28,000 or $30,000. Put against that the $10,000 for gas, and it will still be seen that the government is spending $18,000 per annum for all time to come beyond the old expenditure on the Welland canal.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. J. D. Reid) to say that we are paying on the Cornwall canal over $50,000 a year. Was not that amount a little more than 50 per cent beyond the truth?

Mr. J. D. REID. That is a fair question. I have here the Auditor General's Report for the nine months ending March 31, 1907. If the hon. gentleman will turn to page W—83 of that report, he will see payments there—account of the Cornwall canal staff: St. Lawrence Power Company of $15,493.20 for electric light, being at the rate of 30 cents a light per night; also 400 horsepower at $63 per annum, $18,847.92, or a total of $34,541.12. Will the hon. gentleman dispute that statement? Well, if this is the

payment for nine months, add one-quarter to make up the whole year, and you have a total of close up to the amount I have stated.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. J. D. Reid) will recollect that, some years ago, when this matter was up for discussion, it was shown that there was a contract for something over $52,000 a year with the Davis Company—they call it now the St. Lawrence Power Company. That contract had been conditionally entered into by the former government and was carried over. But the Minister of Railways and Canals of this administration reduced that to about $28,000. Since that time, they have put up the workshops and done some extra work in Cornwall which may have made some extra expenditures by the government necessary—I am not informed as to that. But there is the fact as stated in this House at the time, that there was a contract for $52,000 which was reduced under this administration to $28,000.

Mr. J. D. REID. The original contract was entered into years ago, before the art and science of electricity had developed as they have now. But that contract was for twenty years only. It would have been expiring about now. But the present government made a contract for eighty-nine years, and they are expending about $45,000 per annum, as I have said, for these six or seven locks, which is only about one-quarter the number on the Welland canal. The government can pay the running expenses and the interest for four times as many locks and do it for about half what they are paying on the Cornwall canal. Judging by the Welland canal, they are paying altogether too much on the Cornwall canal.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. The hon. gentleman is comparing the present advanced state of electrical development with a period when there was but little such development. But if he will compare what was done by this government with what was done by their predecessors, he will find that there has been the saving that I spoke of, and I do not think there is in that much to complain about.

Mr. J. D. REID. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. J. T. Schell) leaves out of account the fact that the contract under this government was made for eighty-nine years. I can understand why the hon. member for Glengarry is so anxious about the Cornwall canal. We have had a break in the Cornwall canal, and I claim that the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Schell) is almost responsible for that break, and I will tell the House why. Through the influence of the hon. member for Glengarry a man was put there as superintendent over that canal, who was a school teacher, who was a clerk getting $30 a month in the Canadian Pacific Railway shops. They had a man there in charge of that canal, and over all these canals, that never had any experience on canals at all, and he was put over all the men who did have long experience.

An hon. MEMBER. Who recommended him ?

Mr. J. D. REID. The hon. member for Glengarry recommended him. He was organizer in the hon. member's county, and the hon. member cannot deny it.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. I tell the hon. gentleman that is not so.

Mr. J. D. REID. Yes, and the hon. member went to the Minister of Railways and recommended him.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. He happened to teach school there for a short time, but he was neither born in the county, nor resided there, except one term as teacher.

Mr. J. D. REID. I claim that it was neglecting the marine interest of this country to put over the works of that kind a school teacher, a man who never saw a canal until he was put there, and they gave him a steamboat to run up and down the canal.

Mr. GRAHAM. Will the hon. gentleman tell the House who his predecessor was ?

Mr. J. D. REID. The hon. gentleman knows that he was supposed to be one of the best engineers in Canada, the late Mr. Rubidge.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend will pardon me. Dr. C. E. Hickey, ex-M.P., was superintendent, occupying the same position for quite a long time, and a good man he was, too. He occupied the same position as Mr. Stewart.

Mr. J. D. REID. Now the minister knows that is not a fact, and I will tell him why. The late Mr. Rubidge was the engineer in charge of all the canals from Cornwall to the Murray canal. Is not Mr. Stewart in that position to-day ? Has not Mr. Stewart charge from Cornwall to the Murray canal ?

Mr. GRAHAM. The hon. gentleman is quite mistaken. There is at the present time, and has been, an engineer equal in ability to any engineer I care to name ; he is in charge under Mr. Stewart of the Cornwall and other canals.

Mr. J. D. REID. As I understand the position, it is this : Mr. Stewart is occupying the position that Mr. Rubidge did, and Mr. Rubidge was the engineer in charge of the canals from Cornwall to the Murray canal, and to-day there is no other man but Mr. Stewart in that position. He is the only man now that has charge from Cornwall to the Murray canal, except the men who are called overseers.

Mr. GRAHAM. No, my hon. friend is wrong. I want to explain to him again

that there is a competent engineer under Mr. Stewart, having jurisdiction over the canals from Cornwall up to the Murray canal, just as Mr. Rubidge had. I refer to Mr. Sargent. He is in Cornwall assisting in this work, and was up at the Murray canal overseeing some other work when the accident happened. My hon. friend speaks as if there never was a break in the Cornwall canal before. When the hon. gentleman tells the House that there is no engineer in charge from Cornwall to the Murray canal, I tell him there is, and has been.

Mr. J. D. REID. The minister states that Mr. Sargent is an engineer under Mr. Stewart. Now the minister knows that Mr. Sargent was the engineer in charge of the work at Cardinal, in charge of Murray and Cleveland's work, and has been living there for the last ten years. He knows that Mr. Sargent has only been placed in the position he speaks of within the last three weeks.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend is stating what is absolutely without foundation. Mr. Ross was the engineer under Mr. Stewart on that canal. He was transferred to the Sault, and a gentleman came from the Sault to take the place as overseer. Mr. Sargent is there, and has been acting for months as engineer.

Mr. J. D. REID. Mr. Ross's position was only that of overseer.

Mr. GRAHAM. He was an engineer.

Mr. J. D. REID. Mr. Ross is not an engineer. I have known Mr. Ross for the last twenty years, and I make the statement that he is not an engineer. Mr. Ross was sent out from this department to oversee the works at Cardinal, and has been working there for the last 15 or 20 years. I never heard of Mr. Ross passing any examinations or qualifying himself for engineer.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I call attention of the committee that the item before us is the Welland canal. There is another for the Cornwall canal.

Mr. PRINGLE. I do not intend to resurrect the old lighting contract on the Cornwall canal. But I want to say that I agree with the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) that Mr. Stewart was not the man who should have charge of the canal, and I am pleased to see that the government has come to that conclusion, and have placed Mr. Sargent in charge of the Cornwall canal, not only of the Cornwall canal, but of all the canals up to the Murray canal. Mr. Sargent has been located in Cornwall for some months, and is residing there, and is a thoroughly competent engineer. Now, to come back to the subject under discussion, the lighting of the Welland canal by electricity, so far as I am concerned, I want to see the money spent where it can be spent in the best interest of navigation. The expenditure of a few thousands for electricity on the Cornwall canal has come up here time and time again, it is brought up nearly every year. It may cost a good deal of money, but it is the greatest advantage to navigation we can possibly have. Large vessels are coming down the Cornwall canal carrying 65,000 bushels of grain, and they do not now use lamps as they did in the old time, when vessels had to tie-up and suffer delays for hours. They go right through now, in the night time as well as in the day time. I do not want to discuss the terms of the contract, that has been discussed over and over again in this House. The government have made a contract that I imagine they will have to stand by. This is what I want to get at. Is this increased cost justifiable, and in what way does it aid navigation? I understand that these vessels can go through much more quickly to-day, with these modern electrical appliances to operate the locks, than they could some years ago. I do not know whether I am right or wrong, but I think the Soulanges canal was the first one on which the locks were operated by electricity, and I think the plan has been a great success, that a great deal of time has been saved. Now, the minister has with him an engineer who has had a great deal of experience in these matters, and he can tell us whether this plan is going to aid navigation in the Welland canal. Can a vessel go through more quickly, once these electrical appliances are put into effect? If it can, then it is a decided advantage. We know that late in the fall of the year these vessels are crowding down, every minute is important to them, we have to, in the fall, open our canals on Sunday, so they are operated every day in the week. Now I want to say a word with regard to that break. That is not the first break that has occurred in the Cornwall canal. We must remember that the Cornwall canal was originally built with a depth of 10 feet, and that has been increased to 14 feet. That extra 4 feet has increased the danger to the banks of the canal. There is a long stretch from lock 20 down to the lock at the mouth of the Cornwall canal that is dangerous, and always will remain dangerous. Six or seven years ago in this House I advocated with the then Minister of Railways and Canals the putting in at lock No. 20 another lock to the river. I understand that when the deputy minister, Mr .Butler, came into the department he saw the advantage of it, and that plans have been prepared, and that this will probably become an accomplished fact. If it had been done a few years ago the whole navigation of the country would not have been tied up as it is to-day. In so far as that break is concerned, it was a most unfortunate occurrence. It probably could have

occurred at a worse season of the year but it is an enormous loss to this country. I say with all the credit to those who are doing the work of repair that it has been rushed as expeditiously as it was possible to rush it. I was on the ground. The next day after the accident work was begun, within nine days water was in the canal and I understand that within three days vessels will be passing up and down. The work has been expeditiously and well done. But, I want to call the minister's attention to lock No. 20. If what I suggest is done it will save an enormous amount to the people interested in navigation and it will prevent a recurrence of navigation being tied up for two or three weeks owing to a break in the canal.

Mr. J. D. REID. I would like to ask the minister——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. J. D. REID. I am going to take my time until I obtain this information even if the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Ross) continues interrupting as he did last night. I think that we are entitled to some consideration.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I also think that the other members of the House are entitled to some consideration.

Mr. J. D. REID. I do not think it is fair of the hon. gentleman to interrupt. I would like to ask if it is a fact that a competent engineer like Mr. Sargent is on that work under Mr. Stewart.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Stewart occupies the position of superintendent and Mr. Sargent is engineer of the canals from Cornwall to the Murray canal.

Mr. J. D. REID. I understood that the minister stated that Mr. Stewart is in charge of the canals from Cornwall to the Murray canal and that Mr. Sargent is the engineer acting under Mr. Stewart. Is that right?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend is not going to put words in my mouth.

Mr. J. D. REID. No.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend knows what 'superintendent' means. I say that Mr. Stewart is the superintendent of the canals from Cornwall to the Murray canal and that Mr. Sargent is the engineer.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not understand what the expression means. Is the engineer under the superintendent or the superintendent under the engineer?

Mr. GRAHAM. The superintendent is the officer responsible to the department and the engineer is responsible for everything appertaining to engineering. The superintendent is the chief officer. I do not mind explaining to the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) because he is not conversant with the facts, but the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) knows all about it. He lives on the canal. He is playing upon words.

Mr. J. D. REID. No, I am not.

Mr. GRAHAM. The superintendent is the man in charge of the canal and the staff is under him.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. gentleman told us three times that Mr. Ross was under Mr. Stewart. Did he mean that or not?

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Ross bore the title of overseer and was on the Williamsburg canal. I have always understood that he was an engineer, but he was known as the overseer and was subject to the superintendent.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. gentleman disputed the statement of my hon. friend from Grenville and said that he as an engineer.

Mr. GRAHAM. I say so still.

Mr. LANCASTER. And he said that Mr. Ross was the engineer in charge.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend must admit that a superintendent may be an engineer and that an overseer may be an engineer.

Mr. J. D. REID. The only thing I contend for is that a person occupying the position of chief should be an engineer of the qualifications of Mr. Sargent or of the gentleman in charge of the Welland canal. I think it is hardly fair to put a man with the qualifications of Mr. Sargent or any other engineer—I only mention his name because he happens to be the gentleman there—under the instructions and subject to the orders of a man with the qualifications of Mr. Stewart, who was a school teacher down in Glengarry before he got that position. I think that the minister, if he stated his own opinion, would agree that this is hardly fair. If the minister wants to prevent accidents of this kind he should put a man like Mr. Sargent over the whole canal. Mr. Sargent has to take his orders from Mr. Stewart; therefore he does not feel that he is responsible and the matter is not looked after as well as if we had Mr. Sargent or some other man of equal qualifications in charge of the Cornwall and Murray canals. The accident is to a large extent due to not having a competent man in the position that Mr. Stewart occupies.

Mr. BERGERON. I should like the minister to explain why it is that we are paying $14 per horse-power on the Welland canal and $63 per horse-power on the Cornwall canal. Why is there such a difference between the two? If $14 is sufficient for the Welland canal which has twenty-six locks why should we pay $63 for the Cornwall canal which has only six locks?

Mr. GRAHAM I am not an expert in electricity and I do not know anything about the contract. There is this difference, however, that electrical science is in a more advanced state to-day than it was when the contract was made. On the Welland canal we merely get the power delivered to us over our own lines of transmission. I imagine that the power on the Cornwall canal is transmitted in a different way.

Mr. BRODER. While the question of the lighting of the canals is under consideration I would like to ask the minister whether he has considered the advisability of lighting the Williamsburg and Edwardsburg canals with electricity ? The power is available and if it is such a benefit to navigation as my hon. friend from Stormont (Mr. Pringle) suggests, the minister is very derelict in his duty in not taking steps to have these canals lighted by electricity. I can understand that the Welland canal might be lighted a little cheaper than the Cornwall canal from the fact that it is alongside of the great originator of electricity, Niagara Falls. But I think that the prices on the Cornwall canal are beyond all reasonable calculation. I am sure that the Williamsburg canal and the Iroquois canal will be lighted at very much less cost per horse-power if the minister sees fit to recommend that it be done.

Mr. PRINGLE. Just one word in connection with the positions of Mr. Stewart and Mr. Sargent. I have objected for some years to Mr. Stewart having absolute charge of the canal. I have nothing to say against Mr. Stewart as a citizen. He is a good citizen, but I do not think that a man of his experience should have been placed in charge of such an important link in the navigation of the St. Lawrence, and I was very much pleased when I learned from the department that they had made a change. As I understand Mr. Stewart has to-day simply got control of the men, and sees that they do their work properly. Mr. Sargent has absolute control with regard to the maintenance of the canals from Cornwall to the Murray canal. I think that is proper. I have always thought they should be in charge of an experienced man such as Mr. Sargent is. There are doubtless many in the House who will remember that I before brought up the question of Mr. Stewart whom I was bound to speak highly of as a citizen but who, I feel has not the experience necessary to enable him to fill the requirements of this position, a feeling shared by those interested in navigation. I have heard men at the head of our large companies speak in that way in regard to Mr. Stewart. We should have a man with a large experience like Mr. Sargent who has charge of the canal system. As I understand the position Mr. Sargent has absolute charge in so far as repairs, maintenance and works connected with the canal are concerned while Mr. Stewart simply has charge of the men, of the operation of the canal.

Mr. FOSTER. When this installation comes into operation it will cost $15,000 per year to operate it including the price of the current and the wages of the men on the canal.

Mr GRAHAM. No, I said in answer to my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid) that that did not include the wages of the lock men. We had that information here when we were on the votes for maintenance.

Mr. BERGERON. In other words, this is an extra expenditure. It will be over and above what we paid for the management of the canal except the $10,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. The question resolves itself into this : Is it in the interests of navigation to light the canal ? Everybody says yes. Under the old scheme we had it lighted for about seven miles by gas at a cost of $10,000. Under this we have lighted by electricity twenty-seven miles of the new canal and six of the old for the guidance of the men in regulating the water, &c., over thirty miles in all that are well lighted by electricity. If it had been all lighted by gas before it would have cost as much but we get twenty-six extra miles lighted, we get all the lock gates and bridges opened and closed for an extra $5,000. It seems to me it is a remarkable investment, to say nothing about the improvement to navigation and I am told that vessels save two hours in every twelve by this system.

Mr. BERGERON I am not criticising the lighting of the canal and the working of the locks by electricity, but as a matter of fact the Welland canal will cost $18,000 a year more than it cost before, that is $28,000 less $10,000 for the gas, leaving $18,000 a year more than before.

Mr. GRAHAM. For which we get all the extra lighting and the working of the canal.

Mr. J. D. REID. At page 36 of the report this appears :

The cost of repairs, &c., for nine months, ordinary repairs under the head of staff and repairs, $53,247.50.

As I understand the minister that will not be reduced, that will be paid as before and in addition there will be $15,000 more for the operation of this electric plant and the interest on the $450,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think so.

Mr. FOSTER. By this system we will have better lighting and better operation, the saving of time in operating the canal now that you have this improved lighting and the operation of the locks by electricity instead of manual power.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think there will be no decrease in manual power. The benefit will result in improved lighting and operation, but we must continue to have two men night and day at each lock gate, one on each side.

Mr. LANCASTER. To make it clear, I would say that the canal has been lighted by electricity for several years so that is not included in the new vote, the electric operation of the gates is the only new feature this year.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is to complete payments on the whole system.

To remove centre piers and rebuild bridges at Queenston street and Homer road crossing, $30,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is taking out a pier and making one wide passage instead of two narrow passages.

Mr. FOSTER. Will this complete it ?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, a year ago there was an appropriation of $70,000. This year we will spend only $30,000 but it will take $70,000 eventually, I think.

To make survey of the canal, $15,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This has been going on for some time. There was no complete survey or plan of the canal lands but it was necessary to have a plan showing the boundaries which should be properly marked. The survey was more extensive than it was thought it would be and more work had to be done. There are four parties at work. The survey had never been completed.

Mr. FOSTER. What has been spent on it so far ?

Mr. GRAHAM. About $27,000. The estimate for the whole work is about $47,000.

Mr. HAGGART. How long have you been at it ? Since about 1870 thirty years ago I think.

Mr. GRAHAM. This work has beeen going on about two years. With the old canal there is about seventy miles of length. You have to mark the boundaries and there are many questions of water power, &c., in reference to the old canal.

Mr. HAGGART. There was a vote for it in my time.

Mr. GERMAN. If there was a vote many years ago to do the work the money must have been uselessly expended because there was no delimitation of the boundary limits of the Welland canal that any one could discover and there was great difficulty continually between the owners of adjacent lands and the government officials in regard to the true boundaries of the land as they should and did exist. It was thought necessary to define exactly the true boundary lines along the whole government property and this is being done.

Mr. LANCASTER. I agree that there was that difficulty, but I do not think it is yet cured. Hardly a week goes by without somebody wanting to know where their land ends and the canal property begins. There are not fences or lines of demarcation that ought to be there.

Mr. FOSTER. Do I understand that this vote is simply to pay the cost of marking the boundary lines between the government property and individual private property on each side ?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is a great part of the work.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is doing that work ?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is being done under Mr. Weller, the chief engineer of the canal.

Mr. FOSTER. That canal is about 27 miles in length.

Mr. GRAHAM. The new canal and the old canal together are about 70 miles.

Mr. FOSTER. Does it require $47,000 to run lines for 70 miles to show the boundaries between government property and private property ? It seems a most expensive survey.

Mr. GRAHAM. It does seem expensive ; but, as my hon. friend from Lincoln said, it is not simply a question of running a line ; it is more difficult than that. The chief engineer says there is no time being lost in the work.

Mr. FOSTER. Does Mr. Weller employ outside engineers ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, he has a surveyor and a staff of several men under him.

Mr. BERGERON. There must be in the registry office certain papers showing the land that was transferred to the government when the canal was built, and from these there should be no difficulty in finding where the lines should run. I do not understand that parties of surveyors should be engaged for that purpose. Have these parties anything to do with finding out whether the old canal or the new canal should be deepened ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not know what has been done in the last couple of years. I only know that I have asked Mr. Weller, in his work of marking out these lines, to get any information he can as he goes along.

Mr. FOSTER. It is almost incredible that such an amount of money as this could be spent in delimiting the boundaries of this canal. It is not a new country ; we have been in possession of the land for a great

many years ; and what can be found for engineers or surveyors to do there at a cost of $47,000 I cannot see. It seems to me that the engineers who are on the canal might very easily do the work of delimiting these boundaries in their odd times.

Mr. HAGGART. Is the permanent engineering staff paid anything out of this ?

Mr. GRAHAM. No.

Mr. KEMP. Do I understand the minister to say that the money we are now voting is not to be used in making surveys for the new canal of 25 feet ?

Mr. GRAHAM. No.

Mr. KEMP. The reason I ask the question is that I read the following in the 'Globe' the other day :

St. Catharines, June 12.—The announcement of the Minister of Railways and Canals, looking to the possibility of a new 25-foot canal to replace the present Welland canal, is hailed with delight throughout this vicinity, as the need for the new waterway has been seen for some little time.

No less than four surveying parties are already at work taking the levels of the whole locality. Five men are in each party, and they have now been engaged for some time. Notes of the field men are transferred to the staff at the local canal office, who reduce them to designs, which, when completed, will show all the different routes available between Lakes Erie and Ontario. Several routes are now contemplated, one being near the present canal, one from 'The Fifteen,' three miles from Port Dalhousie, and one from Jordan harbour.

The 'Globe' is evidently under the impression that the Minister of Railways and Canals has several survey parties out making surveys for the 25-foot canal.

Mr. GRAHAM. I suppose that is the impression of some enthusiastic correspondent. If there have been four or five parties out surveying for a new canal, they have been doing so without my instructions.

Mr. BERGERON. Then what my hon. friend read is not correct ?

Mr. GRAHAM. These surveying parties are not doing the work the 'Globe' mentions. They are not surveying with the idea of making a report as to whether the old canal should be deepened or a new canal built. The engineer has been getting all the information he could with these survey parties, but there is no idea of starting a survey for a new canal so far as I know.

Mr. FOSTER. If that is being done, it is absolutely unauthorized by the vote. The vote taken was for delimiting the boundaries, and there is no authority for the minister to use any part of that money for sending parties out to survey new territory with a view of finding a better route for the canal. If the minister wants that information there is a way of getting it ; he has to come to the House to get a vote for the purpose. But I cannot understand how it is possible to spend this amount of money in delimiting simple boundaries. I find that one surveyor last year was in charge of a party which cost $4,604 for nine months, and another with a party which cost $1,461 for nine months. There was another surveyor, Hughson and party, $866 ; Surveyor Hill and party, $2,261 ; Surveyor Ross and party, $777. And there were sundry expenses amounting to $1,000, or a total of $10,825 spent in nine months on this simple delimitation of the boundaries along the canal through the Welland country. The statement that $47,000 is to be paid upon that demands more explanation. The minister may not have the information, but there should be some investigation to know how that money was spent. We ought to delimit nearly half the boundary between the United States and Canada for that sum.

Mr. KEMP. It would be far more in the interests of the country to make surveys for the new canal than to carry out the work in respect to the old canal. I am not criticising the minister if he sees fit to make a survey with regard to a twenty-five foot Welland canal, because that is about the only sensible plan with regard to transportation from the upper lakes that we have had. I have a clipping here from the Toronto 'World,' the purport of which is about the same as the one which appeared in the Toronto 'Globe.'

Mr. SPROULE. The statement was made by the minister that the government had decided, as a matter of policy, to deepen the Welland canal or build a new one. Is that authoritative or intended to be final and conclusive?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend was not here or he would have heard me twice declare that I did not say that. In discussing the transportation problem, the only positive statement I made was that the Hudson Bay Railway would be built. The other schemes were problems which will have to be faced before many years if we are to compete with our rivals in transportation facilities.

Mr. BENNETT. The minister promised the Trent Valley canal. He is a good promiser.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is under construction now.

To widen canal near Welland, $55,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. When the contract was let for the building of turning basins it became necessary to widen the canal by removing the slopes on the face of the banks. About a mile below Welland the

canal was not made to the full width at the bottom.

Mr. FOSTER. What will be the total cost?

Mr. GRAHAM. Between $71,000 and $72,000. The estimates have been made up

Mr. J. D. REID. Is it under contract?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. J. D. REID. Who is the contractor?

Mr. GRAHAM. W. Flint. He was the lowest of three tenderers.

Mr. J. D. REID. How long ago was the contract given and what length of time was allowed for the completion of the work?

Mr. GRAHAM. The contract was let about a year ago. It was to have been completed by the 1st of August of this year.

Mr. J. D. REID. How much has been done and how much has been paid the contractor on account?

Mr. BERGERON. What was the amount of the contract?

Mr. GRAHAM. The contract price was $72,000. The estimates have been made up several months and the statement is months behind.

Mr. FOSTER. As an older man than my hon. friend I would give him a piece of advice. At this stage, when so much depends on the despatch of business, if he would take an hour or two and go over these estimates with his officials before coming to the House he would have the answers ready to these questions, which must be put on every estimate, and we would get through much faster. It seems to take him a lot of consultation with men who do not know much about it before he can give any answer.

Mr. GRAHAM. My deputy is not here and has not been here for weeks, and I am getting the estimates through without him.

Mr. FOSTER. That makes it all the more necessary that the hon. gentleman should have a consultation with his other officials before bringing on his estimates.

Port Colborne improvement, $115,000.
Port Colborne elevator, $172,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the minister state how much has been expended, first, on the so-called improvements and then on the elevator, and the condition of the elevator to-day and the amount he intends spending next year?

Mr. GRAHAM. Port Colborne improvements, total estimate, $1,000,000. Expended up to 30th September, $1,537,510. Estimated cost of elevator, machinery and foundation, $750,000. Total expended up to 30th September, $420,750. The elevator is nearing completion. We extended the time for finishing the contract. It will be ready in a very few weeks.

Mr. BENNETT. How much will it cost to complete the improvements, apart from the elevator?

Mr. GRAHAM. This vote is expected to finish the entire thing.

Mr. BERGERON. What was the original price of the contract?

Mr. GRAHAM. The contract was for $637,000 made in 1906. It will cost to complete about $750,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. minister tell us what assets we shall have after this expenditure?

Mr. GERMAN. I think I can answer the question of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). In the first place, we have one of the best harbours on Lake Erie. We have 22-foot navigation where, formerly, there was practically no harbour—at any rate, no harbour of refuge. We have not merely one of the best, but the best elevator in America. That is acknowledged by elevator men who have come to see it, and it has been visited by many of them. It has a capacity of 800,000 bushels, with the machinery sufficient to operate an elevator of a capacity of 2,000,000 bushels. The additions to this elevator which will bring it up to the capacity of 2,000,000 bushels will cost, perhaps, one-third of the expenditure already made on the elevator. The intention is to tranship grain at Port Colborne on full canal-sized boats and create a channel of grain transportation from the west to the seaboard. I believe that if the scheme is carried out effectively, intelligently and energetically, it will afford means of transport of all the grain that will be grown in the Northwest Territories as well as a considerable part of that grown in the United States for a great many years to come—at least for the time it will take to build new canals between the upper lakes and Montreal.

Mr. KEMP. What remains to be done in order to carry out this scheme?

Mr. GERMAN. Very little remains to be done to carry out the scheme as originally intended. The minister has said that the vote he is proposing will complete all the improvements in the harbour at Port Colborne. It will complete all the improvements for which the vote is asked. There will be other improvements, not of any great extent, which will be necessary in order to make the harbour such as was originally intended. The elevator is completed. I have said before, and have not changed my opinion, that it was a mistake not to make it a two mil-

lion-bushel elevator at first. However, the cost of increasing the size will not be very great. If the electric power were provided—and it will be provided in a very short time—the elevator could begin handling grain now.

Mr. BENNETT. With the public debt of Canada approaching $300,000,000 and with an annual expenditure of upwards of $150,000,000, it is no wonder that sober-minded business men, when they consult together without taking politics into consideration, propound to one another the question, 'Whither are we drifting?' A few years ago the government came down with proposals of expenditure at Port Colborne. The idea was laughed at when it was said that they would spend $1,000,000 before they got through. We are told now that the amount spent is about $3,500,000. And what shall we have in return for this expenditure? The hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) tells us that boats carrying upwards of 400,000 bushels will come to Port Colborne, and that there will be smaller boats there carrying 80,000 bushels that will carry the grain to Montreal. But I would ask the hon. member: What difference is there in the rate on a boat going to Buffalo whether she carries 400,000 bushels or 80,000 bushels?

Mr. GERMAN. Of course, there can be no difference in the rate, or the smaller vessel would not get anything to carry. But the smaller vessel carries at a smaller profit.

Mr. BENNETT. So we have it acknowledged that a vessel carrying 400,000 bushels into Buffalo gets the same rate as a boat carrying 80,000. And what is the proposition of the government in this scheme? They say these large vessels will discharge into the grain elevator and the grain will be transferred into boats of 60,000 or 70,000 bushels carrying capacity and taken to Montreal. And we have spent $3,500,000 on that scheme. And to-day we find the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) going from end to end of the country foreshadowing the schemes of the government—$120,000,000 to $140,000,000 on the so-called Georgian Bay canal; a bagatelle of $40,000,000 or $50,000,000 to deepen the Welland canal. And yet, despite the fact that the government are threatening to expend millions on these schemes, private capital is quietly going about its own business providing transportation facilities immeasurably ahead of what the government propose. According to my hon. friend from Welland (Mr. German), since these works at Port Colborne have been completed nothing more remains to be done—no Georgian Bay canal, no Hudson Bay Railway—none of these things——

Mr. GERMAN. I did not say that.

Mr. BENNETT. I am willing to admit that the hon. gentleman's scheme is ahead of many others that are being put forward by different members of the government. Look at what the Canadian Pacific Railway are doing to-day. It is doing just what American railway and shipping companies have done for the last twenty years in the United States. These American interests have placed on the Great Lakes the largest possible vessels to carry grain to Buffalo, where it is placed on the best systems of railways that money can produce that carry it at rates that beat the Welland canal. The Canadian Pacific Railway is undertaking an expenditure probably running to $10,000,000 to secure a lake port on Georgian bay at Victoria harbour, a few miles below Midland. They are constructing their line from that point to Peterborough. This will give them an all-rail route from Victoria harbour to Montreal, which is their Atlantic shipping point. The Grand Trunk are spending as much at Midland. They are building extensive docks and also an elevator that will make this little elevator at Port Colborne a mere trifling affair. And the Canadian Pacific Railway are constructing one of about equal importance at Victoria harbour. The public wonder, when they hear the ministers of this government put forward their schemes, how these railway companies, having immense interests behind them, and headed by men of such eminent ability as Sir Thomas Shaugnessy and Mr. Hays, can ask of their stockholders to provide these millions upon millions of dollars to construct their transportation schemes. And the general public are simply laughing at the government.

But they are laughing in rather a serious way when they consider the proposals the government are putting forth. Nothing need be said about the Port Colborne scheme, where three and a half million dollars have gone, and that is all going to be an experiment. Even if it were finished, vessels carrying 70,000 bushels of grain would go right past there to Kingston—I have heard that opinion expressed by capable vessel men. My hon. friend admits that a vessel carrying 80,000 bushels gets as much per bushel as a vessel carrying 400,000 bushels. I am free to admit that a 400,000 bushel vessel makes more money for her proprietors; but there is the fact that the smaller vessels of 70,000 or 80,000 bushels get the same rates as the larger vessels of 400,000 bushels. Vessel men claim that they have been making 20 per cent in this business.

But look at the superiority of the Georgian Bay plan over the Buffalo plan. Buffalo to-day controls the trade, reaching to 300,000,000 bushels of grain every year. Where is your Welland canal service com-

pared with that? A mere bagatelle is that which goes down the Welland canal compared with that which goes via Buffalo. But let the minister and the House remember this, that once the Canadian Pacific Railroad and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway have all their terminal facilities completed at Midland and Victoria Harbour, and have their lines of railway running to Peterborough and Port Hope where they will strike their main lines, when they will be able to run 50 cars per train instead of 17, they will be able to beat the Buffalo trade out. And why? Because they will make three trips to Midland or to Victoria as against two to Buffalo from the upper lake ports. Ask any vessel men if these figures are correct, and they will tell you they are. To-day you can, with the same vessel, make three trips to Midland as against two to Buffalo. That is an enormous advantage, when you consider that these vessels can carry 400,000 bushels of grain, and that the rate in the fall of the year sometimes runs up to three cents a bushel. When the Canadian Pacific Railway works are built at Midland and Victoria Harbour, the same vessel going to those ports will make $12,000 on three trips, more than if she was employed in the trade to Buffalo. Now I would advise the minister to go slow, and let the country have a chance to breathe for a while and see whether the projects of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific are going to be a success, and whether this Port Colborne proposal is going to aid the Welland canal. Let the Minister of Railways and Canals take the advice of his former colleague, Mr. A. G. Mackay, who characterized the government of Mr. Whitney as spending the money of the province like a lot of drunken sailors. The phrase was expressive, if not elegant. But think of the few thousands being spent in the province of Ontario compared with the threatened expenditure of millions coming on top of that. Here is this terrible expenditure, this awful expenditure, that is going to drag down Canada for years to come, the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, that is going to cost the country—every man sees it—not a hundred millions, but it will never be completed for $200,000,000. And coming on top of that huge expenditure, what do we see? The government threatens now to plunge Canada into an expenditure for building a Hudson Bay Railway, and a canal from the Georgian Bay. In the name of all that is good let the country have a rest for a little while, and let the private enterprise of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway who are to-day expending millions of dollars, in conjunction with the projects that the government has now undertaken at Port Colborne, have a chance to develop themselves, and don't drive the people of Canada into a state of consternation by threatening to unsettle the financial conditions of the country.

Mr. BENNETT

Mr. J. D. REID. So far as I am concerned, I have every session advocated the enlargement of the Welland canal, and I think that is one of the most important public works that this government could undertake. When the Welland canal was first enlarged to 14 feet it was supposed that would be sufficient depth for many years to come. But what is the case to-day? We all see that vessels carrying 300,000 bushels and over are navigating the lakes. My idea is that these large vessels will seek the very nearest point on the sea-board. To-day the minister admits that the amount of money the government are expending for the Port Colborne elevator, $732,000, is to be practically wiped out, and will be absolutely useless, if he goes on and constructs the Welland canal as he has been telling the people he proposes to do. Of course he understands that these large vessels will never stop to unload at Port Colborne, so that port will practically be abandoned. Now at the present time grain is being carried, I may say, for 3½ cents a bushel from Port Arthur right through to Montreal, that is the present rate, the summer rate; but in the fall it is 5 cents a bushel. Now I claim that when that Welland canal is deepened to 25 feet, as the minister states, these large vessels carrying 300,000 or 400,000 bushels will go either to Kingston or to Prescott. I say Prescott, because it is at the foot of navigation, and grain will be taken from either Kingston or Prescott to Montreal for one cent a bushel. That can be done, these large vessels will bring that grain from Port Arthur to Prescott for a cent and a half a bushel. If these vessels carrying 65,000 bushels will take grain from Port Arthur to Montreal for 3½ cents, which means practically 2½ to Prescott, there is no reason that I can see why they would not bring grain for 1½ cents to Prescott or to Kingston.

Mr. BENNETT. How long does it take an ordinary vessel carrying 70,000 bushels to lock through the Welland canal at present? It takes fully 18 hours.

Mr. GRAHAM. It takes 16 hours.

Mr. J. D. REID. Admitting it takes 18 hours to do the locking now, and the present rate of grain is 3½ cents a bushel from Port Arthur delivered into the ocean steamers at Montreal, if the ocean steamers are in a position to take it out of the vessel, then, even if the Welland canal is enlarged, they will bring it down to Prescott for 1½ cents a bushel. I claim that if the government, instead of undertaking that Port Colborne elevator, had undertaken the enlargement of the Welland canal, as they propose now, that money would have been put into a work that would have been of

use for all time to come. I hope that the enlargement of the Welland canal will be proceeded with at the earliest possible moment. I believe that it is in the interest of the country that it should be done, and commenced at once, and I shall continue to advocate it, whether I am in the House or out of it.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it the purpose of the government to bring power there to run the elevator, and if so how much would it cost?

Mr. GRAHAM. That deals with something I do not know much about. We made a contract for power to run the elevator at half a cent per kilowatt hour.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a contract entered into by the government?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the estimate of the cost of running that elevator for the season?

Mr. GERMAN. The cost of running the elevator for the season will depend on the volume of grain passing through the elevator.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose it runs up to its 800,000 bushels capacity?

Mr. GERMAN. That would simply be the capacity per day.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose it keeps going to its full capacity what will the cost of running the elevator be.

Mr. GERMAN. I could not say. Half a cent per kilowatt hour is something that an electrical engineer has to figure out, but I can say that every electrical engineer with whom I have talked on this matter—and I have talked with many—said that it was the best contract for electrical power as far as the government is concerned that has ever been made. It was made with the Ontario Power Company. In operating an elevator of that kind the power has to be kept at what is always called the peak load. That means that there must always be sufficient power to run the elevator at its full capacity, whereas there may be days and days when the elevator would only be running at half its capacity. The electrical company is required to keep the power at a sufficient volume to run the elevator at its full capacity and it will only get paid for the actual amount of electrical power that is being used at any one time.

Mr. SPROULE. Convert that into ordinary horse-power, let us know what it costs and we will understand it.

Mr. GERMAN. It will be $11 or $12 per horse-power.

Mr. FOSTER. If you can let us know what it will cost to elevate 100,000 bushels of grain you will come down to the understanding of ordinary mortals.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is above me. The estimates made for the running of the elevator for seven months from the 1st of September to the 31st March next is $8,000, of which $1,600 will, we expect, be for power.

Mr. FOSTER. The government will be prepared to run the elevator and take in whatever grain comes?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, beginning on the 1st September.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the government going to carry the grain?

Mr. GRAHAM. That opens up a pretty big question to which I referred some months ago in this House. It is a debatable question whether the elevator should not be leased to a company that will fill and empty it for the benefit of the trade.

Mr. KEMP. As has been stated by my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), this plant at Port Colborne has cost $3,500,000. It is almost ready for operation. My own opinion is that the best policy that the government could have pursued would have been to have deepened the Welland canal to 25 feet. However, this scheme was conceived at a time when a very large amount of wheat from the Canadian Northwest was going out by way of Buffalo, when large boats from the head of the lakes were delivering this grain at Buffalo and some people, amongst them Mr. George Bertram, thought that we could divert that grain to the St. Lawrence by building this elevator at Port Colborne. I did not agree with him, but I believed that the best thing that could have been done was to have deepened the Welland canal, but the scheme was to try and encourage some of the vessel owners to carry out the system which was proposed at that time, that large barges should be employed to go as far as Port Colborne for cargo through this elevator—perhaps one steam barge towing two ordinary steel barges. It was thought that these barges could be towed down Lake Ontario and through the St. Lawrence canals. I think that is a scheme which should commend itself to the Montreal shipping firms. They have barges which go through the St. Lawrence canals and I think we ought to try and see if they will not send them as far as Port Colborne. The cost of elevating grain in such an elevator as this is very little indeed, and I am not sure but what this scheme of transporting grain from the head of the lakes to Montreal would be as economical a scheme as any we have at the present time. I do not think it would be as cheap as to transport grain from the head of the lakes to Prescott and Kingston, by the Welland canal route, if the Welland canal were deepened,

but it would be as cheap as any in existance at the present time. We have always contended in Canada that our canal systems have been regulators of freight rates, as they have contended in New York state that the Erie canal has been a regulator of freight rates. The Erie canal does not have the capacity of the St. Lawrence canals for carrying a large volume of traffic, but it has always been the regulator of freight rates, and they never would have got such a low rate on the New York Central for grain going to the sea-board if it had not been for the Erie canal. I have very much the same criticism to make in regard to our transportation schemes as my hon. friend from East Simcoe made. It has been demonstrated that east of the lakes there is very little profit in carrying grain. Whatever profit there is in carrying grain is west of the lakes where the railway companies have more of a monopoly and they can regulate their rates to suit themselves to a greater extent. But once you land the grain at the head of the lakes, competition is very keen and there is very little money in carrying from that point.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. You are speaking of through grain?

Mr. KEMP. I am speaking of grain for export.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The rate on grain from points in my constituency to Montreal is greater than it is from Fort William to Montreal.

Mr. KEMP. I know that local rates are very much higher than through rates. That is another question that I do not intend to dwell upon just now, but I would like to invite the attention of the minister to the number of routes east of the lakes that we have in working order at the present time. First, I will refer to the American system of railways and transportation which routes are very numerous, which we all know about and which are an important factor with respect to competition. Then we have the Canadian Pacific Railway from Owen Sound to the sea-board and the Canadian Pacific Railway from Victoria harbour to the sea-board, which has been referred to by my hon. friend from East Simcoe. We have the Grand Trunk Railway from Depot Harbour, Parry Sound, Midland, Collingwood, Wiarton, Goderich, Sarnia and Windsor. We have the St. Lawrence canal system and we will have, I suppose, the Trent canal system. Then we have the system that we are referring to at the present time, and which is part of the St. Lawrence canals system—the scheme of transferring grain at Port Colborne, taking it from large boats and putting it through the elevator. We have before us the Hudson Bay Railway. We have the Georgian Bay canal scheme and we have the Grand Trunk Pacific scheme. Hon. gentlemen will remember that in the debate upon that scheme in this House we were told that the Grand Trunk Pacific would carry grain to the sea-board at a cheaper rate than it could be carried by any canal or railway in existence. It is on record in 'Hansard' that ministers of the Crown made that statement when the Grand Trunk Pacific Bill was going through this House. We have also the Erie canal and the American transportation system. It seems to me that the time has come when we should call a halt. If we have money to spend and if money can be saved to the benefit of the farmers in the Northwest it seems to me that the very first thing that we should ascertain is whether or not we can save sufficient to warrant us in spending what will be required to deepen the Welland canal. That seems to be a feasible project, because if we can load these large vessels to carry half a million bushels of wheat as far as Kingston and Prescott, where it can be transferred to barges which would float down the river to Montreal—it would be as cheap to store the wheat in those barges as to put it into the elevator at Montreal—and if the wheat could then be transferred through floating elevators to the steamships at Montreal, it strikes me that it would have the effect of reducing the cost of carriage and of diverting a large amount of the grain trade to the St. Lawrence route. That, it seems to me, would be an inexpensive way by which the produce not only of the northwestern states, but of our own Northwest could be transported to the sea-board. We should not invest another dollar in any of these schemes before we have ascertained from experts what is the cheapest way of transporting a bushel of wheat from the head of the lakes to the sea-board.

These engineers' reports go for nothing in my mind. They gave us information as to what can be done and in these days of advanced engineering almost anything can be accomplished if you are willing to spend the money. If after the work is done you can carry a bushel of wheat a fraction of a cent cheaper by one route than by another, you can divert the traffic by that route. Although I am greatly in favour of the Welland canal route for many reasons, even in reference to it, I think that the only proper way to proceed is to have the opinion of experts as to whether grain can be carried to the sea-board by that route cheaper than by any other. I am thoroughly opposed to going into so many half digested schemes of transportation and talking big to the people all over the country, trying to make them believe we are to deepen the Welland canal and the St. Lawrence canals and to have the Georgian Bay canal, when it is impracticable to do all these things, when we cannot afford them. Let us devote our attention to one scheme. A 25-foot Welland canal would be efficient to carry all the grain of the Northwest. But while doing

that we must not discourage private enterprise. I agree with the hon. member for Simcoe that the railways have done a great work. Let us improve the harbours on the Georgian bay and assist the railways, but we must remember that the Welland canal system is the regulator of freight rates to the sea-board.

Mr. GERMAN. The hon. gentlemen are developing a proposition that might have been much better discussed in the earlier days of the session when we had nothing to do. The policy of constructing an elevator and the deepening or practically building a harbour at Port Colborne was adopted by reason of the fact that the Welland canal as a portion of our transportation system was practically useless without the elevator and harbour. I supported the building of the elevator and the enlargement of the harbour because those two things were both necessary and will be necessary even after the Welland and St. Lawrence canals are deepened and the Georgian Bay canal is constructed. The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) has made the assertion that I was opposed to the deepening of the Welland canal.

Mr. BENNETT. I did not say that.

Mr. GERMAN. I understood my hon. friend to make that statement and I think I am quite correct in my assumption. I think he made it. However, he is liable to develop erratic theories and to endeavour to square the facts to the theories. I am not opposed to the deepening of the Welland canal by any means. I think the Welland canal in the future will need to be deepened and enlarged to meet the future growth and development of this country, but at present we are dealing with a vote in connection with the completion of certain improvements at Port Colborne authorized by parliament. These improvements are necessary as a step towards the solution of the transportation problem of this country, they have been approved of in the past and I am sure will be found in the future to have been necessary and to justify the expenditure of this money.

Mr. LANCASTER. I am glad to hear from the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) now that he is in favour of deepening the Welland canal, but in view of what he says as to not speaking earlier in the session I would call attention to the fact that when the Georgian Bay canal scheme was under discussion I had the temerity to advocate the deepening of the Welland canal rather than the construction of the Georgian Bay canal and had not his support then.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. Some remarks I had occasion to make in this House two or three years ago have been amply verified. I went into the matter of general transportation quite extensively and at that time I agreed that the building of the elevator at Port Colborne would probably be of benefit. The idea seems to be to deepen the Welland canal very quickly. I do not think that we need be in a hurry about deepening the Welland canal for some years to come. We are only now getting the improved elevator system ready to work and we have had no demonstration as to what benefit we will derive from it. Then, again, suppose you deepen that Welland canal, is it going to be to the interest of Canadian trade or American trade? Will it draw away trade from Canadian channels? That is a matter that should be well considered. As soon as you deepen the Welland canal to 25 to 30 feet you open a clear waterway to all American corn, wheat and grain of any kind to Ogdensburg or to any of the ports on Lake Ontario and that means that grain which under the present arrangement will probably come largely to the elevator at Port Colborne would go down through the deepened Welland canal to American ports. For what reason? Suppose the large lake vessels could come down to-day from Duluth or Chicago and go through the Welland canal. They certainly would not go beyond Prescott. They would go where they could get a return cargo. As soon as they passed Port Colborne they would have to go to the American side for their return cargo, so they would carry their eastbound cargo there and take their return cargo back. Let us have a trial of the benefit that we have been expecting to derive from the elevator and improvements at Port Colborne before we undertake or put the country looking towards the deepening of the Welland canal. Let us have a trial of one, two, three or four years. That was the argument I made two or three years ago, but at the same time I advocated the postponement of the building of or agitation for the Georgian Bay canal until this route had become developed and we could see what it would do. Then you could put on a commission and ascertain what benefit you would receive from the building of the Georgian Bay canal system. In the meantime our railways would be developed just as they are being developed to-day, from Midland or from Tiffin or Depot Harbour or any of these ports. By that time probably we will have also the Grand Trunk Pacific which road with a 4-10 grade can at the same rate as is charged by any other large grain carrying road of the northwest haul their grain from Winnipeg into Quebec a good deal cheaper or quite as cheaply as it can be carried by the rail and lake route. These are matters on which I hope the government will not lose their heads. When the time comes for the Georgian Bay canal then build it. I do not believe the time has come for it. When the time comes to enlarge the Welland canal, do it. In the meantime I hope the government will give the improvements and the elevator and storage facilities at Port Col-

borne a thorough, complete trial so they will be able to demonstrate not only the cost but the question as to whether the grain will tend to come by way of Montreal or by way of Buffalo. We know well that the American shippers would prefer to ship by Montreal during summer the grain stored in Chicago. They will pay larger prices for shipment by Montreal than by the southern route. There is a large traffic which probably would not go through Montreal and neither would any of the other grain come through Montreal. We would not hope to develop a traffic from the United States by deepening the Welland canal, for then you would open the way to the New York terminus at cheaper rates probably than could possibly be given to Montreal. You must stop at either Port Colborne or Prescott. It will cost too much for many generations to deepen the St. Lawrence canals.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. On the 11th June I asked for certain information with regard to the cost of the Mountain division of the National Transcontinental Railway A return has been brought down which is absolutely unsatisfactory, because I cannot understand what is intended. It is said that the length of the whole road from Winnipeg to the coast is 1,755 miles, of which 916 miles are included in the prairie section and 839 miles in the mountain section. Further down I find this language :

The estimated cost of construction is set down at the present date at $61,520,000, which includes terminals at Prince Rupert, $3,000,000.

Does that refer to the mountain section or to the whole road from Winnipeg to the coast ?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is the Mountain section.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Might I suggest to the minister that when his clerks prepare returns they make a matter of that kind plain, so that I need not take up the time of the House in asking questions which would be unnecessary if the return were brought down in proper form ?

Sault Ste Marie canal—construction, $105,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is the amount expended in deepening and widening the chanel at the upper end. Mr. Boone has the contract, amounting to $256,657.

Mr. J. D. REID. How much has been paid on it?

Mr. GRAHAM. $234,102 up to September of last year.

Mr. J. D. REID. Has the contractor been paid the amount estimated, or does the government expect that the work will cost more than the amount of the contract ?

Mr. GRAHAM. This vote is expected to cover the whole amount.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL.

Mr. J. D. REID. It is going to cost the country $50,000 more than the amount of the contract.

Mr. GRAHAM. Although these contracts are made on an estimate of a lump sum, the payments are at schedule rates of so much a yard.

Mr. BENNETT. Has the minister's department had any expense in connection with the work at present being done by the American government at Lime Kiln crossing near Windsor ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think I am safe in saying no, but I will make inquiry.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the minister inquire whether his department has in its employ a couple of agents superintending the operations of the American government ?

Mr. J. D. REID. Has the minister ever gone along the Rideau canal to see how it is lighted ?

Mr. GRAHAM. The Rideau canal seems to be under double jurisdiction. Part of the work is done by one department and part by another.

Mr. J. D. REID. In going through that canal this summer I noticed that it is lighted by lanterns hanging from sticks.

Mr. GRAHAM. That would be in the lake section.

Mr. J. D. REID. Although the canal is supposed to be lighted every night, it seems to be lighted only about two nights in the week. Although there are not many boats navigating the Rideau canal, I think in the interests of navigation it should be lighted every night.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the minister propose to make his statement to-night ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am not quite ready to make my statement to-night.

Mr. FOSTER. Can he say when he will make it ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I will be prepared to take it up to-morrow.

Mr. FOSTER. I would also like to know when the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) proposes to make his statement. Will that be to-morrow ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I cannot say.

Mr. J. D. REID. He said he was ready.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Then, I will ask him to be here to-morrow.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, we will take the Transcontinental first ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight oclock.

Quebec canals—steam road roller and stone crusher, $7,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. What is this required for?

Mr. GRAHAM. To macadamize the tow path. They do a great deal of travelling on the canal bank.

Soulanges canal—improvements, $15,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. What are the improvements there ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Fire protection, electric motors, machine shop, timber and lumber shop, cast-iron and concrete posts.

St. Lawrence canal—district office, $7,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is really finishing up the expenditures for work in that district. We have our engineer and staff there.

Trent canal—construction, $1,000,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is this work all under contract ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, all let to the lowest tenderers.

Mr. LENNOX. Has the southern outlet been determined upon yet ?

Mr. GRAHAM. No.

Mr. LENNOX. I want to ask the minister with reference to that Devil's Elbow he has been talking about, that is, the work at Bradford. The minister explained the other day that the chief engineer is not able to attend to it now. Could not the minister send some one else up there in the meantime ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I had a little conversation with the secretary of the chief engineer this morning, and I understood him that some time before the session closed he thought he could give me an idea of what that work was going to cost. I think he said some engineer was there looking at it.

Mr. LENNOX. I think the chief engineer is quite familiar with the general character of the situation. It is absolutely level land, it is called a marsh. I was at Bradford the other day, and talking with a gentleman who knows a great deal about it in a non-professional way, he said the distance was about three-quarters of a mile. The soil is mucky on top for about three feet, then you get to solid earth. I would be glad if the minister, before the session closes, would give me an idea as to whether he will undertake the work.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will try and get that.

Mr. LENNOX. It is a place where there will be a good deal of traffic, which comes up to the point of the Devil's Elbow. It is a small matter, and will give an additional outlet to the people of Bradford and of the neighbourhood.

Mr. OWEN. Could the minister tell me when the contract was let for the section passing through the town of Campbellford ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I cannot say that. When the work of the session is over and my chief engineer comes back, I intend to go with him to see the place.

Mr. OWEN. Will this complete the Trent canal ?

Mr. GRAHAM. The Trent canal will not be completed until it has got away up into the waters of Lake Simcoe. There are some sections of it for which an estimate has not yet been made. I have sent out for information on those sections which are under contract.

Mr. KEMP. How many years will it take to complete the canal, and how much will it cost ?

Mr. GRAHAM. If we base an estimate for the future on the number of years it has been going on, some of us will be pretty old men when it is completed.

Mr. KEMP. Then it won't be any benefit to this generation ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think it is a great accommodation now.

Lachine canal—wall north side basin No. 2, $98,000; wall side basin No. 2, $49,000; workshops, $15,000.

Mr. HAGGART. Does that finish the wall on basin No. 2?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. How much does the whole wall cost?

Mr. GRAHAM. $147,000. It is under contract.

Chambly canal—to macadamize towpath, to complete, $10,000.

Mr. HAGGART. What do those macadamized roads cost altogether?

Mr. GRAHAM. $3,500 a mile, and there are four or five miles.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the stone crusher and roller be utilized here ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Cornwall canal—to build a gate lifter, $10,000.

Mr. HAGGART. What does that gate lifter cost altogether?

Mr. GRAHAM. $12,000.

Murray canal—to provide houses for bridgemen, $5,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. What kind of houses, and how many?

Mr. GRAHAM. There are eight men and only two houses, and the whole length of the canal is several miles away from any town. We propose to build two houses one and a half stories each, at $2,500 each.

Rideau canal improvements, $4,500.

Mr. TAYLOR. What are the improvements?

Mr. GRAHAM. Building a platform and rebuilding the swing bridge across the upper lake.

Trent canal improvements, $45,000.

Mr. HAGGART. What are those improvements?

Mr. GRAHAM. Dredging between Bobcaygeon and Peterborough, Peterborough and Fenelon, and Balsam lake and Lake Simcoe. We do that with our own dredge.

Mr. TAYLOR. Are you getting a dredge built for that?

Mr. GRAHAM. We propose to get one built. $15,000 is the estimate.

Trent canal—new lock and dam, Lindsay, $80,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. We are replacing the old wooden locks which the Ontario government built there some fifty years ago.

Mr. HAGGART. Will that be used in the navigation of the Trent?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Trent canal—dam at Buckhorn, $25,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This work is being done by Conroy, of Peterborough, and was let by tender. The amount is $55,119.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it intended to place the section under contract between Lake Simcoe and the Georgian bay this coming year?

Mr. GRAHAM. Not this season.

Mr. OWEN. Where is the dam at Buckhorn being built, and what is it for?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is for navigation purposes practically, and we may develop power as well.

Intercolonial Railway—increased accommodation at Halifax, $500,000.

Mr. CROCKET. The departmental report says that three contracts were let at Halifax during the year. Who are the contractors and what is the contract price in each case?

Mr. GRAHAM. The contract for grading on the west side of water street is not a lump sum contract but is a contract at schedule prices.

Mr. CROCKET. Who is the contractor ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Kitchen & Co.

Mr. CROCKET. Has the minister a statement of the estimated value of the contract ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not seem to have it here. The estimated expenditure is about $520,000 for the year. The expenditure to the 31st March last was $3,233,158.01.

Mr. CROCKET. Has the minister a list of the amounts paid under each of the contracts ?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, I will try and get a statement of the different contracts.

Mr. CROCKET. The report states that the Cunard property was secured by the railway. I would like to know what was paid for that.

Mr. GRAHAM. $187,366.66.

Mr. CROCKET. Through whom was the purchase negotiated ?

Mr. GRAHAM. There was an offer made, arbitrators were appointed and it was settled by the officers of the department.

Mr. CROCKET. Did Mr. McIlreith get a fee ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. McIlreith searched the title or did some legal work of that kind.

Mr. CROCKET. What was the amount of his fee for that service ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Has my hon friend a copy of the Public Accounts ?

Mr. CROCKET. There does not seem to be anything in the Public Accounts. All I find in the Auditor General's Report is the amount paid to Kitchen & Co. for excavation. There seems to have been $54,217.51 paid out during the last fiscal year on account of the Halifax works.

Mr. HAGGART. Would the minister state what he intends this $500,000 shall be applied to, whether it will meet the object he has in view, and what is the total amount that has been expended for increased accommodation at Halifax ?

Mr. GRAHAM. The amount expended to the end of March is $3,233,000 in round numbers. This amount is required for additional facilities on the west side of Water street, engine house, heating and turntable, freight and car repair shop and planing mill, store house, oil house and sand house, chimney and foundation, coal pockets, water tank and supply, cinder pits, grading, ballasting and tracks, double tracking Richmond to new yard, heating of buildings, &c., tracks and turnouts in Richmond yard, building for car inspectors and wharf. These improvements which I am speaking of now will cost $1,019.80.

Mr. HAGGART. Which, added to $3,200,000 will be $4,200,000 ?

Mr. GRAHAM. $4,255,000. But the $3,200,000 includes the $500,000 already expended.

Mr. DANIEL. I notice, at page W—19 of the Auditor General's Report that Mr. R. T. McIlreith, for legal services and expenses, received $1,861.30. Was that in connection with the purchase of property in Halifax ?

Mr. GRAHAM. This was in connection with the purchase of property required for these improvements.

Mr. DANIEL. Did this include the properties in connection with which Mr. Pearson got $14,000 ?

Mr. GRAHAM. The last item, in connection with the roundhouse, I think is the only one.

Mr. HAGGART. Is any of this expenditure for increased accommodation at Halifax charged to revenue account besides what is charged to capital ?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, I think not, this is revolutionary.

Sydney Mines—extension to, $14,625.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is from North Sydney to Sydney Mines, not quite three miles, 2·7 I think. It is an extension of the line. The expenditure up to March 31, 1907, was $88,043. That includes the land and a very large yard to accommodate the traffic we receive from the Nova Scotia Coal Company.

Improvements at North Sydney, $4,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is an addition to the engine house.

Mr. HAGGART. Why is that charged to capital account ?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is really a new thing, to provide accommodation for more engines, we might have built it by itself and it would then have been absolutely new but we attached it to the other one.

Sydney—increased accommodation, $14,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is in connection with the bridge at Sydney yard. The bridge itself will cost about $14,000.

Improvements at Mulgrave, $46,800.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is to provide an extension of the wharf, additional sidings, extension of the freight shed, land, coaling pockets, improvements at the station and water tank. The total cost will be $78,800. This vote finishes the work.

Antigonish—increased accommodation, $4,500.

Mr. GRAHAM. We are building a concrete platform, providing drainage and completing the water service ; the work is practically finished. I received a telegram today asking me to extend the work to the amount of $400 in order to have our walk meet the town walk. If we decide to do that we will require $400 more. We have expended there $21,354.57. It is under contract to Mr. Sutherland.

New Glasgow—increased accommodation, $7,500.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is to complete the work of providing two undercrossings. The expenditure to March 31, 1907, was $46,677.22.

Stellarton—increased accommodation, $6,500.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is for a sand house and electric lighting plant. It will take about $9,000 more to complete this work. It is under contract. The General Electric Company are putting in the lighting plant.

Pictou—increased accommodation, $8,600.

Mr. CROCKET. Is any of this sum for Pictou to be applied to the contract for the engine house ?

Mr. GRAHAM. There is nothing in this. It is for coaling pockets, water service, loading platform and a building for our car cleaners.

Mr. CROCKET. In connection with the contract for the Pictou engine house I was informed some time ago by the minister that the contract was $13,950, that there were some schedule prices, and that the contractor had been paid to that date $100,221 and that there was a final estimate amounting to $10,719 remaining to be paid, so that the total amount payable to the contractor would be about 111,000. How is it that such a large sum has been paid under that contract ? The department estimated the value of the contract at $62,000. The contractor Mr. Walberg, has received nearly double that amount.

Mr. GRAHAM. It includes more than the engine house, there is the crib-work, filling in, &c., which was not for the contract for the engine house proper. It is hard for me, of course, to explain how far—I am not referring to this particular—the execution of the contract varies from the estimate. I went into it with an engineer one day, and he convinced me that it is likely to be the case quite often. Contracts are taken at a named sum, but the payments are made on schedule prices, and the details vary. The estimates for some of the largest railway works on this continent are not approximately near to the final cost, although the estimates serve as a basis for the amount of the contract.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the estimate upon which the contract was made, what is the amount expended, and what do you require to finish the work ?

Mr. GRAHAM. This work is all finished and paid for.

Mr. CROCKET. It is true that the contract for the building proper was $13,950, but the department estimated the contract upon Mr. Walberg's tender of schedule prices and including the bulk sum as worth $62,000. Notwithstanding that, we find that he received over $110,000 on that contract. It seems that in this case, as in all other cases in which contracts were awarded to Mr. Walberg, he was the lowest tenderer, but he managed to come out at the completion of this contract as in the case of all his other contracts with an amount far in excess of the highest tender. I can understand that there might be some slight variation between the department's estimate and the actual working out of the contract; but it does seem to me that it is not very complimentary to the engineering staff of the Department of Railways and Canals that they should be out to such an immense extent as in this case. There were additional amounts in connection with the Pictou engine house outside of Mr. Walberg's contract which made the total value of this work $129,111. It is an immense amount of money to spend for such an engine house as that at Pictou.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend is wrong. This item has nothing at all to do with the item he is discussing. The details of this contract will appear in the Auditor General's Report for the year just past. The contract was for an engine house, cribwork, and several other things; but as it is not a matter germane to this item, I did not bring the details.

Mr. CROCKET. Can the minister say when Mr. Walberg received his last payment? He was paid $100,221.91, up to the date of my asking the above question, and there was still outstanding a progress estimate amounting to $10,719. I would like to know when that was paid?

Mr. GRAHAM. I will have to get that information at another time for my hon. friend.

To increase accommodation at Truro, $105,000.

Mr. STANFIELD. What is this for?

Mr. GRAHAM. The estimate is as follows: Station, $85,000; yard, $168,000; water service, $5,000; coal pocket, $3,000; ballast, $30,000; store, $12,000; office, $25,000; small items, $30,000; grading, $51,000; freight house, $25,000.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the total cost and what is the total amount expended?

Mr. GRAHAM. The total amount expended at Truro, including everything, is $271,366.77. That is not on the work I have outlined, which will cost over $400,000.

Mr. HAGGART. How much of this vote will it take to complete it?

Mr. GRAHAM. About $250,000.

Mr. HAGGART. Is the work under contract, let by tender, and, if so, who are the contractors?

Mr. GRAHAM. We are doing the yard work ourselves, and the coal pits have been let. The balance of the work has not yet been let.

Mr. HAGGART. What part of the work is done?

Mr. GRAHAM. Part of the yard north of the main line of the Pictou branch is done by ourselves. The water service is done by contract.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is the new station to be let by tender?

Mr. GRAHAM. It has not been tendered for yet, but it will certainly be let by tender.

Mr. STANFIELD. Is it the intention of the minister to start the new station this year?

Mr. GRAHAM. The plans are being considered now. I do not know just what we shall be able to do this year, as the season is so late; but it is not the intention to make a difference between places.

Mr. STANFIELD. The reason I ask the hon. minister this question is that in 1904 I think it was, the government started to build a new engine house. The work was left until the eve of a general election. They did not know what site they were going to select. You did not know what site you were going to take and were forced to take a certain site which cost the country a considerable sum. In turning up the Auditor General's Report, I find that upwards of $220,000 was spent on that engine house. Of that amount over $80,000 was spent in excavating. What I would like to impress on the minister is that it would be far better to provide this new station before the general elections. He would get just as many votes out of it and so will I, if fortunate enough to run. While on my feet, I would like to impress on the minister the absolute necessity for better precautions on the crossings in Truro. I have a copy of a letter sent by a lawyer to the department claiming damages on account of an accident at a crossing there, in which two horses were killed but fortunately without any loss of human life. The cause of the accident was this. It was a dark and stormy night and there were no lights on the crossing. The town of Truro had written the department several times begging it to put two lights on this crossing, but the department neglected to do so. From what I understand, the lawyer for the department wrote the Truro people that the government will not pay this claim. I would like the minister to look into the question.

There are no gates any way down there and it is a miracle that no lives have been lost.

Intercolonial Railway—increased accommodation at Springhill junction, $2,900.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is for coal plant and hot water pumps.

Improvements at Amherst, $47,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is for a station, $38,000, a concrete platform and an engine house. Estimated cost $59,500. The contract was given to Leblanc & Company, the lowest tenderers, after newspaper advertisements.

Mr. HAGGART. Why build an engine house at Amherst? It is not a division point.

Mr. GRAHAM. We have two engines there, used for shunting in the yard.

Mr. ANGUS McLENNAN (Inverness). Before you leave the Nova Scotia items, I desire to call attention to the fact that while I am pleased to see so many votes for increased accommodation along various sections of the Intercolonial Railway passing through that province, I regret that the good old county of Inverness, through which thirty-five miles of the road runs, is left out. My regret is that the minister, on his tour of inspection, did not have time to see that fine county in daylight, and most of all to see its requirements. There is a private company owned railway running along the county of Inverness, a distance of 61 miles. There are three thriving coal mining towns tributary to that road, together with about two-thirds of the area of the county of Inverness and its people. All the freight emanating from these mining towns and other parts of that county, together with the passenger traffic, passes, almost all of it, over the Intercolonial Railway. That other railway forms a junction with the Intercolonial Railway about a mile and a half or so from the Strait of Canso, or about a mile and a half from Point Tupper, one of the Intercolonial railway terminals. Every passenger—and this is what I desire to call attention to particularly—who leaves the county of Inverness by that road has to land in a swamp along the track of the Intercolonial Railway. The government, it would appear, took excellent care to make accommodation for the freight coming off the Inverness and Richmond Railway, but it left the passengers to shift for themselves, and they have to land, as I have said, about a mile and a half from the government station at Point Tupper. The attention of the late Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) was brought to this matter by myself, and he claimed that it was the duty of the private company to provide a shelter there for its passengers. The company, on the other hand, contend that they have their station in the town of Hawkesbury, about one-quarter of a mile from this junction, and that the moment they land their passengers on the Intercolonial track they are Intercolonial passengers, and consequently they back their train right to their station in the town of Hawkesbury. I have been time and again on board the Intercolonial and taken the Inverness train to my home, and in the spring and winter I have seen twenty-five to thirty passengers, of both sexes, having to walk the whole length of the train in snow and slush to their knees and get to the Intercolonial as best they could. This has been going on some six or seven years, so that it is a case, as far as the people of Inverness are concerned, of being between the de'il and the deep sea. What I contend is that the passenger earnings which the Intercolonial derives from this traffic amply warrant a station being built at that junction by the government for their accommodation. The passenger earnings on this 61 miles of the Inverness railroad this last calendar year were $20,000, and no doubt that would be at least duplicated on the Intercolonial, because the run on that road is longer. With its freight traffic and passenger traffic that 61 miles of railway cleared $75,000 last year, as is shown by the government returns. These earnings, I say again, have been more than duplicated in the case of the Intercolonial, because the greater amount of that freight and traffic would go over the Intercolonial sometimes twice or three times the distance that it goes over the Inverness road. I listened to a question asked and answered in this House the other day as to the amount paid by the Sydney and Louisburg Company to the government for the use of the government terminals at Sydney. It is evident from that question and its answer that the Sydney and Louisburg road is compelled to make use of the government terminals at Sydney, for which they pay a certain amount. What I claim is then that it is the duty of the government either to erect a modest station for the shelter of the passengers here or compel the running of the Inverness trains into the government terminals at Point Tupper. The people of Inverness would be perfectly satisfied with either.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the distance to Point Tupper?

Mr. McLENNAN. About a mile and a half. I think that the request I make of the government is perfectly reasonable. To show the absurdity of the present arrangement let me state the position as it is. A freight train to-day leaves Inverness town, goes to the junction and then right on into the government terminals at Point Tupper, where it transfers its freight comfortably. But a train loaded with passengers leaves soon after and is treated very differently.

The passengers are dumped in a swamp, the most hideous looking place along the Intercolonial Railway.

I was determined, before these votes went through, to call the attention of the Minister of Railways to this matter, in order that at least, he should give the matter attention when the Supplementary Estimates are being prepared, or arrange with the company, as I have indicated, that they might use the government terminals at Point Tupper. I certainly refuse to hold a seat in this House quietly and silently while this abuse of the people I represent goes on.

Mr. HENDERSON. What do you think of that, Mr. Minister?

Mr. GRAHAM. As I understand the hon. member (Mr. McLennan) the Canadian Northern, or Inverness road, put the passengers off at a place other than the station, landing them on the Intercolonial tracks. That is a matter well worth looking into; and, if my hon. friend will drop me a line putting the matter in concrete shape, I will take it up with the railway. Perhaps the Railway Commission might induce them to do something, or we might make some arrangement with them.

Mr. McLENNAN. There is an excellent way for the minister to arrange this matter perhaps better than in any other, and that is to make this excellent piece of railway a branch of the Intercolonial—to take it over and experiment with it as an excellent feeder of the road. I am introducing this subject to the attention of the minister with the hopeful assurance that the road cleared $75,000 in its working for the last calendar year.

Mr. STANFIELD. I notice in the newspapers a statement that the Minister of Railways is expected to spend a month or two in inspecting the Intercolonial. While he is on that tour of inspection, I would like him to spend a few days in my county. The reason I ask is that we are sadly in need of branch railways. I will not weary the House or take up its time with a long discussion of these matters, but I would merely say that the branch railways particularly needed are from Brookfield to Lansdowne, Brule to Truro, and from Parrsboro' to Truro. The minister need not laugh at this. If he had seen, as I saw last fall, the farmers and the merchants of that country having their stuff hauled over muddy roads—it was a muddy season—at a cost of $3 to $5 a ton, he would have seen the need of these branch roads. And I believe it can be shown that the roads I have mentioned are a paying proposition. If the minister will spend a day or two with me, we will look it over.

Improvements at Sackville, $27,000.

Mr. CROCKET. What are these improvements?

Mr. McLENNAN.

Mr. GRAHAM. Station, freight sheds, grading of track, water service and so on—total, $66,000.

Mr. CROCKET. Have the contracts been let?

Mr. GRAHAM. The contract has been let for the station. Calls are out for the freight sheds, but tenders have not yet been received.

Mr. CROCKET. What was the contract for the water system?

Mr. GRAHAM. It was $32,000.

Mr. CROCKET. Who was the contractor?

Mr. GRAHAM. Willard, Kitchen & Co., Limited.

Mr. CROCKET. How much for the station?

Mr. GRAHAM. The contractor is Thomas R. Anderson, at $20,000.

Mr. CROCKET. Speaking of stations, I do not want to repeat at length what I have already said in this House and privately to the minister, in regard to the need for a new station of the Intercolonial at Fredericton. The Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) who was acting Minister of Railways last session, admitted that Fredericton was entitled to a better station than we have now. The Minister of Railways has himself visited Fredericton and seen the station, and both he and his deputy have admitted that the station is neither creditable to the railway nor to Fredericton, as the capital of the province. I will simply say that the Fredericton people are looking to the Supplementary Estimates this year to find provision for a new building and that they will be grievously disappointed if no provision is made.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the total amount of these improvements? What will be required after this vote to complete them?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is expected that this vote will complete the work. There is a revote here of $20,000. The total cost will be $66,000.

Mr. CROCKET. I would like to hear from the Minister of Railways as to the proposition to erect a new station at Fredericton.

Mr. GRAHAM. They are not in these estimates.

Mr. CROCKET. I have noticed that.

Mr. GRAHAM. I can say nothing further, except to recommend faith and hope for a few days.

Towards double tracking parts of line, $200,000.

Mr. DANIEL. What parts of the line are to be doubled track?

Mr. GRAHAM. From Moncton to Painsec Junction.

Mr. HAGGART. What is your plan for double tracking the road? Has the minister looked over the southern road from Moncton to Halifax that he did not know whether he would adopt or not?

Mr. GRAHAM. The double track is absolutely necessary on this piece to accommodate the traffic. This double track goes toward Prince Edward Island. The other question is a large one. If the trade of Canada is to come from the west and to be exported from Canadian ports, and the goods imported into Canadian ports at Halifax and St. John, they will have to be provided for. The Grand Trunk Pacific is near Moncton, the Canadian Pacific Railway is now at St. John, the Canadian Northern is at Quebec, and some way will have to be found to get this traffic from Moncton to St. John and Halifax, and somebody will have to provide more railway communication between Moncton and St. John and between Moncton and Halifax.

Mr. HAGGART. The Grand Trunk Pacific will not be finished until 1911, and it will require a couple of years to develop the traffic at least, so it will be thirteen years before the minister will have to take into consideration either the double tracking from Moncton or building this new line.

Mr. EMMERSON. This question was discussed two or three years ago in this House. The policy was then laid down that the Intercolonial should be doubled tracked between St. John and Halifax, as early as circumstances would permit, and there were certain portions of the line which, if it were to meet present requirements, must necessarily be double tracked at once. For instaance, a double track was absolutely necessary between Halifax and Windsor Junction. That work was done, and also a double track was put down between Stellarton and New Glasgow. At the same time there was a location made between Hampton and the city of St. John. That work I believe has not been commenced, although the surveys have been made. Within the very near future a double track will have to be extended on to Springhill. Between Moncton and Springhill the traffic to-day is very heavy indeed. One of the great difficulties in proceeding with the double track must necessarily be the grade between Dorchester and Sackville. Pursuant to that policy, the Department of Railways and Canals, as I understand, have been conducting surveys in order to obviate some of these difficulties. Therefore, this is not a new question, it is one which has been practically settled. In the very near future, and indeed before the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway reaches Moncton and seeks an outlet at Halifax, the necessities of the traffic between Moncton and Truro and Truro and Halifax will make it absolutely necessary for the government to double track that portion of the Intercolonial.

Mr. TAYLOR. Perhaps the minister would allow the balance of this item to stand and let us go back to item 102, on which the leader of the opposition wants to make some remarks.

National Transcontinental Railway, $30,000,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has the minister made any estimate of what the total cost will be from Winnipeg to Moncton ?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend will see that he is taking me unawares. The member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) drew a pledge from me at six o'clock that I would not bring this matter up and I left all my papers in the office.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN, Then I had better leave the mattetr until the minister makes his speech. Will it include any statement of the cost of the road?

Mr. GRAHAM. I will have to prepare my statement after I get through with the House to-night. I will give all the information I possibly can.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then perhaps I had better go on and give the minister the benefit of some little researches I have made into the cost of construction, and they will be subject to any subsequent criticism the minister may see fit to make. It is well for the purpose of convenience to place upon the records of the House the purport of the returns that have been brought down touching the cost of the eastern division of the Transcontinental Railway. In answer to a question put by myself, the minister in the month of May last brought down a statement, Sessional Return 39f, which is as follows :

The Commissioners of the National Transcontinental Railway, Ottawa, April 4, 1908.

Dear Sir,—I have the honour to give below the answers to the inquiry of the ministry to be made by Hon. R. L. Borden as follows, viz.:

1 (a) The estimated length of the Transcontinental Railway from Winnipeg to north end of the St. Lawrence river bridge near Quebec is 1,344·92 miles.

(b) From north abutment of the St. Lawrence river bridge near Quebec to Moncton is 459·74 miles, which includes 1·11 miles of Quebec bridge link.

2. The estimated average cost per mile (not including Quebec bridge link) is $63,427.

3. This estimate is based on quantities as estimated by district engineers and contract prices so far as contracts have been let; remaining prices estimated by the commissioners' chief engineer. Distances are those of actual survey, and the total, from which the average cost per mile of completed main line

track is arrived at, includes the cost of 326 miles of sidings.

I have the honour to be,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) P. E. RYAN,
Secretary.

On a subsequent date I addressed to the minister this question:

Mr. R. L. BORDEN asked:

Referring to the return, sessional paper No. 39f, touching the estimated cost of the eastern division of the National Transcontinental Railway, which shows the total length, less the Quebec bridge, to be 1,803.55 miles, the average cost per mile to be $63,427, and the total estimated cost not including the Quebec bridge, to be $114,393,765.85, does this estimate include the cost of station houses, terminals, engine houses, round houses, turn tables, water tanks and all other buildings and structures necessary or usual for the effective operation of the road? If not, what will be the additional cost for all such purposes?

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). The estimate referred to in this question, of the average cost per mile of the eastern division of the National Transcontinental Railway, of $63,427, includes the cost of terminal yards, station houses, engine houses, turntables, water tanks and all buildings and structures, necessary or usual for the effective operation of the road; but does not include terminals at Winnipeg (in regard to which an agreement between the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, the Canadian Northern Railway and the commission was ratified, by Act of parliament during the session of 1907-8) or shops east of Winnipeg, or terminals at Quebec or connection therewith, plans of which have not yet been made and of which accordingly, no estimate of cost can yet be furnished.

At a subsequent date I asked the minister for some further information and, in response to my request, he was good enough to bring down another return which is sessional paper 39k and as it is of considerable importance and is not very long, I will read this also:

Memorandum *re* Trancontinental Railway.

The length of the road from Moncton to Winnipeg is 1,803·55 miles, or including the Quebec bridge 1·11 miles, 1,804·66 miles.

The estimate of $63,437 a mile did not include any allowance for interest.

For the terminals at Moncton, the sum of $97,000 was included in the above for a terminal yard. With regard to shop accommodation, it is assumed that an arrangement will be made for the joint use of the new shops of the Intercolonial. If so, the Transcontinental share of the capital expenditure on them is estimated at $750,000, or, at 4 per cent interest, $30,000 a year.

The terminals at Quebec would include the cost of the line from the Quebec bridge to Champlain market, Quebec, say six miles and terminals at the market, at a cost of, say $2,000,000.

It is not practicable, at the present time, to state the extent of the liability in connection with the Quebec bridge, nor to furnish any estimate of the cost of building it.

For the shops east of Winnipeg the estimate is $1,500,000.

With regard to terminals at Winnipeg, by the agreement of March 1, 1907, confirmed by the Act of that year, chapter 52, between the Canadian Northern, the Grand Trunk Pacific and the government, the value of the Canadian Northern lands is fixed at $2,625,000, upon which sum the Grand Trunk Pacific and the government, under clause 13, are to pay, in equal shares, one half of 4 per cent, or $26,250 a year each. This includes grading, levelling and filling, as at the date of the agreement; but does not include buildings, fixtures, tracks and other improvements and facilities. For these—which the Canadian Northern undertakes to construct and supply—the Grand Trunk Pacific and the government are to pay, in equal shares, one half of 4½ per cent. The assumed cost is set down by the chief engineer of the Trancontinental Railway at $2,000,000, making the amount payable by the government yearly $22,500, or a total for the Winnipeg terminals of $48,750.

The whole of the lands of the Canadian Northern Railway on the Winnipeg side of the Red river, together with the buildings, fixtures, improvements, tracks and facilities will be jointly used by the Canadian Northern, the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Transcontinental Railways, with equal rights for passenger and local freight business.

As to the question of the probable date for the completion of the railway between Moncton and Winnipeg, the department is advised by the chief engineer of the Trancontinental Railway that in his opinion if contracts for the remaining portions of the line are awarded before the middle of September next; and the labour market remains anything like it is at present, there should be no difficulty in fully completing the line by December 1, 1911.

Re Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.

The length of the road is approximately 1,755 miles, comprising the Prairie section extending from Winnipeg to the east bank of Wolfe creek, a distance of 916 miles, of which the whole has been finally located, and the Mountain section from Wolfe creek to Prince Rupert, 839 miles, of which 278½ miles have been finally located.

Wolfe creek is 119½ miles west from Edmonton. The grade elevation there is 665 feet above the grade elevation at Edmonton, and the grade elevation at Yellow Head Pass is 840 feet above that at Wolfe creek.

The estimated cost of construction is set down, at the present date, at $61,520,000, which includes for terminals at Prince Rupert, $3,000,000.

With regard to the question of the date of completion of the road, the president of the Grand Trunk Pacific has telegraphed, in reply to an inquiry from the department, that they expect to carry out their obligations to complete the railway to Prince Rupert by December 1, 1911, and it is possible will be able to anticipate that date to some extent. This is the extended date fixed by the Act of 1904, chapter 80.

Memorandum for the Hon. Mr. Graham respecting Mr. Borden's inquiries, page 10,694, 'Hansard,' in regard to the National Transcontinental Railway, in so far as the same affect the Finance Department.

Mr. Borden, after discussing the cost per mile and inquiring the present estimate as to the length of time to be occupied in the construction of the road, concludes: 'I would like to know also the approximate rate of interest to be paid upon money which will have to be borrowed for that purpose. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways may be obliged to seek the assistance of the Finance Minister, but I think that the information I ask is reasonably required for the purpose of the discussion which will take place when the minister makes his statement. I would like the minister to give me the estimated rate of interest which we would have to pay on the cost of the road during the period of seven years after its completion, in which period the Grand Trunk Pacific will pay no rental.'

The issue of 3 per cent government guaranteed bonds to the amount of £3,200,000 already made by the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, netted about 92½, approximately an interest charge of about 3:24 per cent on net proceeds. There has been thus far no loan negotiated by the government exclusively for the National Transcontinental Railway. What the cost of money will be when future issues of the Grand Trunk Pacific guaranteed bonds are made, or at what rate the government will be able to borrow money for the purposes of the construction of the eastern division, it is impossible to hazard a forecast which would be a present guide. That will necessarily depend on the fluctuations of the money market.

Mr. Borden asks in the same connection 'the exact amount of the liabilities of the country in connection with the Quebec bridge up to this date, as well as the approximate estimate of the cost necessary for the building of that bridge.'

The government's liability for the Quebec Bridge Company was limited by chapter 54 of the Acts of 1903 to a guarantee of the payment of the principal and interest on an authorized bond issue by the company to the amount of $6,678,200. This guarantee was given and the bonds were issued and pledged by the company to the Bank of Montreal for the raising of the money. Of these guaranteed bonds £478,700, approximately $2,330,000, have since been returned to the government and are held as collateral for an advance of $2,000,000 made by the government to the bridge company under the provisions of chapter 35, Acts of 1907. The remaining bonds to the amount of the sterling equivalent of $4,348,200, are outstanding in the hands of the Bank of Montreal. The bank's claim against the bridge company on April 30, 1908, for general advances and interest was $3,773,223.71, and for further special advances the bank claimed on May 31, 1908, $174,431.36.

No estimate, so far as the Finance Department is advised, have been made of the cost of rebuilding the Quebec bridge, or of what part of it would be a charge against the Transcontinental Railway.

Mr. Borden further says: 'Then the minister, of course, remembers that for a period of seven years the country is to pay interest on those bonds so guaranteed without recourse. I would like a statement which will follow from the information already asked of the estimated amount which the country will pay over without recourse in respect of the Mountain division.

Uncertainty as to the rate of interest at which money can be obtained during the next few years makes it impossible to submit anything like an accurate calculation in reply to this question.

(Sgd.)N. T. R.

Finance Department, June 30, 1908.

For the purpose of estimating the liability of the country in connection with the road it might be proper to refer for a moment to the provisions of the agreements of 1903 and 1904 between the government and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and to the Acts of this parliament which ratified these agreements. By section 28 of the agreement of 1903 it was provided that the government should guarantee the bonds, with respect to the construction of the prairie section, to an amount not exceeding $13,000 per mile and, with respect to the Mountain section, to an amount not exceeding $30,000 per mile. By section 4 of the agreement of 1904, the latter provision was modified so far as the Mountain section is concerned, so that in respect of the Mountain section the country is under obligation to guarantee bonds to the amount of three-fourths of the cost of construction, whatever that cost of construction may be.

It may also be proper to refer to the leasing provisions of the agreement of 1903. By these leasing provisions it was provided that after the completion of the road from Winnipeg to Moncton it shall be leased to the Grand Trunk Pacific under certain conditions for a period of fifty years. During the first seven years the Grand Trunk Pacific is to pay no rental whatever, and during the balance of forty-three years it is to pay a rental of three per cent upon the cost of construction as ascertained under the agreement; provided, however, that if during the first three years of the period of forty-three years just alluded to, the net earnings of the road shall be insufficient to pay the rental of three per cent, then to the extent to which they are insufficient the Grand Trunk Pacific shall not be obliged to pay rental but the rental so unpaid shall be added to the cost of construction. I think I have fairly stated the provisions of the agreement reciting them at length. I should add that the cost of terminals under sections 15 and 18 of the agreement of 1903 are to be included in the cost of construction for the purpose of any estimate made under those agreements.

It is not necessary or advisable for me at this juncture to go very exhaustively into the estimates made in 1903 as to what the road would cost the country. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) at page 8,583 of 'Hansard' of 1903, estimated that the New Brunswick section of the eastern division, from Moncton to Quebec, the length being estimated by him at 400 miles, would cost $25,000 per mile, or $10,000,000, and from Quebec to Winnipeg, he estimated the length as 1,475 miles, at $28,000 per mile;

making $41,300,000, or a total cost of construction from Winnipeg to Moncton of $51,300,000.

The right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) at page 7691 of 'Hansard' used these words :

> The sum total of the money to be paid by the government for the construction of the line from Moncton to the Pacific will be in the neighbourhood of twelve or thirteen million dollars.

And to the same effect was the language of the then Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) at page 7711 of 'Hansard.' The hon. the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) at page 10304 of 'Hansard' confirmed the above statement of the Prime Minister as to the probable cost of the road.

I estimated the road from Winnipeg to Moncton at $40,000 per mile for 1,875 miles or a total of $75,000,000 and the estimate which I made at that time was regarded by hon. gentlemen opposite as excessive to the point of absurdity. Let us look a little at the actual cost of the road as borne out by the figures brought down by the government.

I shall read a statement which I have prepared in order that the figures may appear in consecutive order upon the pages of 'Hansard.' Let me say to my hon. friend the Minister of Railways that so far as data were available from official returns brought down by the government this session I have used those data and where I have been obliged through the absence of information to make any estimate of my own, I have endeavoured to be conservative and thoroughly within the mark. The estimate which I have made as to the eastern division is as follows :

Statement of cost to Canada of National Transcontinental Railway.
Eastern division.

Construction of railway from Moncton to Winnipeg, 1,803.55 miles, at estimated cost of $63,427 per mile.	$114,393,765
Allowing five years for period of construction there will be an average of 2½ years' simple interest at 3½ per cent per year during construction, or $4,003,781.67 per year for 2½ years..	10,009,454
Cost of eastern division at completion will thus be	124,403,219
To this must be added 7 years' interest at 3 per cent (not compounded) after completion during which Grand Trunk Pacific is to pay no rent..	26,124,676
Also interest at 3 per cent for three years additional during which no rent is collectable unless earnings are sufficient..	11,196,290
	$161,724,185

Quebec bridge.

Cost of Quebec bridge up to March 1, 1907..	*$5,422,238	
Estimated cost of completion..	9,000,000	
		14,422,238

* 'Hansard,' 1907, p. 7960.

Terminals.

Estimated cost of our share of terminals at Quebec, Winnipeg and Moncton, and shops east of Winnipeg..	5,470,000
	$181,616,423

Mountain section.

Cost of mountain section (839 miles) as stated in return brought down, $61,520,000.	
Seventy-five per cent of the above, $46,140,000, to be guaranteed by the government for construction of mountain section.	
And the government agrees to pay without recourse the interest on bonds so guaranteed for 7 years which at 3½ per cent amounts to..	$ 11,304,300

Recapitulation of cash expenditure.

Total cash expenditure and interest in respect of eastern division as above..	$124,403,219
To this must be added 7 years' interest at 3 per cent (not compounded) after completion during which G. T. P. is to pay no rent..	26,124,676
Also interest at 3 per cent for three years additional during which no rent is collectable unless earnings are sufficient..	11,196,290
Cost of Quebec bridge as estimated	14,422,238
Interest to be paid by government without recourse on mountain section..	11,304,300
Cost of terminals at Moncton, Quebec and Winnipeg, including shops east of Winnipeg..	5,470,000
Total cash expenditure	$192,920,723

Bond guarantee.

In addition to the above cash expenditure the government incurs the following obligations on its guarantee of bonds—	
Guarantee on bonds issue on mountain section as above..	46,140,000
Guarantee of bond issue on prairie section, 916 miles, at $13,000 per mile..	11,908,000
	$ 58,048,000

Cash expenditure	$192,820,723
Bond guarantee..	58,048,000
Total..	$250,968,723

In order to explain the basis of some of these estimates I would like to say a word or two, and that is really the only comment I have to make, because the figures which I have brought to the attention of the House, and which I submit for the comment and criticism of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals, speak for

themselves. I have allowed five years for the period of construction. I base that on the statement in the return brought down that the road will be completed about December, 1911, and on the information contained in the report of the commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway, dated October 9, 1906, in which they point out at page 16 that in the spring of that year contracts were awarded for a considerable portion of the road—150 miles in one contract and 244 miles in another contract—and the report proceeds to state that the work had been commenced and was in progress. Therefore the estimate of five years for the period of construction is somewhat less than I would have been justified in taking if I had adhered strictly to the official returns on which my information is based.

I have taken two and a half years as the period for which interest would be charged. That I think is the usual practice. During the period of five years the interest charges will continually increase. During the first year they will be very small. During the last year they will be very large. The custom, as I understand, is to take one-half of the period of construction and estimate interest, at whatever the rate may be, for that period. So far as the rate is concerned I have taken the reply of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance in the House today in which he says that a recent loan has been floated bearing interest at 3¾ per cent. That loan was underwritten at par. I have taken 3½ per cent or ¼ per cent below the rate on the loan, as a fair interest charge during the period of construction.

With respect to the interest during the seven years during which the Grand Trunk Pacific Company pay no rental, I have endeavoured to be very conservative in my estimate. The Grand Trunk Pacific agree to pay a rental of 3 per cent after seven years. It is highly probable that during that period of seven years the interest which the country will have to pay will be at least 3½ per cent, and I think I would have been justified in making up the loss to the country during that period at that rate, but I have given the government and the transaction the benefit of the doubt, and I have made my estimate during that period at only 3 per cent, which is the rate of rental the Grand Trunk Pacific Company will eventually pay to the government.

I have observed the same course in making an estimate for the three years additional, computing the interest during those three years at 3 per cent and not at 3½ per cent. The comment and criticism may of course be made that during those three years it is possible that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, by means of the operation of the road, may show such net earnings that some portion of this $11,000,000 will be reimbursed to the country. I would hardly think that very probable; therefore, I have taken the liberty of including the whole of that as an amount which the country will have to bear in the end. If the Minister of Railways and Canals has any data or argument to show that this is not a fair way of dealing with that particular part of the transaction, he will of course submit his arguments and considerations to the House when he comes to examine the statement I have made. Looking at the character of the country through which the road runs, looking at the enormous difficulties which will confront the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company in operating that road during the winter, looking at the almost entire absence of local traffic during the first ten years at least, I would think it a reasonable assumption that there would be no net earnings of the road available for the purpose of paying any rental during those three years. That of course must be a matter of opinion and of argument, and to a certain extent of conjecture. However, I have taken the view that we shall be responsible for the whole of that $11,000,000, and will not be reimbursed in respect of any part of it, and, therefore, I have added it to the other amounts included in the total cash outlay which this road will entail upon the country.

A word or two of explanation may be added as to my basis of estimate for the cost of the Quebec bridge. In 1907 my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, at page 7960 of 'Hansard,' informed an hon. gentleman on this side of the House—I think it was my hon. friend from Simcoe—that the cost of the Quebec bridge up to the 1st of March, 1907, had amounted to the sum of $5,422,258. The details of the position of the country with regard to the construction of that bridge are pretty well set out in the return which has been brought down and in the Acts of parliament alluded to in that return. I need not go at any length into the subject at the present time. It is sufficient to say that the Quebec bridge is recognized by all parties in this House as an essential and integral part of the National Transcontinental Railway which must be pushed to a completion at as early a date as possible in order that there may be in effective operation a through line from Winnipeg to Moncton. Therefore we come to the question as to what would be a fair amount to estimate as the cost of completing the Quebec bridge. The greater part of that work has become a wreck. I do not know how far completed it was—perhaps one-half or more than one-half at the time of its collapse. I have been able to get no assistance whatever from the government in this regard, and I think I might reasonably have expected some assistance; in the absence of official information I have estimated the sum of $9,000,000 as a fair and reasonable

amount for the cost of completing that bridge so as to make that through line from Winnipeg to Moncton a through line in every sense of the word. If my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals has any grounds upon which he would reasonably think that that sum of $9,000,000 ought to be cut down, I shall be ready to give every fair consideration to anything he can bring forward for that purpose.

So far as the cost of the terminals is concerned, a word of explanation is perhaps also due. I have taken the cost of terminals at Moncton, as stated in the return brought down, at $750,000; I have taken the cost of the terminals and approaches at Quebec, as stated in the return brought down, at $2,000,000; I have taken the cost of the shops east of Winnipeg, as stated in the return brought down, at $1,500,000, and I have capitalized the annual sums which we shall be obliged to pay, according to this return, for the use of terminals at Winnipeg. The way in which I have done that cannot, I think, be criticised as unfair. The statement in the return is as follows:

With regard to terminals at Winnipeg, by agreement of March 1, 1907, confirmed by the Act of that year, chapter 52, between the Canadian Northern, the Grand Trunk Pacific and the government, the value of the Canadian Northern land is fixed at $2,625,000, upon which sum the Grand Trunk Pacific and the government, under clause 13, are to pay, in equal shares, one-half of four per cent, or $26,250 a year each. This includes grading, levelling and filling, as at the date of the agreement; but does not include building, fixtures, tracks and other improvements and facilities. For these—which the Canadian Northern undertakes to construct and supply—the Grand Trunk Pacific and the government are to pay, in equal shares, one-half of 4½ per cent. The assumed cost is set down by the chief engineer of the Transcontinental Railway at $2,000,000, making the amount payable by the government yearly $22,500, or a total for the Winnipeg terminals of $48,750.

Capitalizing an annual payment of $48,750 at 4 per cent would make approximately $1,220,000 which I have estimated. If I had taken it at 3½ or 3 per cent, the amount would have been much greater. I have taken 4 per cent as the agreement seems to be to some extent based on that rate. And the total of these sums is in all $5,470,000 which I have taken as the cost of the terminals in my calculation.

So far as the Mountain section is concerned—

Mr. GRAHAM. Would my hon. friend allow me. I want to read this clause of the agreement between the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Canadian Northern and the government:

With regard to the compensation payable by the Grand Trunk Pacific and the government 'in equal shares' to the Canadian Northern

for the joint terminals (namely one-half of four per cent on $2,625,000 and one-half of four and a half per cent on the buildings, tracks, and facilities under clauses 5, 8, 10 and 13 (a) and (b)—clause 49 goes on to provide that, prior to the execution of the lease of the eastern division to the Grand Trunk Pacific, this compensation shall be paid by the Transcontinental Railway commissioners and form part of the 'cost of construction' of the eastern division, and for the first seven years of the lease such compensation shall be wholly born by the government; the Grand Trunk Pacific for the next forty-three years, repaying annually to the government, by way of rental, the amount of the said compensation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have not taken anything except what is in the return brought down. If there be any modification by reason of the provision just mentioned, we will find that out when the hon. gentleman comments on my statement. I take the payment of $48,750 anually—and I capitalize that at a rate which I think could not reasonably be complained of.

Mr. GRAHAM. I may be wrong but I think that eventually goes into the cost of construction.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps it does and if so I shall stand corrected to that extent. I cannot say that I have thought that particular matter out and speak subject to any observation of my hon. friend in that regard.

In this conection, I should say further that I think I have omitted some charges that I might very reasonably have included. My statement had to be made up hurriedly, after getting information from my hon. friend this afternoon, and I have not included in it—but my hon. friend may and I think should include in it—the interest charges on the cost of these terminals. I did include interest on the cost of the construction of the road but had not the time to work out the interest charges on the $5,000,000 and upwards, which are estimated as the cost of the terminals. If that is charged, my hon. friend will probably find that it will more than offset any little criticism of the character to which he has just now alluded.

So far as the Mountain section is concerned, I inquired of the minister this afternoon whether or not the sum of $61,520,000, set forth in the return, was the cost of the whole line from Winnipeg to the coast or the cost of the Mountain section only. My hon. friend assured me that it was the cost of the Mountain section only, and I have made my statement on that basis. Seventy-five per cent of that sum amounts to $46,140,000. As regards the interest charged in that connection, I have adopted the same basis as that to which I have already alluded. I have taken 3½ per cent in the absence of any information from the department of Finance or the Department of Railways, as

a reasonable rate and I have computed the interest charged for seven years in that $11,304,300.

I desire to give a plain statement of what I conceive to be the cost of this road as based on the official information which I have been able to obtain. It is subject to any correction or observation on the part of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways ; but if you subject it to the most searching criticism, I do not think you can find that it will be brought materially below the amount I have estimated, namely, $192,920,723, which is rather a staggering amount for the country to face, especially under present conditions. Because going on as we are, it would seem exceedingly probable that, by the time this road is completed, the debt of this country will have reached the figure of about $450,000,000. I would venture to think that such a consideration might well give us pause, especially when contemplating some of the very large expenditures which have been promised, both in this House and out of it, by hon. gentlemen on the treasury benches.

The public debt of Canada at present is, I suppose, from $265,000,000 to $268,000,000. The cost of this road will amount to at least $190,000,000 before we are through with it ; and unless some considerable portion of that amount can be paid out of revenue—which does not seem very probable under present conditions—the total debt of this country, by the time this road is completed, without our spending a dollar for the development of our ports and inland waterways or in the construction of railways or for any other of the enormous calls that will be made on the treasury within the early future—without taking into consideration a single one of these demands on the public treasury, the public debt of Canada is likely to reach $450,000,000 before we pay for the building of this National Transcontinental Railway. For this reason, I thought it important at this time to invite the attention of the House and the country, and especially of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways, to the estimate I have made and the data upon which it is founded, and to ask from him his criticism and comment. And if he finds my statement not according to his judgment, I sincerely trust we shall have from him some statement as to what, in his opnion, the total cost to the country will be by the time the railway is completed.

Item allowed to stand.

Mr. HAGGART. Will the minister be kind enough, in making his statement tomorrow, to tell us whether, in the estimate of $63,437 a mile, he includes the terminals at Quebec or the shops at Winnipeg because it is not clear, under this statement, whether these are included or not.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think I answered that question when it was asked by the leader of the opposition some time ago.

Mr. DANIEL. Last year, when this item of double-tracking was up, I asked the then Minister of Railways what parts of the line were to be double-tracked out of the vote. He mentioned, amongst others, that part of the Intercolonial between St. John and Hampton. I see by the report of the Minister of Railways and Canals that the survey was made and plans and specifications prepared for double-tracking that part. But I think that no start has been made in the matter, and I suppose the money voted last year must have been deflected to some other purpose. Is it the intention to go on with double-tracking that part of the road at an early day?

Mr. GRAHAM. We are not asking for any vote for that work. This is for double tracking between Moncton and Painsec Junction.

Mr. DANIEL. What was done with the vote for that purpose?

Mr. GRAHAM. Was it a vote or a statement of the minister?

Mr. DANIEL. I only know that the minister said it was for that purpose.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. It was not so stated in the estimate?

Mr. DANIEL. It was so stated by the minister.

Mr. CROCKET. Does the minister say that this whole vote of $200,000 is for double-tracking the Intercolonial between Moncton and Painsec Junction?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. CROCKET. How many miles is that?

Mr. GRAHAM. Less than eight miles.

Mr. CROCKET. How far has the work advanced now?

Mr. GRAHAM. About half way.

Locomotive and car shops with equipment, $570,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is for the new locomotive and car shops with equipment, also grading and providing additional yard accommodation.

Mr. J. D. REID. There is a contract that we have been trying to get some information about in connection with these Moncton car shops. The engineer, Mr. Mackenzie, it appears, has given a verbal contract for the amount of $50,000 or $60,000 under which work has been done but concerning which the government do not seem to have any information.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. It was given at schedule rates.

Mr. J. D. REID. No.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Yes, if the hon. gentleman will read the evidence be-

fore the Public Accounts Committee he will see that.

Mr. J. D. REID. As I understand it, the chief engineer has made a contract, as he claims, partly under schedule rate, and the other part is to be done by the contractor at whatever it costs plus 15 per cent. But the contractor himself states that the whole work is to be done by him and he is to get 15 per cent profit on his work.

Mr. CROCKET. And the deputy minister says that the contract is entirely independent of the contract for the building.

Mr. J. D. REID. Here are these two statements, one of the chief engineer and one of the contractor.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. The chief engineer is to come before the committee on Friday.

Mr. J. D. REID. He has already made that statement. Here is a work involving a large amount of money about which neither the deputy minister nor anybody else on behalf of the government seems to have learned anything until it was brought up at the Public Accounts Committee and, up to this day, we are not able to find out what has been done. The contractor swears that he cannot tell what amount has been paid out. Neither did Mr. Mackenzie, the engineer, know. That is a strange way of doing business. If the minister has any information, we would like to know what has been expended on that contract.

Mr. GRAHAM. We have paid nothing to Mr. Walberg for that as yet. This is a large building. And, as often occurs in these cases, it is more convenient to have such a work as this sewer done by the man who already has the large contract, for he work to the best advantage. This sewer is 2,880 feet long. At the shops and for 800 feet it is 20 to 24 feet in depth, and the balance is of 20 feet. So, this is not a small work. It is done in a way that is quite usual in railways, on what is called force account. That is, if you have confidence in the contractor, you give him the contract for his actual cost, plus so much. That is practically what is done with Mr. Wallberg. He has all the appliances for the work, and the engineer at Moncton thought this the most practicable way to get it done. The contractor is to be paid cost price—for which he must show actual progress for every dollar—plus 15 per cent, he supplying all the tools and that sort of thing. Up to date we have not paid him anything on his work, because he has not asked for anything.

Mr. J. D. REID. That statement does not agree with the statement of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), who said that the work was being done at schedule rates.

Mr. J. D. REID.

Mr. CROCKET. The deputy minister stated distinctly that the schedule under the contract did not apply to that work, that it was an entirely independent contract, which the engineer made without any authority from the department. The job has been in progress now for over a year ,and I think Mr. Walberg himself stated that it would probably cost upwards of $20,000.

Mr. MACDONALD. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that Mr. Mackenzie, the engineer, did wrong in providing for the work to be done in this way?

Mr. CROCKET. I certainly do. I say it is an extraordinary thing for an engineer of the railway to assume the responsibility of entering into a contract of that magnitude without any instructions from the department. I doubt whether the department itself, until this House authorized an appropriation for the purpose, would have been warranted in entering into any contract. Much less was a subordinate official of the Intercolonial at Moncton authorized to prepare plans for this work, and enter into a contract, and set the contractor at work, under a verbal agreement, without having received any instructions from any official of the department, or even reporting the matter to the department down to the time that the deputy minister was examined a few weeks ago. I was somewhat surprised at the statement of the deputy minister when his attention was called to the matter and he was made conversant with all the facts. He did not even seem to have reprimanded Mr. Mackenzie for having assumed such a responsibility. He said that he simply asked him the question, and expressed the opinion that there should have been a written contract. The member for Pictou asked me if I saw anything wrong in this matter. I say that if the people of this country are to be rendered liable for contracts of this kind entered into by subordinate officials of the railway, without any instructions from the department, not to say without any appropriations being voted by parliament, I do see something decidedly wrong in it.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Of course, the version of my hon. friend from York (Mr. Crocket) as to what was said in the Public Accounts Committee is entirely out of order. I understand my hon. friend from York has asked Mr. Mackenzie to appear before that committee on Friday, when we will hear that matter discussed, and I assume we will have a report to this House, on which the whole question can be considered. My hon. friend from York says that because this was not contained in the original contract, therefore it was an enormous thing to do. Now, if it was con-

tained in the original contract there would be no question about it, because it would form part of the work that was to be done under the arrangement that was made with the contractor. But my hon. friend knows too much about these matters not to know that when there are subsidiary propositions to be dealt with in a very large contract, there are various ways of dealing with them. As a matter of policy, the thing can be advertised and left open to new contractors, who cannot work so expeditiously as the original contractor could do the larger work. Then it can be done on schedule rates.

Mr. HAGGART. How can you do that on schedule rates?

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. In that contract a large amount of excavation is provided for, and it was tendered for at schedule rates. The construction of a sewer is naturally a question of excavation that could be dealt with along the same line as the excavation for the original work. I only mention that as one of the methods by which it could be dealt with. There is a third method of dealing with it, and that is by force account. Any one acquainted with railway business knows that it is a method which is resorted to invariably by railway companies, because it is a fair method. Take the amount actually expended by the contractor, and 15 per cent is a reasonable amount of profit, and is so recognized by railway companies everywhere in dealing with works of that kind. I do not understand that my hon. friend takes any objection to the method of dealing with it by force account, but merely that Mr. Mackenzie should not have done what he did. I would like to hear Mr. Mackenzie's explanation of that matter when he comes before the committee. I agree with my hon. friend that Mr. Mackenzie should not assume too much responsibility. But let us remember that Mr. Mackenzie is an old official of the Intercolonial Railway, he was in the Intercolonial under my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart), and I do not think my hon. friend from Lanark would say that Mr. Mackenzie was not a perfectly responsible man. There is no politics in this question, it is simply a question whether Mr. Mackenzie exercised an accurate judgment. For myself, I await his explanation before deciding whether he assumed a responsibility which he ought not to have assumed. I am inclined to agree with my hon. friend that if he did assume an unwarranted responsibility for expenditure, it is a matter that the minister should deal with, and no doubt he will do so. But Mr. Mackenzie's record in the Intercolonial, his reputation as an engineer and his whole course, are such that I do not think that my hon. friend ought to impute any wrong-doing to him until he has some better grounds for it.

Mr. BLACK. He is a good Tory.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I am not discussing this matter from a political standpoint. I think I have fairly stated the facts, and I submit that we can fairly trust the minister to deal with the matter as his judgment shall dictate.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman talks about the contractor being paid by schedule rates. Who ever heard of a contractor being paid by schedule rates for the building of locomotive and car shops with equipment? He is paid on progress estimates. Schedule rates only come in on earth works or stone excavation, or anything of that kind.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. This work was of that description.

Mr. HAGGART. The principle is this: When a contractor enters into a contract, if contracts are drawn up now as they used to be, he accepts responsibility for all the quantities made out by the department. If there is an error committed by the department there is a provision in the contract that before the contractor commences his work he has to get a written order from the chief engineer, and the chief engineer generally allows him, as the hon. member has stated, what has been the actual amount expended on the work plus 15 per cent. There can be but very little of that kind of work in the contract for the building of the car shops, the locomotives and equipment.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. The point is as to whether or not this sewer, which was necessary in consequence of the erection of the shops, should have been included in the original contract.

Mr. HAGGART. If this large expenditure is not included in the contract the engineer in chief, or the engineer in charge, has no right to let that work to the contractor. The proper way is to call for new tenders for the work. The contractor assumes the responsibility of the engineering and of the architecture of the building and the schedule price has only reference to the work under contract. If there has been a mistake made by the architect or the party who drew the plans for these buildings that must be corrected by the engineer and before the contractor does a cent's worth of work, or is entitled to anything, he must get an order from the engineer in his own hand writing. If there have been large sums of money expended outside of the contract there is no justification at all for it.

Mr. J. D. REID. What makes this thing look rather bad, in so far as the engineer is concerned, is this: Here is an expenditure which is started. If there had been any payment on account of the work at all we would have been able to have had the matter brought up and properly investigated in the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Does my hon. friend blame the department or Mr. Mackenzie?

Mr. J. D. REID. Mr. Mackenzie is an officer of the department and it was Mr. Mackenzie who made the mistake if a mistake was made. If moneys had been paid on it we would have been able to have investigated it in the Public Accounts Committee. When does the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) expect that the matter can be brought up in the Public Accounts Committee according to the rules of this House?

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. You have brought it up now.

Mr. J. D. REID. I admit it is practically out of order.

Mr. HAGGART. Not out of order at all.

Mr. J. D. REID. To bring it up in the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. We have been very liberal in giving you the opportunity of going into all these matters.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. As this is before the Public Accounts Committee perhaps it would be better to leave it there.

Mr. HAGGART. When we are discussing an item in the estimates, because that item is under consideration by the Public Accounts Committee, surely we are not to be prevented from discussing in the fullest possible manner any evidence which may have been adduced concerning it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I believe you can discuss everything in connection with the item but hardly what is going on before the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. HAGGART. Why not? Can the evidence that is given in reference to this item not be discussed?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Because the committee has not reported on that point.

Mr. HAGGART. It reports the evidence every day.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand from the statements made that Mr. Mackenzie is still to be called before the committee. I just want to shorten the debate. You can discuss the item, but not what is going before the committee.

Mr. J. D. REID. I never heard of a case in which a department had a contract going on, but what there were progress estimates made on account of the contract. The result of the way this is manipulated will be that it will be two years before that item will appear in the Auditor General's Report, so that it can come up in the regular way in the Public Accounts Committee. Next session we will only be able to investigate what appears in the Auditor General's Report up to March 31, 1908. It is hardly fair in the interest of the public that the matter should be staved off so long. It is a very strange proceeding that the Department of Railways and Canals should allow an official of the department to give a contract outside of the original contract they gave, which will amount to anywhere from $20,000 to $50,000. The position, as I understand it, is that the officials can make contracts verbally without even advising the department. If the department undertake the erection of a building—take the Moncton car shops for instance—and if there are to be any extras or changes the minister should be made aware of what these changes are and what they are going to cost so that he can give orders as to how they are to be carried out. There is not a solitary contract on the Intercolonial Railway that has been carried out but what the amount has exceeded the contract price by a very large sum. I do not think that is the right way of doing business. If a man gives a contract to a private individual for a building he generally gets a statement of what the cost is to be and that is all he has to pay, but in so far as these works on the Intercolonial Railway are concerned, they exceed very much the amount of the estimate. If it is going on in this case how do we know that it is not going on in other cases?

Mr. CROCKET. When does the minister expect these works will be completed?

Mr. GRAHAM. The contractor says in four months. If they are completed in six or eight months I will be satisfied.

Mr. J. D. REID. We have not had an answer yet as to the total amount that has been spent.

Mr. GRAHAM. I told the hon. gentleman in my first statement, that I had no statement from the contractor and had not paid him anything. With reference to that work and the position of the department and the chief engineer, my hon. friend must remember that the chief engineer is an old employee. Hs is not in the position of a subordinate, as you call him, although he is subordinate to the department. He is chief engineer of the Intercolonial Railway. He is a man of great experience, and when the contract was let for that building it was found necessary to have a very large drain constructed. At some places it runs to a depth of 24 feet. It was necessary for drainage purposes and in his wisdom he made this arrangement with the contractor who had all the appliances on hand. My hon. friend will see that we do not pay the contractor anything on account of the work because there has never been any money voted up to the present time. The chief engineer thought it was wise to do this work immediately before the buildings were constructed and he started the construction

of this very large sewer for drainage purposes. If the accounts are kept properly and honestly I am prepared to say that this is as cheap a way as any of getting work of this kind done, and if it were my own I would be prepared to do it in that way.

New machinery for locomotive and car shops, $155,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. Some of this goes into the new shops at Moncton and some into the other shops at Halifax, Rivière du Loup and other places.

Mr. CROCKET. Is this by public advertisement and tender ?

Mr. GRAHAM. All the machinery is purchased by tender. We generally purchase from the large firms dealing in this.

Mr. CROCKETT. Is any of it purchased in the United States ?

Mr. GRAHAM. That has not been purchased yet. Sometimes we buy in the United States, but my object is to buy everything possible from our own Canadian people.

Rolling stock, $1,550,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is for additional rolling stock, ten passenger and twenty-two freight locomotives, three shunting locomotives, 300 box cars and so on.

Mr. BLAIN. What firms are supplying the new locomotives ?

Mr. GRAHAM. The passenger locomotives are purchased from the Montreal Company and the freights from the Canadian Company.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the price ?

Mr. GRAHAM. The passenger engines cost $24,000, and the freight engines $21,-950.

Increased accommodation at St. John, $120,-000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is for ballasting, grading tracks, car repair shops, coal pockets, &c.

Mr. J. D. REID. How much grain has passed through the government elevator there in the past year ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have not the figures, but I understand that a greater amount of grain has passed through this year than in any previous year.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the hon. gentleman intend to build a spur from the Intercolonial Railway near the wharf to Robertson's coal pockets at Robertson's wharf ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think we have not an amount in this year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think the coal company propose to build that themselves. They get the permission of the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. DANIEL. I understood the Intercolonial Railway would build it there and I presume expropriate the property to build it on.

Mr. GRAHAM. There is a basis on which all such things are done. Unless there is some special reason the private individual does the grading and tie laying and the railway lays down the tracks and takes a certain amount on the cars handled in order to repay the expenditure. No special arrangement has been made with the coal company.

Mr. HAGGART. The minister has given the cost of increased accommodation at Halifax at about $4,000,000. What has the increased accommodation at St. John cost ?

Mr. GRAHAM. We have spent at St. John up to March 31, 1907, $2,582,616.30.

Mr. DANIEL. Since when was that?

Mr. GRAHAM. A good many years back. I will not say really from the beginning, but this is the amount given to me as the total expenditure at St. John.

To put railway between Indiantown and Blackville into condition for operation, $80,000.

Mr. CROCKET. Why was nothing done with this matter last year?

Mr. GRAHAM. We could not get any contract to build the bridge there and the work was stopped. It was almost impossible in the early part of the year to get contracts.

Mr. CROCKET. When that is completed is it intended to make a connection with Fredericton by Newcastle and the Indiantown branch?

Mr. GRAHAM. I would not like to say what the intention is.

Improvements at Campbellton, $25,000.

Mr. J. D. REID. I would like to know what the policy of the department is in regard to purchasing coal cranes ; is it to be through a middleman or by contract? As I understand, you cannot buy in Canada the kind of cranes required for the Intercolonial Railway, and they have to be purchased from firms which the Intercolonial have been dealing with every year for the last ten or fifteen years. If we can buy other kinds of cranes from these firms, there is no reason why we cannot buy cranes for the coal business from them at less cost than he can buy them from a middleman.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. They are bought by tender.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Does not the hon. gentleman know that the people from

whom they are bought are Canadian agents of the American manufacturers who alone make them? He calls them middlemen, because they happen to live in Canada.

Mr. J. D. REID. The man from whom they were bought swore that he was not the agent of the firm that manufactured them.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. That is one instance.

Mr. J. D. REID. The government formerly always before purchased these cranes directly from the manufacturers except in one instance. I claim that if they do that they will save a lot of money.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is not fair to call the agent of a manufacturing establishment a middleman, as if you were making some reflection upon him. If a letter were sent to the agent's firm in the United States they would probably send it back to him so as not to do him an injustice. I do not think it is at all disgraceful to be a representative of one of these large firms. In some instances the firm themselves have asked us 10 per cent more than they have allowed their agents to quote us. What my hon. friend would call a middleman is a respectable agent of the firm, and the firm stands by him and allows him to do the business.

Mr. J. D. REID. I would like my hon. friend to show the case he mentions, for I never heard of such a case.

Ste. Rosalie,—Improvement at, $85,900.

Mr. GRAHAM. We are making arrangements for a water supply, for an engine house, a building for stores, a turntable, grading, masonry, tracks, and ballasting. The engine house and the tanks are under contract and the building for stores. The engine house $20,000, building for stores $3,500.

Increased accommodation and facilities along the line, $169,000.

Mr. HAGGART. That is a large sum and the House should insist on a specific statement of how the money is spent.

Mr. GRAHAM. A good deal is for additional sidings at different stations.

Mr. HAGGART. Hitherto these have been voted specifically. This is an exemplification of the absurdity of charging to capital account all these little expenditures.

To strengthen bridges, $190,000.

Mr. HAGGART. When is this work to be finished ? We have this item every year.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is work that has to be done. The strengthening of bridges is one of the most important things for the safety of the road and public. We did not spend anything last year.

Mr. MACDONALD. This vote is for changing bridges which were not up to the standard. You changed your locomotives and got much heavier ones and then have to change your bridges so as to make them capable of bearing them. When will this be finished ?

Mr. GRAHAM. We have really to go over the whole line, and there are one or two sections on the road that have not been really commenced.

Mr. HAGGART. We have had statements from every other minister of the amounts required to finish this particular kind of work and we ought to know specifically what is required to finish. Your bridges ought to be strengthened before you built heavier locomotives. The idea of buying heavy locomotives and then coming to the House for a vote for the purpose of strengthening the bridges. I must protest, as I have done again and again, that none of these expenditures should be charged to capital account. Fancy in Great Britain an expenditure of this kind being charged to capital account. They never charge items of that kind to capital account. No matter what the system of keeping books may be in the case of a railway company, in the case of a government-owned road, none of these items should be charged to capital account. Let me not be misunderstood. I have been represented by an hon. gentleman opposite as opposed to expenditure on capital account. Nothing of the kind, but what may be capital account on a private railway is not capital account on a railway owned by the government. None of these items should appear in the capital account of the Intercolonial Railway at all. When charged against capital, they do not go into the ordinary expenditure during the year. They are in the position of lead bounties charged to capital account for the purpose of enabling the Finance Minister to make a good financial showing. As the late Mr. Mackenzie held, when at the head of the Department of Public Works, and when in opposition, the capital of the Intercolonial Railway should be closed. Not that there should not be expenditure for useful work, which on other railways may be charged to capital account, but the simple fact of charging items of this kind to capital account is wrong and I protest against it.

Mines and Geological survey—Geological survey branch'—for engraving, lithographing, &c., of maps, plans and illustrations; and for copying and compiling of survey plans, maps and utilizing field notes, $20,000.

Mr. DANIEL. Are these maps made in the Geological Survey branch or in the same branch as the map making of the Interior department ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The map making of the Interior Department is separate alto-

gether from the Geological Survey. We have draughtsmen and map makers in the Geological Survey, and they do the work. In some of our work, we have the assistance of the photographers branch of which Mr. White is the head.

Mr. DANIEL. Who is the head of this department ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Mr. Senecal is the chief draughtsman.

To pay for specimens for Victoria Memorial Museum, $5,000.

Mr. DANIEL. Where are these specimens kept ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. In the Geological Survey on Sussex street.

Mr. LAKE. When is the new museum likely to be finished ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I understand that the work is progressing rapidly and hope it will be completed within two years.

Department of Labour—printing and stationery, including printing of 'Labour Gazette, allowances to correspondents, administration of Conciliation Act, Railway Labour Disputes Act, travelling expenses, &c., &c., and $500 for an accountant, which sum may be paid to any one in the civil service, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $30,700.

Mr. DANIEL. What is the amount of the allowance to correspondents of the 'Labour Gazette' ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. There are forty-five correspondents and each is paid at the rate of $100 per annum.

Mr. TAYLOR. There is an increase in this vote of $2,350. What is the explanation of that ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. As the hon. gentleman knows we passed last year the Act providing for investigation into labour disputes. We had about forty cases last year, and happily, they were all settled under the new law. We have had to send Mr. King and other representatives of the department to preside over these boards of inquiry and that entailed some expenditure. But I trust that the country approves of the work of the department in that direction, as we were very successful in all our investigations.

Fisheries—salaries and disbursements of fishery inspectors, overseers and guardians, $137,600.

Mr. BRODEUR. There is an increase of $10,000 in that vote. It is to provide for some new appointments in the Northwest and British Columbia and also some small increases in salaries to the officers.

Mr. TAYLOR. We are willing to allow these items to run through without very much discussion, reserving one, but with the right to discuss the whole vote.

Mr. BRODEUR. All right, which one does the hon. gentleman wish to have reserved ?

Mr. TAYLOR. The first one.

Lighthouse and coast service—construction of lighthouses and aids to navigation, including apparatus, submarine signals and providing suitable boats for carrying on construction work in the Gulf of St. Lawrence and elsewhere in the Dominion, $260,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This item was left over out of the general lighthouse and coast service.

Mr. DANIEL. I think the minister ought to give some idea of what is to be done under this vote.

Mr. BRODEUR. We discussed this item several times, and I gave the information concerning it. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) will remember that he asked that this item should stand, and that was agreed to, but we discussed it before.

Department of Marine and Fisheries—Magnetic observatory, $3,200; Meterological service, $122,000; Montreal observatory, $500; Kingston observatory, $500; Hydrographic surveys, $170,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. I presume it is under this item that observatories are being erected throughout the country. Is it the Department of Marine and Fisheries who are erecting these towers throughout the country?

Mr. BRODEUR. That is not under the Meteorological service of my department.

Steamboat inspection, $43,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. When does the minister intend to go with the Bill from the Senate in reference to steamboat inspection? There is a good deal of dissatisfaction on the lakes because the customs officers cannot deal with gasoline launches. Some of the customs officers say that they cannot do anything until it becomes law.

Mr. BRODEUR. The Bill provides for that. In the meantime we do not enforce it.

Mr. PERLEY. When does the minister intend to bring up that Bill that has been on the Order Paper so long?

Mr. BRODEUR. As soon as the more pressing work which is now demanding our attention has been disposed of. We want to send as much work as we can to the Senate.

Mail subsidies and steamship subventions, $1,291,550.

Mr. FIELDING. I would like to explain with regard to all these items that

in consequence of suggestions which were offered the previous session, the Minister of Trade and Commerce has published a supplement to his report which gives particulars of each one of these services and full explanations. This supplement has been in possession of hon. gentleman for some time, and those who feel an interest in the matter have given it their consideration. Information concerning each one of these services is fully set forth in this blue-book entitled 'Supplement to the Report of the Department of Trade and Commerce.'

Mr. BLAIN. Are these subsidies all the same as last year?

Mr. FIELDING. Except in one case—the British ocean mail service—where there is an increase. That is due to the fact that the contract fixes a price that each vessel gets, and as we get more trips from the better vessels we necessarily have to pay them more. With the exception of that item, I think they are all the same as last year.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would suggest that one item be reserved for discussion by the leader of the opposition or any other member.

Mr. FIELDING. That is a reasonable proposition.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Will the minister agree that some time shall be fixed when the various supplementaries will come up?

Mr. FIELDING. I hope to bring the supplementary estimates down to-morrow or the following day, at the latest, and from then to the end of the session I fancy that all business will receive expeditious treatment, so that it will hardly be necessary to fix a day.

Mr. NORTHRUP. A great many items are allowed to ship through on which there would naturally be some discusion if the members interested in them were present. But we do not want to sit here all the time waiting for some particular estimate to come up, and we would like to know when the supplementaries will be taken up.

Mr. FIELDING. After the supplementaries come down, if any particular subject interests the hon. gentleman and he will notify us, we will either take up that item or fix a time for doing so.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the minister look at item 190: 'Steam communication between St. John and ports in Cumberland basin, $3,000.' Is that subsidy paid to a steamer called the 'Harbinger?'

Mr. FIELDING. No contract has been entered into for this service. The subsidy was offered, but not taken up.

Mr. TAYLOR. I beg to suggest that item 153 be reserved for discussion.

Mr. FIELDING. Very well. I wish to strike out item 169: 'Steam communication between a port or ports in Prince Edward Island and a port or ports in Great Britain, $7,000. A quarter of this sum has been voted, but we have no expectation that the service will be required, and practically the sum already voted will lapse. I move that we strike out the remainder, and in the supplementaries we will utilize the money for some other service suitable for Prince Edward Island.

Mr. TAYLOR. Item 153: Ocean and mail service between Great Britain and Canada, $550,000,' will stand, and any member of the opposition who wants to discuss any of the subsidies will have an opportunity of doing so under this item?

Mr. FIELDING. I quite agree with what my hon. friend suggests.

Department of Trade and Commerce, $91,600.

Mr. BLAIN. How much money was paid to each of the provinces under the Chinese Immigration Act?

Mr. FIELDING. It is practically all paid to British Columbia, but I will be able, when the matter comes up again, to give my hon. friend a more exact statement.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think we had better let item 276 stand, as I see that it includes bounties on steel and iron.

Mr. FIELDING. It does not take in the bounties, but only covers the administrative expenses.

Mr. TAYLOR. I know.

Mr. FIELDING. All right. Let 276 stand.

Item allowed to stand.

Inspection of staples, $130,000.

Mr. LAKE. Is it expected that other inspectors will be required in consequence of the amendments to the Grain and Inspection Acts; and, if so, will provision for these be made in the supplementary estimates?

Mr. FIELDING. The officer of the department says that the supplementaries will have to contain a further sum to cover that.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will there be an item in the supplementary estimates for this?

Mr. FIELDING. There will be some items, although I do not remember for what particular purpose.

Mr. TAYLOR. And if we want to discuss anything in connection with the Department of Justice it may be discussed upon the supplementary estimates?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Penitentiaries, $559,050.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will there be an item in the supplemenary estimates for this?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Some resolutions reported.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

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

Mr. FIELDING. I understand that on motions the matter of the Hodgins Committee comes up. After that the various government orders, Bills and resolutons might be taken up, and later in the day the balance of Supply.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Minister of Militia said he had a statement to make.

Mr. FIELDING. That would come in Supply, I presume. The Hodgins matter was arranged for the morning; it would come on the motions.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then Bills and Supply?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. It would be the Minister of Militia?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes. I understood it was arranged that he shall make a statement.

Mr. TAYLOR. Either he or the Minister of Railways, who has also a statement to make.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not know whether the Minister of Railways will be ready on the Transcontinental matter.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then it will be militia?

Mr. FIELDING. We take Militia and the balance of any items that may remain.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.38 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, July 8, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the chair at Eleven o'clock.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—MAJOR HODGINS' CHARGES.

Mr. VICTOR GEOFFRION (Chambly and Verchères). Mr. Speaker, in asking that the report of the committee appointed to inquire into the charges of Major Hodgins with respect to the National Transcontinental Railway be concurred in, I wish to place before the House as briefly as I can some of the reasons which induced the committee to adopt this report. It will be useless for me, I suppose, to state very minutely the circumstances which led to the appointment of this committee of investigation. I think they are known by every hon. member of this House, and I simply wish to recall that Major Hodgins, who now resides in the city of Victoria, B.C., who had been for some time previously in the employ of the Transcontinental Railway Commisison and who had either left his position or been dismissed by the commission on the 16th April last, wrote a letter which he signed and caused to be published in the 'Daily Colonist' newspaper, published in the city of Victoria, B.C., charging the Transcontinental Railway Commission with undue influence over their engineers, charging them also with undue influence over some members of the government and making other charges which are set forth in the letter, which letter is quoted in the report now before the House. This letter was followed by two alleged interviews in the same paper with Major Hodgins enlarging and repeating in other words the charges that had been made by him in the previous letter. The Transcontinental Railway Commissioners thought it their duty to send a memorandum to the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) denying all the charges made by Major Hodgins in his letter and these interviews, and asking that a committee of this House be appointed to inquire into these charges, to give an opportunity to Major Hodgins to prove his charges and an opportunity to themselves to disprove them. That committee was appointed on April 29, and commenced its proceedings about that date. Major Hodgins was put on the stand and was subjected to a long examination by his own counsel and by the counsel of the Transcontinental Railway Commission. During the course of this examination, after it had proceeded for some time, on June 3 last Major Hodgins practically repudiated the two interviews which had been attributed to him by the 'Colonist.' I shall quote his exact words to the House to show how emphatic his repudiation was. They are to be found at page 248 of the evidence. He was then being examined by Mr. Murphy, counsel for the Transcontinental Railway Commission, and his examination reads:

Q. Well, it is of importance to know, major, how much or how little of this interview you are now prepared to stand by, because it affects the cross-examination?—A. I am not prepared to be responsible for the interview at all. As I say, if a reporter interviews you and takes down half a dozen sentences, and his notes certainly were not that long (illus-

trating by a gesture) and writes up two columns you cannot hold me responsible for it. Part of the interview, I might tell you, the reporter was trying to find out what an engineer has to do, why he does this, that and the other—in fact I was giving him more or less of a lecture on engineering. There was a whole lot of questions he was working up and he got hoplessly mixed up in the thing.

Q. From your answers this morning you would not like to be responsible for other articles that are written nearer home?—A. No.

Q. On the same subject?—A. No.

After this repudiation by the Major of his two interviews in the 'Colonist.' I think about June 16, Major Hodgins repudiated or withdrew all charges he had made previously in his letter to the 'Colonist' with which we had to deal during the investigation. The question of the classification of materials in district F where he was working, had been the subject of a great deal of correspondence and discussion between the engineers for the Grand Trunk Pacific and for the Transcontinental Railway. The engineers, the commission and the contractors also had obtained from eminent jurisconsults in different parts of the country opinions as to the proper interpretation to give to the specification on that very question which was the basis for Major Hodgins' charges. It was given in evidence that these opinions were all adverse to the contention held by the Major. In the face of this evidence the Major on June 16, withdrew these charges and imputations which he had made in his letter. His withdrawal is to be found at page 386 of the evidence. Major Hodgins was examined by Mr. Macdonald, a member of the committee :

2. You regard that as practically the only question left now?

That is the question of the interpretation of the specification for the classification.

Q. You regard that as practically the only question left now, the question of whether your view of the classification is correct?—A. That is all.

Q. That is all. I understand you to say, from the information that you have gathered since coming into this matter, Major, that you feel that you can not say that you have any imputations to make upon the commissioners in regard to any improper interference, with the engineers for instance?—A. With those legal and engineers' opinions there I do not see that I have.

Q. And you are not in a position to offer any evidence to show that they exercised any improper interference with the engineers?—A. No.

Q. In regard to that matter in which the statement was made here that Sir Wilfrid Laurier refused investigation on account of the influence exercised on him by Mr. Parent; I understand you are not in a position to say, or to offer any evidence that would show that Mr. Parent attempted to influence Sir Wilfrid in any way, or are you?—A. No, not unless Mr. Parent came up to say he did.

Q. You have no evidence of that?—A. I have none.

Q. And in regard to the question of engineering you apparently as an engineer, with your experience, took a certain view as to how the wording of these specfications should be interpreted?—A. Yes.

Q. Now you find that since you put in the statement here, Mr. Lumsden, on January 10 laid down certain instructions for the engineers to follow, which may be said to be an interpretation from his standpoint of what the specifications mean?—A. Yes.

Q. You were not aware of this being in existence at the time you wrote to the 'Colonist' on April 15, were you?—A. No.

Q. I suppose in regard to these opinions of counsel on the meaning of the specifications you had no intimation of them at the time you wrote the letter?—A. Another man's opinion is just as good as mine, as a matter of fact every engineer's opinion is valuable to himself.

Q. And it is a question upon which men may differ quite honestly?—A. Certainly.

Q. You do not impute to these gentlemen any improper motives in their ideas?—A. Not after reading Mr. Lumsden's letter.

Q. You made use of the expression the other day that you did not regard this committee as the proper tribunal to determine the question at issue?—A. With all due deference to the committee, I do not; it is an engineering dispute and as far as I am concerned I quite believe that the arbitrators who are appointed for the purpose should deal with this question of classification and I think that the board of arbitrators is the only right and proper tribunal to determine it.

Q. And any evidence you have to offer in regard to this matter, to this question at all, whatever is left of it now, is evidence that you would prefer to give to this tribunal of arbitrators that has been appointed under the statute?—A. Exactly.

Q. They are people in whom you have confidence that they can settle this question in the interest of this country fairly?—A. Absolutely.

Q. And you are prepared to accept their judgment on this question of classification as absolutely fair from your standpoint and in the interest of the country?—A. Certainly; I would not put myself in the way at all; they have to look after the interest of the country.

Q. And you regard this board of arbitration as being the proper tribunal to determine whatever there is in issue in this matter?—A. They are the proper tribunal.

Q. Personally, Major, it does not seem to me —or have you any desire to go on before this committee through your counsel offering evidence and taking up the time of this committee, or wouln't you prefer to give it all before the aribtrators?

Mr. Lennox.—Would it not be better to hear counsel?

By Mr. Macdonald:

Q. What do you say to that, Major?—A. What is that again?

Q. Have you any desire to go on giving evidence here in view of what you have said now, or do you not think that the proper tribunal

to determine this question is the board of arbitrators composed of Mr. Woods, Mr. Lumsden and a third arbitrator?—A. I do not think it is for me to answer that. I think it is for the committee to decide that.

I shall pass over some of the evidence which is very long as I want to give only answers bearing on the withdrawal of the charges. The examination continued:

By Mr. Macdonald:

Q. I understand you to say you do not desire to press before this committee any charge of wrong-doing on the part of the commission as far as their interference with the engineers is concerned, is that a fair statement?—A. That is right.

Q. And as far as that phase of the inquiry is concerned, you do not offer any evidence for our consideration?—A. It is simply this, that I do not see why I should stand the expense of finding out whether the specification is right or wrong.

Q. Or whether the academic question between engineers should be settled at your expense, that is the position you take?—A. Yes.

This was a withdrawal by the Major of all imputations and charges made in his letter. The question came up afterwards in the committee whether it was proper to continue the investigation. A long argument followed between members of the committee and the majority of the committee thought that it was no use continuing the investigation after the withdrawal of the letter. I submit that the proper guide for us in this investigation was the order of reference which reads as follows:

Order of reference.
House of Commons,
Tuesday, April 28, 1908.

Resolved, that the memorandum of the chairman of the Transcontinental Railway Commissioners to the Prime Minister, of date the 23rd April, and laid on the table of this House on the 24th instant, and the papers accompanying the same, together with the letter of Major Hodgins to the public press therein referred to, be referred to a special committee of five members, with instructions to investigate the matters and charges therein mentioned, and that the said committee be composed of Messrs. Carvell, Macdonald (Pictou), Geoffrion, Barker, and Lennox; and that they have power to send for persons, papers and records, to examine persons on oath or affirmation, and to report from time to time.

Attest.

(Sgd.) THOS. B. FLINT,
Clerk of the House.

What was referred to that committee for investigation? I submit it was properly the charges of Major Hodgins. It could not be the memorandum by the Transcontinental Railway Commissioners to the Prime Minister denying the charges he had to investigate, it must have been the letter, and the charges in the letter in respect to the question of classification having been withdrawn, we thought that the proper tribunal to continue the investigation was not the committee but the Board of Arbitration which had been created by statute pursuant to agreement between the Grand Trunk Pacific and the commissioners for the Transcontinental Railway. It is for that arbitration board to decide all questions according to the agreement. The agreement says that all difficulties and especially difficulties which appertain to the classification of materials which is probably the most important part to be decided by this tribunal are to be decided by a tribunal composed of Mr. Woods, chief engineer for the Grand Trunk Pacific and Mr. Lumsden, chief engineer for the National Transcontinental Railway. If these two chief engineers cannot agree on the disputed question, they are to choose a third arbitrator and this tribunal is to adjudicate on the question. All these questions of classification are to come up before these gentlemen. They had agreed after having discussed the question a long time to adopt a certain standard of classification which has been adopted in the work and is being used now. I admit that some complaints as to over classification or under classification have been made by the Grand Trunk Pacific, but the fact that one of the parties to that agreement claims that there has been over classification or under classification does not prove this to be the case until that tribunal has adjudicated on it. That clause providing for arbitration in a contract is not an unusual one. We find very often such a clause in contracts where works of special importance have to be performed, and the fact that it is claimed by one of the parties to the contract that the work has not been properly classified, as I said, does not establish that fact until after the board of arbitration has adjudicated upon it. The very important question of classification was not one to be discussed before the committee. A board has been properly appointed by statute for this very purpose, and all those questions, as Major Hodgins said himself, ought to be brought before that board to be adjudicated upon. After having discussed the matter we came to the conclusion that there was nothing left to be inquired into by your committee. Supposing that Major Hodgins, before the appointment of that committee, after the publication of his letter had withdrawn his letter, no one would pretend that this House would have appointed a committee to investigate. Suppose also he had withdrawn all charges and put in another letter charging that there had been over classification by some engineers, would a single member pretend that a committee should have been appointed to inquire and decide whether that question of classification, which by agreement is to be entrusted to the arbitrators, ought to be discussed any further? I think Sir, that the course adopted by the committee was logical, fair

and just, and I move, seconded by Mr. Carvell, that the report which I laid on the table of the House a few days ago be now concurred in.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, I recognize that in appointing a small committee the House expected us to occupy a somewhat judicial position and to endeavour, regardless of what our preconceived opinions politically might be, to arrive at a conclusion which would be in the interest of the country. I am sorry that I cannot concur in the motion of the chairman of our committee for the adoption of the report to which reference has just been made. The order of reference to that committee was made on April 28th last. The hon. gentleman who has just moved the adoption of the report has stated that certain matters were known to the House, certain matters were of public notoriety at the time the order of reference was made. That is true. At the time the order of reference was made it was known to the House and to the country that Major Hodgins had made certain charges which reflected very seriously upon the conduct of public business by the Transcontinental Railway Commission and, not only that, but that his statements had been followed up by comments and editorials in the newspapers which carried the matter even further than Major Hodgins' statements went. There was abundant reason why the investigation should take place. It was the motion of the government and not of the opposition. It was a position taken by the government which the government thought was justified by the circumstances. But whilst the charges of Major Hodgins and the editorial and other comments in the press were known to the country, it was not known to the country or the House, but known to the government and the government alone, that statements had been made by the Grand Trunk Pacific engineers which were far more damaging and far-reaching than any charge made by Major Hodgins or the public press. The Grand Trunk Pacific in fact was up in arms against the classification which prevailed, not upon any special section of the eastern division, but from one end of the line to the other. The charge was made by that company—as the government knew, but as the country did not know at that time—that this was not the result of ignorance on the part of the government, but was due to malice aforethought. At the time the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) made the motion it was not known, but it became known in the committee afterwards, that there were attached to the memo. of the Chairman of the Transcontinental Commission the letters which constitute Exhibit No. 38, as filed before the committee, and which contained the damaging statement I am about to refer to. It is alleged and reiterated by Mr. Parent that attached to the memo. laid on the table, and upon which the right hon. gentleman moved, were not only clippings from newspapers, but the bundle of papers which form Exhibit No. 38 filed in the committee as well, and which contained the charges I am about to refer to. In other words, the right hon. gentleman, for reasons unexplained, saw fit to detach from that memo. a portion of the documents which had been transmitted to him with it. I do not wish to read any more of this correspondence than is absolutely essential, but I believe it is essential that this House should know exactly the class of material and how it was classified, in order to be in a position to decide whether the motion I am about to make, namely, that the matter be referred back to the committee for further investigation, should be adopted, or whether the inquiry should be burked at this stage. Before reading the letter of Mr. Wood, Chief Engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific, I wish to make an explanation in order to elucidate certain statements in it. In the specifications in the various contracts on the eastern division we have it defined that earth excavations have a slope of one and a-half foot to a foot; that loose rock excavations have a slope of one foot to a foot, and that solid rock excavations have a slope of only one-quarter of a foot to a foot. Therefore, when we find in these letters reference to the fact that a slope is one and a-half to one, that means that the engineer is calling attention to the fact that whereas the slope is a slope of common earth the percentage returned for the work is a large percentage of solid and loose rock.

Having said that, I want to read the first letter of Mr. H. A. Wood to the chief engineer:

Montreal, October 7, 1907.

H. D. Lumsden,
Chief Engineer,
Eastern division of the National Transcontinental.

Dear Sir,—At the request of District Engineer Armstrong, he was furnished recently with a statement of classification for the heavier work on the above section, which were, when given in detail, so different from his expectations that he requested the writer to visit the work.

During the past week we passed over portions of the work from the Batiscan river west for fifteen or twenty miles, and later from mile 115 to 132.

With reference to the former portion, the classification was given in distances of from three to five miles, and as we did not have total quantities of graduation, could not judge with reference to any particular cutting, although percentages for entire distance seemed excessively heavy in both loose and solid rock.

With the latter portion we had detailed percentage for each cut, and were greatly sur-

prised at the allowances made for solid and loose rock. In nearly every case where the cuttings were not entirely all ledge the estimate given for solid rock is double, or more than double, what it should be.

In fact, the specifications had been entirely ignored and an excessive allowance made, not by reason of an error in judgment, but, as I understand, by special instructions from the assistant district engineer.

Let me give you some illustrations:

Take the cutting from stations 5818 to 5826, estimated 71 per cent solid rock and 29 per cent loose rock, slopes taken out 1½ to 1. Very little ledge in this cut. Some large boulders, but a very large percentage is common excavation.

Station 5842 to 5860.—Classified 94 per cent solid rock, 6 per cent loose rock. Slopes taken out 1½ to 1. Solid rock over-classified at least 100 per cent.

Station 5866 to 5875.—Estimated 80 per cent solid rock, 20 per cent loose rock. No rock in place in this cut. Many large boulders, but a large amount of earth.

Station 5882 to 5901.—Estimated 78 per cent solid rock, 22 per cent loose rock. A large amount of this cut wasted with slip scrapers, and ploughing being done with two horses. There are hundreds of yards of earth here without a stone, large or small.

And yet there is not a foot of common excavation in that. They plough with two horses, and where it can be ploughed even with six horses it is common excavation. But it is all classified as solid rock and loose rock.

Station 6030 to 6046.—Estimated 40 per cent solid rock, 10 per cent loose rock. This is the large sand cut west of O'Brien's camp. Of the 95,000 yards moved to August 31 in this cut, at least 80,000 yards was pure sand.

Station 6071 to 6078.—Estimated 99 per cent solid rock, 1 per cent loose rock. Very little solid rock in place. Slopes taken out 1½ to 1.

So that the solid rock might crumble down.

West of St. Maurice river.

Station 6391 to 6394.—Estimated 46 per cent solid rock, 33 per cent loose rock. Sand cut with few boulders, and possibly 1,500 yards ledge in bottom of cut not yet taken out.

Station 6493 to 6504.—Estimated 20 per cent solid rock, 49 per cent loose rock. No evidence of ledge and very few large boulders; nearly all sand.

Station 6506 to 6512.—Estimated 16 per cent solid rock, 44 per cent loose rock. This is purely a sand cut, with very few boulders. Upper slope nearly 100 feet high, material wasted into river. Certainly not 10 per cent of this should be classified.

I may say that it is only 'classified' when it is solid rock or loose rock. Ordinary excavation is not 'classified.'

Mr. HAGGART. Do the specifications declare what is loose rock ?

Mr. LENNOX. Yes, they state the nature of each class of material.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. May I ask is that an estimate of the quantities taken out, or an estimate of what they were before the work was begun ?

Mr. LENNOX. This has reference to the returns actually made by the engineers upon the work to the Transcontinental Railway Commission. The engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific Company is pointing out how ruinous and absolutely unjustifiable this classification is. And I am reading for the purpose of showing what these men propose the country shall pay for.

Station 6522 to 6548.—Estimated 26 per cent solid rock, 49 per cent loose rock. This is borrowed material from the side. Very little solid rock shown, except what was used for blind drains, but some large boulders not placed in embankment.

On account of heavy rains we were not able to go west of station 6600, but we understand that classification is made about as noted above.

In every case where cuttings were not entirely in ledge we find the material over classified very largely. Mr. Armstrong has been over this work at different times, perhaps quite as often as the assistant district engineer. His estimate and my own are not very different as to the amount of classified material, and until he received detailed quantities he had no intimation that such heavey classification had been given. In many cases, particularly in sand and gravel cuts, he had supposed that no classification would be given, except perhaps for a few boulders as loose rock.

I am informed also that on the work east of the St. Lawrence river heavy classification is being made in borrowed material where ploughing is done with one team and material moved in slip scrapers.

As before stated, these over-classifications are made through error in judgment, not upon the decision of the resident or division engineers, who are fully acquainted with the character of the work, but by arbitrary orders from their superior. To such classification as mentioned above, increasing the cost of the work to such alarming extent, we most seriously protest, and respectfully request that either yourself or the assistant chief engineer visit the work and pass judgment upon the classification as made. Please note that the percentages given above indicate the work done to August 31. We are not advised what the September estimate will show.

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) H. A. WOODS,

Assistant chief engineer.

Now that letter, I thought it well to read in full, because every word of it is important. But I can economize time in relation to the others. Mr. Lumsden took action. He wrote a letter on October 18 which will be found in the printed evidence at page 395. I need not read the letter but merely refer to it for the purpose of showing that at that time it appeared to Mr. Lumsden, from statements made by District Engineer

Doucet, that Mr. Doucet at that time admitted and recognized that his assistant engineers were over-classifying. It is important to bear in mind that, at that time, Mr. Doucet, to some extent, stood by the country and against the contractors. But Mr. Doucet does not maintain that position afterwards. I need only read from this letter what Mr. Lumsden says to the commissioners. He says: It would appear to me some material may be classified as rock which should be classified otherwise.' He had learned that upon a verbal statement of Mr. Doucet on the 12th instant. More anxiety seems to have been felt about points of etiquette than about the interests of the country. Mr. Ryan, secretary of the Transcontinental Commission says:

Although the procedure——

Referring to the letter of Mr. H. A. W. Woods complaining of these matters:

—was distinctly irregular, the commission have taken full cognizance of Mr. Woods' complaint and have given directions that the matter be fully investigated.

This committee, although they do not approve of the manners exhibited by Mr. Wood, have been gracious enough to say that they will take the matter into their full consideration and have it investigated. I regret to say that that promise has not been carried out. Mr. Doucet thinks this was not as politely done as it ought to be, and he says in his letter to Mr. Lumsden on October 21:

I may state that such accusations are not only uncalled for, but most unprofessional, as we in Canada understand professional etiquette.

I am more concerned about this investigation and about some gentlemen stepping out than I am concerned about the order of their going. Now, I refer on page 399 of this evidence to the letter of Mr. Doucet to the chief engineer of the Railway Commission. That I need not read in full, but I want to call attention to one or two sentences. A moment ago I mentioned the fact that Mr. Doucet did not propose to stand in harmony with his subordinates as to the higher classification, but in some way he gets over there, and like the chief engineer he chooses his attitude as time advances, and as soon as the 26th of October we find that Mr. Doucet is prepared to state to the chief engineer that they stand shoulder to shoulder as one man for the Quebec classification. The effect of that upon the chief engineer, upon the fortunes of Canada and upon the amount that Canada will have to pay for this work will be evident to every member of this House before we conclude. Now, he says to Mr. Lumsden:

Dear Sir,—I have already had occasion to state to you verbally that the interpretation the engineers in district 'B' have placed on the classification of solid and loose rock, and in accordance with which the progress estimates have been returned since the inception of the work.

I want hon. gentleman to take note of that, that the engineer here announces that from the very beginning of the work the classification which he has contended for as made by these subordinate engineers, and which at first was resisted by Mr. Doucet, and definitely resisted by the chief engineer, that classification has prevailed from the very inception of the work, and prevails to the present time.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Would my hon. friend be good enough to indicate where he finds this theory of his that Mr. Doucet in his conversation with Mr. Lumsden, as referred to in Mr. Lumsden's letter, took any different position from that which he took in his letter of October 26?

Mr. LENNOX. I have given the evidence and the references. I had some little experience of my hon. friend in the committee, where I had not as much support as I hope to have here, and I will endeavour to make this clear. My hon. friend can point out a distinction if he sees any between the letters to which I have referred. I have read a portion of this letter, and I have referred to the position which Mr. Doucet is said to have taken, as reported in the letter of 18th of October, and now I wish to add a sentence:

I have never had occasion to force my views on my assistants, all, to a man, have taken the same interpretation of the classification as I have.

So, as I intimated a moment ago, between the 12th and the 26th, for reasons which I cannot explain, Mr. Doucet seems to have advanced along the line on which the contractors were travelling. On the 24th of October there was an examination into this matter. Mr. Lumsden went down, and in the letter of the 30th October, page 403, he points out what was done; he tells who was there. There were a number of contractors, among others. He points out what they did; he refers to an interview with them after they had examined the work, and he points out that after this interview he requested Mr. Doucet, the district engineer, to procure statements as to the interpretation of the specifications from the various engineers under charge of Mr. Doucet and to send these and his own interpretation of the specifications to Mr. Lumsden, the chief engineer. This is a significant letter, the letter of the 30th of October; it shows the position in which Mr. Lumsden stood on the 30th of October when he communicated with the Railway Commission, and it shows this fact, that at that time, notwithstanding his subsequent attitude, he stood in comdemnation of Que-

bec classification. After referring to these various matters, and having had these letters from the various engineers on the Quebec section, including the statement of Mr. Doucet, he says :

I can only say that I do not concur with the interpretation placed on clauses 34, 35 and 36 of the general specifications, by Mr. Doucet or the engineers under him. In my opinion solid rock excavation, clause 34, covers all material that should be classified as solid rock, etc.

He goes on to define for the purpose of pointing out that he does and will not agree with the classification prevailing in Quebec. What are you to say to the members of the committee? What are the members of this House to say to the members of the committee as to staying their hand now when we find that subsequently the chief engineer of this work, for reasons not appearing, now says that that kind of classification is to prevail, and that kind of classification is prevailing from one end of the eastern division of the Transcontinental Railway to the other at the present time? After pointing out what he regards as proper classification, he says :

Such being my views and as stated to you in my letter of the 18th instant, I must decide to certify to any future estimates, except upon classification in accordance with my interpretation of the specifications above mentioned, unless both parties to the contract agree to amend the contract formally, with due concurrence of the government, or until the estimates are corrected and conform with my interpretation. In any event, I ask that this correspondence be at once submitted to the government.

So the matter stands on the 30th October. The chief engineer, the gentleman by whose decision we are bound, the gentleman whose word is final, as has been said by a majority of this committee, the gentleman who is the sole arbitrator on the question of classification, stands firm with his back to the wall defying all the subordinate engineers of the eastern division of the Transcontinental Railway. Yet strange to say, he changes his opinion later on. How does he do it? Well, he does it at the instance of an honourable class of men, but not the best class of men to invoke in a case of this kind. He has the engineers on the one hand, he holds them down ; he seems for the time being to be the strong man. Then a greater influence comes in, and lawyer after lawyer is introduced to argue this question—in the interest of the Grand Trunk Pacific who are complaining? Not at all. In the interest of the people whose money is being paid out? Not at all. But the ex-parte argument of the contractors who are clamouring for more is introduced to shape and guide the judgment of the chief engineer of the Transcontinental Railway Commission.

Mr. FOSTER. Before whom did the lawyers argue?

Mr. LENNOX. They are asked for opinions for which they are paid $500 each. That is all right.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Paid by whom ?

Mr. LENNOX. By the contractors, I presume, but I am not going to swear to that

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Who asked for that opinion?

Mr. LENNOX. I presume the contractors asked for that opinion and the opinions rendered should have been to the contractors and should have been reserved by the contractors, but when these opinions were used as an argument ex parte, behind the backs of the people—and the Grand Trunk Pacific who were, incidentally, protecting the people —to shape and warp the judgment of the chief engineer, who was to have been independent judge in this matter, a great wrong was done to the people of Canada. Here we have Mr. Lafleur—all right; Charles H. Ritchie—all right; Mr. Lacoste—all right ; all good lawyers, all prominent men——

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Not Mr. Lacoste; Sir Alexander Lacoste.

Mr. LENNOX. It is A. Lacoste here. I did not know that he had a title—Sir Alexander Lacoste, K.C. He is no better lawyer on that account. You see etiquette in it all the way through. I do not think the people are so much concerned in that matter as in the question whether or not they are, through fraud or otherwise, paying too much for the construction of this railway. Mr. Donald McMaster, Mr. George F. Shepley—we have heard of him before—and Messrs. Aylesworth & Company, inclosing the opinion of Mr. Wallace Nesbitt. What happens? We had the opinion of the chief engineer on the 18th October, a pretty strong opinion; we had the deliberate, considered opinion of the chief engineer, on the 30th October, sure, firm and defiant; we had a subsequent reiteration of that opinion slightly emphasized on the 16th December, which is found at page 426, and we have his opinion on the 9th January.

Mr. HAGGART. Did the Department of Justice give an opinion?

Mr. LENNOX. That is what I am coming to. Before referring to that I may say that the matter was referred to the Justice Department and that Mr. Newcombe was asked for an opinion but Mr. Newcombe did not give one. I want that to be clearly borne in mind. It is alleged that Mr. Newcombe gave an opinion, but Mr. Newcombe appears to have recognized this fact——

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. What about his letter on page 429?

Mr. LENNOX. Page 429 is what I have here.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. What is it if it is not an opinion?

Mr. LENNOX. My hon. friend can read it to the House.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. You had better read it to show that it is an opinion and in that way contradict yourself.

Mr. LENNOX. Mr. Newcombe writes a letter which I say is not an opinion except in this that he tells the engineer: You are the party appointed to decide, you should decide and you should decide without outside interference. We know the position, and my hon. friend knows it as well as any one, of an architect or engineer who is made the sole referee with regard to a question of this kind; he is not to yield to outside influence. He has to decide by reason of his professional knowledge and no outside or extraneous influences are to guide his judgment. I am glad that I have the concurrence of my hon. friend. On the 6th January, Mr. Newcombe writes and in the first paragraph of his letter he puts the matter alternatively. His letter will be found at page 429. He says if so-and-so is the case then so-and-so results.

Mr. CARVELL. Read what so-and-so is.

Mr. LENNOX. I will allow my hon. friend to read it if he sees fit.

Mr. CARVELL. Well, I will.

Mr. LENNOX. All right, I will read a portion of it just to satisfy my hon. friend. I do not want to be too long over this.

Mr. CARVELL. Just take the middle portion.

Mr. LENNOX. This is what I will take:

I do not understand upon what principle the chief engineer limits the size to pieces extending one cubic foot.

Mr. CARVELL. Commence a little earlier in the letter.

Mr. LENNOX (reading):

The specification speaks of rock found in ledges or masses of more than one cubic yard which in the judgment of the engineer may be best removed by blasting. If 'rock assembled' may be regarded as a mass of rock, and if it may be best removed by blasting, I do not see why under the specification it is material whether the individual pieces exceed or are less than one cubic foot in size—

Putting it alternatively.

—if 'rock assembled' is not regarded as a mass the minimum limit of size which can be classified as solid rock exceeds one cubic yard.

Mr. LENNOX.

That is by the specification. So that he says you have in the specification the means of determining and I determine nothing. Then he says:

It seems to me, however, that these questions are largely engineering questions, the solution of which depends principally upon the judgment of the engineer having regard to the terms used in the specifications.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. LENNOX. I am glad that the hon. gentleman says 'hear, hear,' because I want to emphasize that point.

I must call your attention to clause 15 of the contract, which provides that the engineer (this term to be construed as defined to clause 2 of the contract) shall be the sole judge of work and material, and that his decision on all questions in dispute with regard to work and material shall be final, thus expressly stipulating that such questions as these shall be submitted to the decision of the chief engineer.

I say 'hear, hear.'

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. LENNOX. I say that we have by this contract placed one man in charge to stand firmly between the people and contractors and that it is infamous, unheard of and something that would never be sanctioned in a court of justice that a man standing in the position of an architect or engineer should be assailed by one party in interest and his judgment warped and perverted. I say further that this committee should have been sitting for the last ten or fifteen days, this committee should be sitting now, to investigate and probe this fact that we have an engineer who, however honest he may be, has permitted himself to be dragged and turned about at the instance of parties whose interests are involved. We should be investigating whether or not it is necessary, assuming all honesty if you like, that there should be a change made and some one else placed in charge of this enormous work in order that the interests of the people should be protected. Now, is it pretty clear that Mr. Newcombe declined to give an opinion and did not give an opinion? I think it is. What do you think then when you find it stated that our chief engineer receded from the definite position he took on the 30th October in deference to the opinion of Mr. Newcombe when Mr. Newcombe never gave an opinion? The chief engineer says, on January 9:

I have concluded in deference to his remarks these bracketted words might be omitted.

Referring to the remarks of Mr. Newcombe. And so, from the position he definitely took and for which he gave us reasons on the 30th October, he recedes and takes an entirely different position as to the

classification that shall prevail upon the work.

One more matter in connection with this branch of the case only, but it is a very significant one. Going back to the correspondence you will find that one of the points Mr. Parent makes emphatically is that there must be uniformity of classification among the engineers, and he says significantly to the chief engineer: You must take steps to bring that about. He does not say what the steps are to be. I have said more than once—and I have had the hearty applause of my hon. friend from Pictou—I have said more than once that Mr. Lumsden is to be the arbiter in this matter and that he is to be left alone, and that he is to go on his own judgment and on his own judgment alone. What will you think of it when you find that in his letter of January the 9th he refers the question of classification practically to the commissioners to gentlemen who are not engineers, gentlemen who were appointed I presume for political reasons. On the 14th October, 1908, you will find this letter from Mr. P. E. Ryan, written to Mr. Lumsden:

Dear Sir,—I beg to advise you that your letter of the 9th instant, giving your interpretation of clauses 33, 34, 35, 36, of the general specifications for construction modified so as to conform with the opinion expressed by the Deputy Minister of Justice, was considered by the board on the 10th instant and approved.

So that we have this point which I want to be kept clearly in mind: that ultimately it has to be submitted to the board as to whether they will adopt the classification of the chief engineer and so constitute themselves the final court of appeal. We therefore have the Board of Transcontinental Commissioners, not one of whom is an engineer, really deciding on the classification that shall prevail upon this railway. I want to point out that this difficulty has not been remedied and that for that purpose I would refer to a few of the letters to be found in the printed evidence. I refer to the letter of Mr. Woods, on page 46, and I shall just read a sentence:

From reports received from our district engineers 'B' and 'F' we understand that, in their judgment, the work in places is largely over classified, particularly in borrowed material and in cuttings of mixed materials where no ledges exist.

Then he goes on to ask that certain things should be done. Again, in a letter of the 20th of February (page 469) he points out that the classification is still as objectionable as it was before. There is a mistake in the printing of that letter, and I have got a correct copy this morning from the commission and I will read from that:

I do not know the date of these instructions or when they are supposed to become effective, but, from reports from my assistants at Winnipeg and Quebec, there does not seem to have been any change in classifiation of work previously reported, the percentage of classified material being steadily increased.

We are satisfied that on some parts of the line the work previously estimated was not classified according to your recent instructions, being over-estimated in both loose and solid rock. The attention of your district engineers has been called to this fact, but apparently without effect. If your instructions were effective when the January estimates were made we certainly will have to object to the classification as rendered on certain parts of the work.

So that we have these two facts: We have the resident and district engineers asserting their right to control the chief engineer, and the chief engineer ultimately surrendering to these men and to the opinion of the lawyers—the ex parte arguments of the gentlemen employed on behalf of the contractors—and we have the further fact that when these classifications are made these gentlemen are ignoring them and going beyond the limit finally fixed by the chief engineer. In a letter of the 24th of March, a few sentences of which are material (page 470) he says:

District 'F.'—Mr. J. D. McArthur, mile 0 to 245, completing returns for February.

In examining these estimates, I find no apparent change in classification since your instructions to district engineers of January 28, 1908. On the contrary, the percentages of classified material seem to be constantly increasing and are even higher than when we made our objections in September last.

I am quite aware that during the winter season it is natural that classified material shall run higher than at other times, as little earth work is opened, but I had hoped to see a reduction in classified material so reported prior to January last.

I have before me a detailed sheet showing classification as made on district 'B' and am surprised to find material classified as solid rock, which, if I am correctly informed, under your instructions could only be classified as loose rock. I also find very large quantities returned both as loose and solid rock in borrowed embankment. On the work east of the Quebec bridge a large amount was done with teams, side borrowed material, and yet the entire contract for the 150 miles only shows 25 per cent of the work done as common excavation.

Then on April 21 coming down to about the time this reference was made to the committee, the same engineer says:

There are few exceptions to be taken to these estimates, so far as I am advised, except to the classified material, which is constantly increasing, and the very large amount of over-break in solid rock cuttings, also increasing and representing in all a very large amount.

And in this same letter there are three or four subsequent paragraphs which I shall read:

From the inclosed list you will note that Mr. Mann makes objections not only to classification in cuttings, but also to borrowed material. On mile 25, stations 1267 to 1280, there appears in this estimate a considerable amount of loose rock for the first time. Of the 25,000 cubic yards returned, 44 per cent is classified. Both Mr. Mann and Mr. Heaman claim that no classification should be given in this material.

And as I have already said no classification means common earth excavation:

We find that this question of over-classification must be settled in the near future. Many of the sub-contractors will soon be completing their work and undoubtedly will receive final payment for same, and if they are paid upon estimates as returned at present, general contractors will naturally object to any change in their estimates.

Pointing out, as we have endeavoured to point out in the committee that great danger exists of these people being paid and absolute loss resulting to the country, whereas the majority of the committee seems to pretend that no loss could result to the country:

While I have no list like the inclosed from district 'B,' reports from my assistant indicate there that east of the river objections lie to the classification generally as returned. A very large amount of borrowed material through farming country has been returned as loose rock. Of the entire work done to date on this section 77·6 per cent is classified material, nearly evenly divided between loose and solid rock.

That brings us down to the 21st of April, and on the 28th of April we have a deadlock between the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and the commissioners. And the very day on which this matter was referred to the committee (April 28) Mr. Woods writes to the chief engineer and says that no arbitration can go on by reason of the position that has been maintained by the chief engineer. He writes:

Montreal, Quebec, April 28, 1908.

Mr. Hugh Lumsden,
Chief Engineer, eastern division,
National Transcontinental Railway,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Sirs,—This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of April 24, in regard to classifications given on districts 'B' and 'F,' wherein you say you could confer with me, either in Ottawa or Montreal, so as to arrange dates for arbitrating the points in dispute and for the appointment of a third arbitrator, &c.

In reply thereto will say that the action you propose cannot be taken until after you have complied with my request of October 7, which, as you will recall, has been several times repeated, that you and I personally make an inspection of those portions of the work on districts 'B' and 'F' where it is claimed improper classification has been made.

Kindly let me know when it will be convenient for you to make this inspection, and I will place myself at your disposal.

Yours truly,
(Sgd) H. A. WOODS,
Assistant Chief Engineer.

So that you will see that at the time when the right hon. gentleman referred this matter to the committee it had got to the position, although months and months had elapsed, that nothing had been done. Although the Grand Trunk Pacific assistant engineer had been insisting on something being done nothing had been done, and in the meantime the moneys were being paid out by the Transcontinental Commission to the contractors. I have referred to these matters as matters which were not known at the time that this committee was appointed but certain matter were known and certain matters were expressly dealt with. Major Hodgins had made his statement; the press had made wider statements—but bear in mind not so wide and not so damaging and not so damning as the statement made by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company through their engineers. I will not take time to read the comments and statements of the press, but I want to say that the press, and particularly the Ottawa 'Citizen' took upon itself the responsibility to make certain specific charges, and charges which went beyond Major Hodgins. Major Hodgins made charges which he was prepared to assume were errors which were made not by fraud or as the result of dishonesty; the Ottawa 'Citizen' puts it on the basis of boodling and dishonesty.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read it.

Mr. LENNOX. I will. It says:

Troubles are coming fast and thick upon the Laurier administration.

You don't want a commission to find that out; every one knows that.

Mr. TALBOT. That is just your opinion.

Mr. LENNOX. The country will care little about the hon. gentleman's opinion. I continue to read:

The latest are the public charges made by Major Hodgins, late district engineer for 400 miles of the government end of the National Transcontinental Railway.

I want to point out, and I hope hon. gentlemen will note it that these are pretty strong charges, but the majority of the committee say they should not be investigated:

The essence of his statement is that millions of dollars are being boodled in connection with the construction of this government work.

Names and figures are given and the allegation is made that he was forced out of his position because he refused to be the tool of the boodlers.

There has been no explanation of why he was forced out; nothing has come to light.

His professional record and admitted ability give due weight to the assertions which he boldly makes. The charges cover not only his former division but apply to the construction of the whole line through Quebec. At the time of his dismissal, Major Hodgins says that he applied to Sir Wilfrid Laurier for an investigation into the scandalous condition which he alleges to prevail and that the investigation was refused. In the face of such charges made by a responsible professional man, who is apparently prepared to furnish the evidence to substantiate them, it will be very difficult for the government to inconsistently refuse to have the matter thoroughly probed.

If that is true and I think it is reasonable, to assume it is; if then difficult for the government to refuse investigation, it ought to be more difficult for the right hon. gentleman who moved for the appointment of this commission to now say that this committee shall stay its hand in the face of the damaging disclosures that have so far cropped up during the investigation of the committee. But it may be possible—history does repeat itself most disastrously and disgracefully in some instances of this kind. We may have a repetition of what occurred in the case of the Royal Commission on the Civil Service which, when it began to do things found it was not required any longer. I do not know whether this committee will be further required or not. The 'Colonist' newspaper also makes statements. Mark you the 'Colonist' publishes Major Hodgins' letter. But the 'Colonist' makes statements of its own and it made them on the basis that Major Hodgins gave them the information. Major Hodgins says he will not stand for all these charges, and when he got into the hands of my hon. friend opposite he did not seem to stand at all so far as I could see. But the 'Colonist' says that Major Hodgins made the statements. The 'Free Press' also made very important and very serious charges, but I shall not trouble the House with reading these. However, I want to refer to a letter of Mr. Parent in which he sends forward the various letters, or almost all the letters, I have referred to this morning and the clippings from the press and his own request for an investigation. I need not read all this letter of Mr. Parent, dated the 23rd of April, he speaks of the insinuations and statements, and he speaks of the various items in the press and various other matters and he winds up in this way:

You will find attached newspaper clippings in reference to Major Hodgins' letter, and all correspondence relating to the circumstances of his dismissal; also a letter from our chief engineer, Mr. Lumsden, on the same subject.

In conclusion, the commissioners would respectfully request, as they do not wish to remain under the aspersion which such reports cast on them, that the whole matter be referred to and looked into by a committee of the House and that Major Hodgins be assigned to appear before the same to repeat his charges in a specific manner in order to substantiate them if he can.

His request is touching the letters and touching the clippings from the newspapers, and he asks that the whole matter shall be referred to the committee to investigate. I am prepared to say that if the right hon. the Prime Minister did not adopt that letter that letter is not binding, but I am prepared to argue that he did adopt it in whole and that he referred to us to investigate the whole of the matters which appeared not only in Major Hodgins' letter but in the several editorials and comments of the press. I shall read, in order that we may be clear upon this matter, the order of reference:

House of Commons,
Tuesday, April 28, 1908.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, it was resolved, that the memorandum of the Chairman of the Transcontinental Railway Commissioners to the Prime Minister, of date the 23rd April, and laid on the table of this House on the 24th instant, and the papers accompanying the same, together with the letter of Major Hodgins to the public press, therein referred to, be referred to a special committee of five members, with instructions to investigate the matters and charges therein mentioned, and that the said committee be composed of :—Messrs. Carvell, Macdonald (Pictou), Geoffrion, Barker and Lennox, and that they have power to send for persons, papers and records, to examine persons on oath or affirmation, and to report from time to time.

Does that make any distinction between the charges in the newspapers and those made by Major Hodgins? Does that refer to the committee merely what Major Hodgins mentioned or does it refer to the committee the matters and charges specified in the several documents attached to the memo.? I understand that what was referred to the committee is this: The memorandum of the chairman of the Railway Commission, the papers attached to it and the letter of Major Hodgins. What then was the purpose of the reference? It was to investigate—what? Was it to investigate the question whether there was or was not an arbitration pending to determine the meaning of the contract between the government and the Grand Trunk Pacific? No, but to investigate the matters and charges mentioned in those several documents attached to the memo. of the chairman of the Transcontinental Commission and the letter of Major Hodgins, and the purpose was to

find out whether the people are paying too much money or not for that railway.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LENNOX. Was the letter of Major Hodgins made more significant or important than the statements in the Ottawa 'Citizen' or the 'Colonist' or the 'Free Press?' I submit it was not. As a matter of history, when the right hon. gentleman first moved there was no letter of Major Hodgins' on hand. The order of reference was at first in this form: 'That the memo. of the chairman of the Railway Commission, with the papers accompanying the same, be referred to a special committee.' And it was only when the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) said he thought it was not broad enough, and when the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) and myself asked to have the letter of Major Hodgins specifically incorporated, that that letter was specifically enumerated. So that it is absolutely idle for the majority on the special committee to claim that we are to be controlled by the attitude or position taken by Major Hodgins. I care nothing for the position Major Hodgins takes. There are larger interests involved. There are the interests of the country at stake. What the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) pretended when he made this reference was that we should have a full inquiry as to whether this railway was costing the people an extravagant sum or not. How did the committee understood the reference? They understood that every charge in the 'Citizen,' the 'Free Press' and the 'Colonist' should be investigated. They understood that Major Hodgins had absolutely no voice, pro or con, as to the scope or direction of the inquiry. And they understood that, with or without Major Hodgins, we were to find out whether the people's money was being wasted or stolen or not; and that such was the unaminous understanding of the committee at the opening of the investigation is shown by the Record.

But what did the majority of the committee do? They induced Major Hodgins to retire on the understanding that there was constituted at that time and then at work a special board of arbitration to investigate this matter, consisting of trained experts for whom Major Hodgins, as an engineer, had the greatest respect. I wish to say here and now that that was an absolute mis-representation. I do not say that it was intentionally a mis-representation, because I have too much respect for the other gentlemen on the committee to suggest anything of the kind; but as a matter of fact, it was an absolute mis-representation of the true circumstances. Up to this day there has been no arbitration board in existence investigating that matter under the terms of the contract we have with the Grand Trunk Pacific.

I have said that although the scope of the inquiry was as wide as I have indicated, the majority of the committee led Major Hodgins to believe that the matter was then pending before an arbitration of experts, for whom he had the greatest respect, and by this means induced him to retire from the field of inquiry before the committee. But after Mr. Hodgins had been induced in that adroit way, by the questions so adroitly put to him, to take that position, the majority of the committee absolutely refused to go a step further. When we entered upon our labours, we did not so understand our duty. We understood that no attitude which Major Hodgins might take could influence the committee, that it was immaterial what attitude he took. I shall read a few sentences for the purpose of proving that statement and to show that the majority of the committee went absolutely against the order of the House when they took the position that the committee should be guided by Major Hodgins and by him alone. At page 55 you will find the following:

Mr. Hodgins.—I think I read one of the cuttings some days ago.

Mr. Carvel.—I presume you would admit, in case the formal charges which you may make here as representing Major Hodgins did not include everything in the reference to this committee that the committee would still have the right to go on and inquire into the foundation of the charges in the newspapers and in the reference?

Mr. Hodgins.—I did not quite catch your question.

Mr. Carvell.—In case the formal charges you will prefer do not include everything mentioned, you will admit the committee have the power to go further and investigate everything that is in the reference?

Mr. Hodgins intimated that he did not know that his view of the matter would affect the question. And so it was dropped for the time. At page 56:

Mr. Macdonald (Pictou).—It being understood—I think Mr. Parent has so understood and I understand Mr. Hodgins, K.C., to say so—that the memorandum he proposes to submit to us does not relate to anything outside of what has been already referred to the committee, in the papers, but is only a summarization of the allegations contained in the newspapers.

Mr. Carvell.—And does not necessarily curtail our rights.

Then, on the same page:

Mr. Carvell.—I think it is in the minds of every member of the committee that we will not allow Mr. Hodgins to enlarge the charges as contained in the newspaper reports.

Mr. Barker.—Nor reduce them.

Mr. Carvell.—If he proposes to reduce them, then so far as I am concerned, speaking for my own part, I would say we ought to stand by the reference to the committee and after Major Hodgins makes his charges then we will know what further course to pursue.

Then, further on :

Mr. Lennox.—The charges made by Major Hodgins will be to some extent, perhaps, of assistance to us; but we have to travel exactly upon the lines of what has been referred to us, neither enlarging nor circumscribing them. The fact does not relieve us from the duty of pursuing the matter just as it has been referred to us nor from investigating all the questions referred. I think every member of the committee understands that.

Mr. Carvell.—Yes.

However, I think you will find practically the whole matter at page 59. The point I am endeavouring to make clear is that at that time we were unanimous in the opinion —and I think it was the only logical position to take—that even if Major Hodgins refused to do anything, if Major Hodgins had died—nothing but impossibility should prevent us from going on and doing the work submitted to us. So I will submit to the House a few sentences from page 59 and leave it there, whether I have established the matter or not.

Mr. Parent.—We have been accused in the newspapers—

The Chairman.—Yes, it has been spread all over the country.

Mr. Parent.—If the gentleman is allowed to limit his charges, I suppose the evidence will be confined to that ?

Mr. Carvell.—Oh, no.

Mr. Macdonald. (Pictou).—Do not worry about that.

The Chairman.—We will have the right to examine Major Hodgins on the rest of the charges he may drop, even if he does not prefer them.

Mr. Parent.—As far as we are concerned we would like to go through the whole of the charges contained in these newspapers.

Mr. Hodgins.—Let me say that I have not asked to drop any charges.

Mr. Lennox.—It may happen that when Major Hodgins prefers his charges, there may be omitted, matters which have been referred to us. Nevertheless although he may not claim to be able to establish it, we can investigate the matter, as it has been referred to us.

The Chairman.—I understand the fear entertained by Mr. Parent to be this : these charges having been printed in the newspapers and circulated all over the Dominion it would not be fair that any of the charges or points dealt with in the newspaper articles should be dropped altogether.

Mr. Parker.—Oh, no.

The Chairman.—I understand it to be the feeling of the committee that they should not be dropped.

Mr. Lennox.—We will allow nothing to be dropped.

And that was the conclusion of the whole matter, that was the definite position we took before the investigation had begun.

Now, what was the result ? After we had sat for many days, and after wearisome days had been spent in a cross-examination which I do not care to characterize beyond saying that it was an absolute waste of time, after it had been impressed upon Major Hodgins time and again that this so-called arbitration was proceeding, and after he had been tired out by the expense he was being put to by being kept there day after day undergoing a useless and senseless cross examination, it was then that the neat little scene which the chairman of the committee read this morning was enacted and the examination of my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) took place, the matter was amicably settled, and we were told to go home and not investigate any further. I do not think that was right. I am not anxious to spend my time there; but I think we had a duty to perform. Everything that was known the day we ended our labours was known on April 28, when the Prime Minister moved the reference to the committee. On April 28 we had the same statute, the same contract, the same provisions as to reference to arbitration, and we had the subsequent contract which was referred to in the committee. That being so, I fail to see why, after we had elicited a certain amount of information, and after it had abundantly appeared that a vast amount of information material to the country's interest could be elicited, we should be told that we should not proceed.

Now, just one more point, as I wish to close before one o'clock. I wish now to refer to the statute, and the point I want to make clear is that it was a misrepresentation to say to Major Hodgins that we had a board of arbitrators investigating this matter. The other day the Minister of Railways answered a question that I asked by saying that, under section 7 of the agreement between the country and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway the reference was taking place. What I want to submit is, that, as a matter of fact, that inquiry, which is progressing now, has absolutely nothing whatever to do with this question of the cost of construction of the railway or with the question of classification or over classification—that is not a matter that can be investigated under the terms of section 7. Section 7 is a provision that the chief engineer of the railway company and the chief engineer of the Transcontinental Railway Commission shall determine two things, two things only, and they shall determine them as experts. First, the kind of specifications that shall be adopted in reference to the building of this road, in other words, defining what class of road shall be built. Paragraph 7 of the agreement provides that before any work is done these two chief engineers shall determine the kind of road and the kind of specifications that shall be adopted. They provide, in addition, that when these specifications have been adopted by joint action of these two ex-

perts, the question whether the road is being built according to the terms of these specifications, in other words, whether the contractors are living up to the contract, shall also be determined by these two men, and in case they differ, the question shall be referred to the party selected by them, or if they do not agree, the third one shall be appointed by the court. But there is not one word in that clause 7 which justifies the argument that these men can determine the question of classification, or the cost of construction. That matter is defined by paragraph 15 of the contract, where the meaning of cost of construction is defined, and by paragraph 47, which deals with the question of cost of construction. Paragraph 47 I will read, because it covers exactly a difficulty of the kind which has arisen between the Transcontinental Railway Commission and the railway company:

Any dispute which may arise as to the meaning or construction of this agreement, or as to the performance of any of the obligations of either of the parties to this agreement, or as to working expense or cost of construction, should, if not herein otherwise provided for, be determined by the award of a single arbitrator, if the parties concur in his appointment, or if not, by the award of three arbitrators, one of whom shall be appointed by the government, one by the company, and a third by the two so appointed, or, in the case of their being unable to agree, by the chief justice of the Supreme Court of Canada, and the award of a majority of such three arbitrators shall be final.

I wish to point out that no action has been taken, and only by action under section 47 can the question in dispute between the railway company and the commission be determined. This is important, because in this case they are not necessarily experts, and it was in view of the pretense that there was a pending arbitration that Major Hodgins was compelled—I might almost use the word compelled—to retire. Now I argue this, because I think it is important to the country, because I think that inevitably an enormous loss will result to the country by the action taken by the majority of this commission. It is idle to say that the determination of this body, if it did determine it, would protect us from loss. In the meantime money is being paid out, and must be paid out, and an arbitration between the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Transcontinental Railway Commission cannot decide the matter of the contract. The matter has to be decided by the chief engineer. Once the money is paid, if it is improperly paid, it is lost to the country. Therefore it is all important that this matter should be investigated now. I therefore move:

That the report now used be not adopted, but that the following be accepted in lieu thereof:

The special committee to whom was referred the memorandum of the chairman of the Transcontinental Railway Commission of date April 23, 1908, and laid on the Table of the House on April 24, 1908, and the papers accompanying the same, together with the letter of Major Hodgins to the public press therein referred to, with instructions to your committee to investigate the matters and charges therein mentioned, and with power to send for persons, papers and records, and to examine persons on oath or affirmation and to report from time to time, beg leave to report as follows:

Your committee met for organization on April 29, 1908, when Mr. Geoffrion was appointed chairman; it was resolved that Major Hodgins be notified to appear before the committee on May 8, 1908, for the purpose of preferring his charges and to bring with him all papers, correspondence and memoranda in his possession relative to the matters mentioned in the order or reference; and that the Board of Commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway be notified that the committee would meet on the said 8th day of May for the purpose of beginning the investigation; and that the said commissioners be requested to submit any papers or information which they desired to lay before the committee for their consideration; and that the said commissioners be notified to produce for the information of the committee all papers and correspondence (if any) relevant to the subject of inquiry, which may be in their possession or under their control, and which have not already been laid before the House, also all maps, plans, profiles, progress and other estimates, specifications, memoranda or other information regarding the classification of materials in cuttings and fillings and any alterations made therein, and also regarding any charges made in the location of the line within districts 'B' and 'F' of the railway subsequent to the final location thereof.

Your committee met on May 12, 1908, and on that day there was submitted to them in writting a statement of such of the charges made by Major Hodgins as he proposed to substantiate, reproduced and made by him more specific at the request of the committee.

On May 13, 1908, your committee resolved:

That the Transcontinental Railway Commissioners be required to produce to this committee all papers and records in the custody or control of the said commissioners relating to or affecting the matters referred to this committee.

That the First Minister, the Minister of Railways and Canals, and the Minister of Finance and any other ministers of departments, including the Auditor General, having papers or records in their custody or control relating to, or affecting the matters referred to this committee be requested to produce the same before this committee.

Thereupon the taking of evidence was proceeded with, and was continued from time to time until June 18, 1908, and papers, records and documents relating to and affecting the subject matters under investigation were produced and submitted to the consideration of the committee; which proceedings, evidence, papers, records and documents are set forth in the printed minutes and proceedings of the committee up to and inclusive of the said 18th day of June herewith reported and submitted.

As shown by the papers and documents produced by the said commissioners to your committee and set forth in the printed minutes of the proceedings of your committee now reported, many charges of over-classification, of excessive allowances, and undue payments by the said commissioners to the contractors, of a like description to those charged by Major Hodgins, have formally been made by and on behalf of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, which charges involve and are examples of enormous overpayments out of the public funds, and are of serious concern to this Dominion. They cover and include not only the charges made by Major Hodgins, but other specific and more serious complaints of the like nature and description; and not merely for the period dealt with by Major Hodgins but are continuous up to the time of the order of reference to your committee.

Such complaints and charges are within the scope of the order under which your committee have been conducting this inquiry and should be investigated by them.

On June 16, 1908, certain statements and opinions having been elicited from Major Hodgins as to the attitude he then assumed and his wishes in the premises as appears of record in the said printed evidence a majority of your committee despite the protest of the minority ruled and thereafter maintained that the matters and charges referred to your committee for investigation should not be further proceeded with by your committee.

Your committee, therefore, humbly make this interim report and recommend that the subject matter of the investigation be remitted to the committee with instructions to proceed therein until completion.

At one o'clock, House took recess.

House resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Carleton, N.B.). Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry that I find it necessary to take up any portion of the time of the House at this late stage of the session in discussing a question which, I may say, was dead and buried something like three or four weeks ago, but as our hon. friends on the other side have decided to discuss it we find it necessary, in order to place the case fairly before the country, to take up some of the time and I will proceed to do so as speedily as possible. This question arises entirely on account of a letter which Major Hodgins, at one time district engineer in the employ of the Transcontinental Railway Commission, wrote to the Victoria 'Colonist,' somewhere about the 16th April last, followed by two interviews, I think, on the 17th and 19th April. When this letter and these interviews were brought to the attention of the chairman of the Transcontinental Railway Commission he immediately sent a note to the right hon. the Premier (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) accompanied by all the correspondence bearing upon Major Hodgins' dismissal and asked that a parliamentary committee be appointed in order to have the matter thoroughly investigated. That was done and even before the full text of Major Hodgins' letter had had time to come from Victoria here, a meeting of the committee was held, we took evidence for two or three weeks, interspersed with a good many adjournments and finally we were able to bring down a majority report with which I am very sorry to say two members of the committee were unable to agree. My hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) discussed this matter for an hour and a half and in the main, as far as he discussed it, he was very unfair. There were one or two instances, which I might almost call glaring instances, of unfairness to which I will be compelled to refer and then I will proceed, as I feel it to be my duty to do, to discuss this matter to some extent upon different lines from those followed by my hon. friend, or rather on lines in regard to which my hon. friend conveniently forgot to discuss it. My hon. friend forgot to discuss the charges made by Major Hodgins, and I do not wonder, because I would think that if there is a man in Christendom whom the Conservative party in Canada to-day want to forget and to imagine never existed it is Major Hodgins. We know the glee with which they looked forward to the investigation of these charges and we can appreciate to some extent their disappointment at the outcome. However, rather than let him die—I mean figuratively—or let his charges die, they have decided to bring the matter up in the House and they have devoted their whole attention to the question of classification and have attempted to make out the charge that a grave fraud is being committed upon the country by means of the classification in the construction of this railway. I must insist and I think I am logical when I do insist, that Major Hodgins' statements are the foundation of the whole case, and that but for this letter and these interviews, we never would have heard of the matter. The press comments upon the letter are only carrying out the same ideas as those which are embodied in the letter itself. The letter, as I understand it, practically charged four things. It did not raise the question of classification in any distinct instance excepting in district 'F' which I will take occasion to refer to a little later on. The first portion of the letter charged that there was trouble in connection with the work in district 'F' and that Mr. Young, one of the commissioners, suggested to Major Hodgins that he should go down to Quebec, take an object lesson and see how matters are run there. The second statement is that Major Hodgins went to Quebec, went to a certain cutting called La Tuque, a cutting originally intended to be a tunnel, but a cutting which they afterwards changed to an open cut, and he there saw that they classified material as 86 per cent solid rock which, in his judgment, should only have been classified as 40 per cent. He at once came to the conclusion that all

the work in the province of Quebec was being classified upon that basis, or that there was about twice as much solid rock as there ought to be. When I point out to the House that under the contract of Mr. McArthur he was paid $1.70 per cubic yard for the removal of solid rock, 60 cents per cubic yard for loose rock and 30 cents per cubic yard for common excavation, it is not necessary to be an engineer to see what a huge fraud would be perpetrated upon the country if the facts alleged by Major Hodgins were true, and if the classification of material in Quebec was as Major Hodgins claimed it was. The third statement is that if he had gone back to his district and had classified the work according to the Quebec classification it would have amounted to a difference of about $4,000,000 on the 400 miles of district 'F' and if applied to the whole line it would have amounted to a difference of $28,000,000 in the cost. The fourth statement in the letter is that because he would not adopt the Quebec classification his services were dispensed with, and that Mr. Poulin, a friend of Mr. Parent, was appointed in his stead. If any person will take this letter, and these interviews and will read them over carefully he will agree with me that these are the salient points, in fact, that they are the only points contained in the letter and the interviews. They are the only things therefore which any ordinary man ought to consider or take up as being the substance of the letter. They are the very things which the Ottawa 'Citizen,' picked out as being the substance and they are the things which any newspaper or individual would pick out.

Mr. TALBOT. There was also the statement about Mr. Poulin being a Frenchman.

Mr. CARVEL. Yes, there was something said about Mr. Poulin being a Frenchman. I do not propose to discuss that. I do not see why a Frenchman should not be as good an engineer as an Englishman. We had before the committee two gentlemen of the French nationality, Mr. Doucet and Mr. Poulin, who, while I am not picking them out and placing them over other engineers, will, I think, compare favourably with any engineers in the Dominion of Canada. However, that is beside the subject. There is no doubt that there had been considerable difficulty in the management of the work in district 'F.' District 'F' covers a distance of 400 miles, extending from Winnipeg eastward, but at that particular time the most important part of that work extended 250 miles from Winnipeg eastward to the junction between the main line of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway and the Lake Superior branch, and we all know that it was the object of the government, of the commission, of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and of everybody and in the interest of everybody that this branch should be pushed forward to completion as rapidly as possible in order that the crop of the west of 1910, might, if possible, be handled in some degree over this line; in fact it was confidently hoped at the time this Bill became law that the crop of 1909 would be handled over this line. In the year 1907 the commissioners, without doubt, saw that the work was not progressing as rapidly as it ought to, and I think it is very likely—and if so it is to their credit—that they were looking around to see if there was not some way in which they could hurry up this work and get it completed more expeditiously than it would be according to the indications at that time.

I am not going into details further than to say that the trouble was entirely a matter between Major Hodgins and his subordinate engineers. Let us look at the facts. There has been no time in my day when labour was as high as in the summer of 1907, and it appears from the evidence that when the contractors made the agreement with the commission they expected to get labour for 15 cents an hour, or $1.50 for a day of 10 hours, whereas it actually cost them from 20 cents to 25 cents an hour. We also know that when labour is scare and wages high it is almost impossible to get as much value from men's labour in 10 hours as when the conditions are reversed. There was no doubt that there was great difficulty in getting labour and carrying on the work as rapidly as was hoped for, and there is no doubt that Mr. Young and other members of the commission took every honourable means in their power to hurry up the work, and no doubt they questioned Major Hodgins as to why greater progress was not being made. I defy any one to point a single instance in the pages of this evidence in which Mr. Young or any other member of the commission even intimated or suggested any improper conduct on Major Hodgins' part. I have gone carefully over the evidence of Major Hodgins on this subject (pages 105, 106, 107), and I submit you cannot find even an insinuation by Mr. Young or any member of the commission against Major Hodgins. I have nothing to say against Major Hodgins; he is a man for whom, in some ways, I have quite an admiration. I believe he is an honourable man, but unfortunately he did not seem to know how to get along with the engineers under him, and I do not think he knew much more about getting along with the contractors. So great was the trouble—it was practically altogether on District 'F'—that the commission found it necessary to appoint an inspecting engineer so that this particular work might have more supervision than it had been receiving. You must remember that the chief engineer has multitudinous duties to perform, and while he might go over a portion of the work he

could not be expected to go over all the work as thoroughly and as frequently as would be necessary. It seems unfortunate that neither Major Hodgins nor his assistant, Mr. Heaman, had ever been over the work except on some small portion of it. Major Hodgins deposed he had only been on the work in one instance for a few miles up to that time, and he also declares his assistant engineer had only been over a small portion of it. Then Mr. Grant was appointed, and Mr. Grant is an engineer of repute, and not one word has been stated against him, either in his personal or professional capacity. I have no hesitation in saying that the appointment of Mr. Grant is the real cause of all the trouble with Major Hodgins. It became simply a question of unreasoning jealousy on the part of Major Hodgins, and we all know that when the green-eyed monster takes possession of a man he ceases to be a reasonable being. Any one who reads the evidence must come to the conclusion that from the time Mr. Grant was appointed inspecting engineer Major Hodgins saw nothing but trouble in everything done by the engineers or by the commission. It is true that Major Hodgins went to Quebec. I will take the liberty of stating something which appears from the documents, although I do not know that it appears in the printed evidence. However, from a letter produced by the commissioners it appears that away back in 1906 the district engineer at St. John, Mr. Dunn, suggested a meeting of all the district engineers on the work in company with the chief engineer and the commissioners, in order that they might satisfy themselves how each was doing his work and, so far as possible, arrive at a uniform system. That suggestion was discussed, and it was not until the month of June, 1907, they were able to carry out this suggestion. Now, in the month of June of that year, instead of Major Hodgins having been sent to Quebec, as he would lead us to believe, for the purpose of taking these object lessons, every district engineer on the whole line from St. John to Winnipeg was sent to Quebec, the chief engineer went to Quebec and every commissioner went to Quebec, and they met the assistant chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific and all the engineers on the work in District 'B,' there being twenty-five or thirty officials present. We find that from the time this party left Ottawa until they separated at Quebec there never was an hour of the time when Major Hodgins was not finding fault with some one over the appointment of Mr. Grant.

Mr. BARKER. There is not a word of evidence as to that.

Mr. CARVELL. I will not take up hours reading the evidence, but I will make this submission to the House, and the House will take my word.

Mr. BARKER. I have to contradict the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CARVELL. The hon. gentleman has his right to contradict, but I will make no statement which I cannot back up by the evidence, and I will make no statement that my hon. friend (Mr. Barker) can contradict by the evidence. It is in evidence, and the hon. gentleman knows it, that on the boat going to Quebec Mr. Hodgins was grumbling and Mr. Commissioner Reid, in the presence of others, remarked: Well, Mr. Grant is appointed and you cannot help it, or words to that effect. I repeat that the whole cause of Major Hodgins' trouble was jealousy over the appointment of Mr. Grant, and that at every opportunity Major Hodgins was finding fault with the appointment of Mr. Grant. Now, all these engineers met on the ground, and they discussed the question, and they tried to get benefit from the inspection, and I believe every man in the party did get some benefit from it except, possibly, Major Hodgins. Major Hodgins, when he was there, in company with Mr. Doucet, visited a certain cutting, and Major Hodgins swears before the committee that Mr. Doucet told him that cutting was classified 86 per cent solid rock. There was an Italian contractor present and he described this cutting very minutely, and there cannot be any question that it was the same cutting to which Major Hodgins refers. Now, I do not mean to say that Major Hodgins is stating what is not true; but I believe that Major Hodgins' mind was so warped at that time by jealousy that I do not think he was in a position to intelligently understand what was going on. The fact is that no matter what Major Hodgins may have believed, there is no possibility of getting away from the fact that while he himself would have classified that cutting at 40 per cent solid rock, at that very time that particular cutting was being classified only 32 per cent solid rock, and 10 per cent loose rock, and the balance common excavation. That was in the month of June, and there is no possible doubt that for the preceding month of May that particular cutting was classified only 29 per cent solid rock, 3 per cent loose rock and 61 per cent common excavation. It would be the month of May which this gentleman would be discussing because the estimates are not made up until the end of the month and therefore any discussion of classification of any particular material in June would be with reference to May classification. I do not care how honest Major Hodgins may have been in his opinion, I do not care whether he was honest or dishonest, the fact remains he was wrong in his recollection of what happened, wrong in

his statement of what actually happened and wrong in the conclusion which he arrived at; that cut instead of being classified at 86 per cent as he said or 40 per cent as he would have been willing to classify it, was classified at 29 per cent in those two months. Major Hodgins also says that at this time he had a conversation with Mr. Armstrong who was assistant chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific. From the beginning of this work the Grand Trunk Pacific have had engineers to go over the work, they have had plenty of them and no one can say that they are not doing their duty, going over the work day by day in order to see that the commission's engineers are properly carying out the work and doing their classifying. Mr. Armstrong was the assistant chief engineer in the province of Quebec at that time, he was a gentleman who had had very wide experience in railway construction in Canada, who had been in the employ of the Canadian Northern for many years and had had large experience not only in the west but also in the eastern portion of Canada. Major Hodgins says that in a conversation which he had with Mr. Armstrong, at Latugne, or the next day at Quebec, Mr. Armstrong told him they were classifying this work to such an extent that it would cost $2,000,000 more to build this portion of the road than it should cost or would cost if properly classified. I shall give Armstrong's evidence on this later on. Unfortunately, on account of Major Hodgins withdrawing the charges, there are many points which should be cleared up that were not, but it was thought unwise to take up the time to clear up points that could be cleared in another way. However, I may say Mr. Armstrong would, if given a chance, have positively denied this statement and will in another way deny absolutely that he ever made such a charge. Prior to this Mr. Grant had been over the work and had made a report which was any thing but complimentary to Major Hodgins and his assistant chief engineer, Mr. Heaman. Things went on from bad to worse and finally Major Hodgins realized that the work was progressing so slowly that he must do something to hurry things along. Major Hodgins claimed in the letter and the interview that they wanted him to introduce in his work what he calls the Quebec classification, and that if he had introduced the Quebec classification in this work it would have increased the cost to the country. Yet Major Hodgins himself is on record as recommending that a portion of this work be done not by the terms of the contract but by what he calls and what is called by the engineers force account. I shall explain that term. He suggested that all classified material or all material as to the classification of which there was a question, should be paid for not by the terms of the contract but by keeping an account of the actual cost of the work and adding to that 10 per cent. He suggested this because he claimed the contractors could not under the then existing conditions as to the labour market, do the work for the amount they were receiving from the commission and come out of it alive and in order to put them in a position to do the work, he suggested that they should depart from the terms of the contract and do this work by force account, although, according to his own interpretation, this must have meant an increased cost to the country. This suggestion was made to the commission and the commission at once did what reasonable business men would have done, they sent their chief engineer, old as he was, busy as he was, up to the work in order to look it over; and while I have no comments to make on the duties or acts of the chief engineer, because he is an official appointed by the government who is not responsible to the commission, who is practically an autocrat as far as his work is concerned and can do as he has a mind to do, I do say that it was a matter of regret that the chief engineer at this time did not find time to go over the whole work instead of only four miles of it. The facts are that he went over about four miles and made an arrangement that he would come back to Ottawa, submit the question to the commissioners, and immediately wire him to Winnipeg the results of the interview. He came to Ottawa and while I have no knowledge of what took place between him and the commissioners, because there is no record of it, I do know that there was a letter written to the chairman of the commission which to my mind is one of the ablest documents placed before the committee although there are many hundreds of them. That document, I think, reflects infinite credit upon the commission and shows that the government have appointed men who intend to carry out the law and to carry on this work according to the law if it is possible to do so. I wish to refer to that letter. It is found on pages 28 and 29 of the case and is written by the commission through its chairman to Mr. Parent. It is dated August 24, 1907, and was written either the very day or the day after the chief engineer returned from an inspection of the western district. I shall not read the first part of the letter which simply refers to going to district 'F' with Mr. Grant's report and a few things like that, but I shall quote the concluding portions. It reads :

> There is a letter from Mr. Hodgins, dated the 6th instant, addresed to you, which should have been submitted to the board, together with document No. 4, attached, so as to give every available information on the subject. They came to our notice incidentally.

That is, the commissioners evidently are finding fault with the chief engineer because certain documents from Major Hodgins were not placed before them earlier but in-

cidently the commission got hold of them. The letter continues :

It would appear from its contents that after certain items had been classified a change was deemed necessary and other classifications made, which it would seem received his approval. Such a state of affairs shows that there has surely been negligence somewhere in the management of this district, and, from a consideration of these facts, the natural inference would be that the district engineer is not competent to handle properly such work as he is now entrusted with. Under the circumstances, it is the duty of the chief engineer to take whatever means are required to put a stop to conditions which have already existed too long. Among the points of first importance requiring your attention is to find and suggest a way to the different district engineers and others to ensure, as much as possible, a uniform classification according to the plans and specifications on which the contracts are made with the contractors. It is essential that there be no misunderstanding on the subject. In this connection I might point out that the commission never authorized any one, nor can it do so, to disregard in any respect the letter of our contracts and specifications, which must be the only guide to go by, and that for no reason can anything be paid to the contractors or their sub-contractors which is not provided for in the same. At the same time, it must be borne in mind that contractors are entitled to a fair and reasonable classification, based as already stated. We cannot deprive them of what is rightfully their own under the contracts and specifications.

It was mentioned by you that Major Hodgins had stated that he had changed the classifications of certain items of work in order to meet our wishes. In that case, he should be informed at once that no such changes should be effected, as any instructions to that effect must come direct from you; and, moreover, inasmuch as the commissioners never instructed him yet in that sense, nor did they express the desire to Mr. Hodgins to make any such changes interfering in any way with his right to make classifications just and reasonable, based upon the specifications.

Furthermore, in order to avoid the risk of any difficulty later on, it should be made a rule as far as possible that the classifications receive the approval of the engineer representing the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway at the various points where there is work going on.

In conclusion, as documents explaining changes made in certain estimates of district 'F' were added to the same after they had gone through and without our seeing them, I must decline the responsibility of certifying to the said estimates before being furnished with a full explanation of the matter.

Awaiting a reply at your earliest convenience.

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) S. N. PARENT,
Chairman.

I submit that if any evidence were required to prove that the commission were doing as good work as possible, you have all you want in that letter. When the chief engineer came down with the suggestion to depart from the conditions of the contract, the moment the suggestion was made we have a letter here—the ablest document produced before the commission—to show that the commission were anxious to have the work done according to the contract and as honestly as possible. Notification was sent Major Hodgins that the commission would not agree to his proposal and he was compelled to submit, but he sent a letter arguing that if the commissioners would allow him to have his way, that would please the contractors, it would amount to very little, and it would be better for the country in the end. Major Hodgins may have been right on the question of expediency, but under the terms of the contract the commissioners could not consent. And because of his proposition to disregard the contract and specifications, Major Hodgins was notified that his services were no longer required.

I have tried to give a summary of the transaction from the time the trouble arose early in June down to the time when Major Hodgins was dismissed from the service. In one of the interviews which Major Hodgins gave the 'Colonist,' there are a few specific instances of over-classification, and these were heralded all over the country in every Conservative newspaper as showing the manner in which the engineers were evading the law, and they were made the foundation for the statement that the commission were paying padded accounts. Now let me point out how this term 'padded accounts,' which has been so much exploited by these papers, came to be used and all the facts in that connection. There were a few instances in district 'F' where there was a quarrel, you might say, between the engineers and the contractors. The engineers had classified these few items as one thing, we will say, as loose rock or common excavation. The contractors said that in these instances the material should have been classified higher—as loose rock instead of common excavation and as solid rock instead of loose rock. These items altogether, will you believe me, only amount to $6,400. All these charges which we have been hearing all over Canada are reduced to the fact that changes were made amounting to between $6,000 and $7,000. These changes were made in the July estimates, they were made in the division over which was placed Mr. McIntosh, and when Mr. McIntosh sent in his July estimates he informed Major Hodgins that these changes had been made. There is nothing concealed about it at all. He reported to Mr. Hodgins in every instance that he had set up these items from common excavation to loose rock or from loose rock to solid rock. He gives the cutting, the station, the amount and everything. That will be found at page 121 of the evidence. I am taking the trouble

to refer to this particularly, because, while it is a very small matter in itself it has given food for a good deal of exaggerated political gossip all over Canada. The letter accompanying that changed estimate from Mr. McIntosh to Major Hodgins will be found at page 132 of the evidence :

Wabigoon Falls, July 27, 1907.

Major A. E. Hodgins,
District Engineer, N.T.C. Ry.,
Kenora, Ontario.

Dear Sir,—Inclosed herewith please find estimates for the month of July. I have made some changes in the classification, changing certain amounts which were returned as loose rock into solid, and common excavation into loose rock on residencies 25 and 26. A statement is attached to the estimates showing the amounts transferred. The amount transferred on residency 26 is 2,300 cubic yards, from loose rock to solid, station 4,240.

Then, Sir, to make it even worse from the Conservative standpoint, Major Hodgins, by a letter dated August 6, reported the same thing to Mr. Lumsden. Therefore, not only Major Hodgins but Mr. Lumsden knew from the beginning that these little changes were made amounting to between $6,000 and $7,000.

I come now to what I consider the next important point in these letters and that is that Major Hodgins concluded that if the Quebec classification, as he chose to call it, were introduced into district 'F' it would mean that it would increase the cost of the work about $4,000,000. It seems that Mr. McArthur, some month or two before this, in an interview published in the Toronto 'World,' stated that the cost of district 'F,' instead of being between $11,000,000 and $12,000,000, at which Major Hodgins had estimated it, probably would be $16,000,000. Major Hodgins and the Conservative press at once came to the conclusion and heralded it all over the country that because they had introduced the Quebec classification the price had jumped from $11,000,0000 to $16,000,000. I want to give some figures upon this question which, I think, pretty thoroughly answer that assertion. Mr. Poulin, the present district engineer, made a detailed statement of the cost of this work immediately after taking charge in September or October, 1907. He stated that he found that there had been about $6,000,000 of the cost of this part of the road actually omitted in the estimate made by Major Hodgins and which has been put forth to the world as being the true cost of this work. Major Hodgins told us his first estimate of cost was between $12,000,000 and $13,000,000, but that on account of changes in the plan and of revising his estimate by going over the work as he ought to—and I give him full credit for doing so, and on account of his good engineering he had reduced the cost down to between $11,000,000 and $12,000,000. We will put it at $12,000,000. I am going to read to the House the actual items which Major Hodgins had omitted in making his calculations of from $12,000,000 to $13,000,000. These items are as follows :

Right of Way..	$175,000
Ties....	672,798
Switch ties..	27,787
Tunnels..	189,750
Drainage tunnels....	16,700
Steel in concrete..	3,708
Steel bridges....	160,000
Rails..	1,336,608

Mr. BARKER. None of these items were in Mr. McArthur's contract.

Mr. CARVELL. I am aware of that and I am aware that these items are included in the work that Mr. McArthur is talking about. He is not talking about his own work.

Mr. BARKER. Yes he is.

Mr. CARVELL. I know this is the thing that pinches my hon. friend, but it is a fact just the same.

Angle bars..	106,172
Bolts..	22,776
Water stations..	103,500
Extra work..	76,500
Frogs and switches...	40,500
Track spikes..	58,820

Then, there is another thing; in all rock cuttings they have to go one foot below the grade in order to give a chance to place the ballast under the sleepers. That one foot below grade amounts to $495,000. Extra width for sidings not estimated amounts to $850,000. Then these figures are only with respect to the actual cuts as figured out from the cross-sections on the plans. My hon. friend referred to the question of slopes. Any man who knows anything about rock work of any kind knows that there is no man who can take out a cut for a railway or for anything in the world and make the sides perfectly smooth as they will be figured out on paper. There must be a certain amount allowed for jagged edges. There must be certain places where you go in further than you ought to go. That is called the overbreak. I am told that this would increase the amount of the cutting by between 20 and 25 per cent. I am told that on the Canadian Pacific Railway work which has been completed between Toronto and North Bay in many cases it exceeds 25 per cent. But, taking it at 20 per cent it amounts to $1,857,080. If you add these items together you find a total amount, not included in Major Hodgins estimate, of $6,192,699.

Mr. LENNOX. Good !

Mr. CARVELL. My hon. friend did not refer to this.

Mr. LENNOX. No.

Mr. CARVELL. No, he would not. The newspapers of hon. gentlemen opposite would not refer to it and my hon. friend and his friends would try to make the people believe that this work is going to cost $16,000,000 or $17,000,000 because of the increased classification. They are not fair enough to admit that this is not the case and that the reason that it is going to cost more than Major Hodgins' estimate is simply because unfortunately he had not included in his estimate certain items which he should have included. I have another statement here which will bear out my contention. When Major Hodgins made his estimates, of course, he made them by divisions. Now one division, No. 9, is practically completed, and therefore I am able to give the House some actual figures to show whether Major Hodgins was correct in his estimate or not. He estimated that in that division there would be removed 132,067 cubic yards of solid rock and 681,752 cubic yards of common excavation, and that there would be no loose rock whatever. He left the works in October, and we have the figures up to 30th September, which was his last estimate. Up to that date there had been actually removed 126,224 cubic yards of solid rock or about 4,000 more than he had estimated altogether. Up to April 30, 1908, there had been removed 180,948 cubic yards, and it will take 4,000 more to complete the work. Therefore, instead of the proper estimate being 132,000 cubic yards of solid rock, it should have been 185,000. And this is not guesswork ; the work has been completed and measured, and the returns have been sent in to the commission. As I said, Major Hodgins estimated that there would be no loose rock. But the loose rock excavated up to April 30 amounted to 20,975 cubic yards. His estimate of the common excavation was 681,752 cubic yards. When he left, the actual quantity was 796,206 cubic yards, or a little over 100,000 cubic yards more than he estimated altogether. Up to April 30, the common excavation removed amounted to 899,040 cubic yards. When Mr. Poulin went on the work, as I said, he made a most careful estimate of what it would cost to complete. His estimate was $17,534,175. To show you how correct his estimate was, I say that he estimated that in section 9 it would be necessary to remove 190,230 cubic yards of solid rock,—the actual quantity was 185,000. He estimated 20,332 yards of loose rock,—the actual quantity was 20,975. He estimated 970,000 cubic yards of common excavation—there was actually 899,040 yards. Therefore, the figures are practically the same. This is, to my mind, the best evidence of the value of Mr. Poulin's estimate of the cost of this work. Now, if you take Major Hodgins' revised estimate of $12,000,000 and add the $6,000,000 of which I have spoken, you have $18,000,000 as the actual cost of the work, whereas Mr. Poulin's estimate was $17,534,000—only half a million dollars between them. This, I submit, is why the work is costing more than Major Hodgins estimated—it is because they are removing more material and because in their estimate they include everything to make a completed railroad fit to run trains upon. Think of estimating the cost of a railroad without rails and ties. When you take everything into account, you find that the estimate is about $17,000,000, and that without changing the mode of classification or giving any contractor a dollar more for the work than he is entitled to. I think that in the face of this surely my hon. friend should have been fair enough to discuss this side of the question. He should have told the country and his political friends to whom he will send copies of his remarks that Major Hodgins was wrong in his estimate, that the 'Quebec classification' was not introduced into district 'F' because there was no such thing as 'Quebec classification.' I hope the people to whom the hon. gentleman is presenting his remarks will find out the facts. And I think they will. For, as I have said, if there ever was an issue dead and buried it is this Hodgins question. However, now that the hon. gentleman has seen fit to exhume it, we should have the facts.

Now, I come to the next question, on which the hon. gentleman spent an hour and a half, the question of classification. I am compelled to discuss this question ; not that I think it should enter into our consideration, not that I think there is anything wrong ; but my hon. friends have been driven from the main question they have been compelled to admit—by silence if in no other way—that Major Hodgins was not sent to Quebec for the purpose of taking object lessons in classification, that there was nothing wrong with the classification in Quebec, that there was no attempt to introduce what they call the 'Quebec classification' in district 'F' and that Major Hodgins was not dismissed because he would not do something contrary to the law that the commissioners wanted him to. They are compelled to admit all this, and they are driven to the only thing that any person could bring forward, and that is to say : Oh, the Grand Trunk Pacific engineers have stated that you over-classified this work. For that reason, it is said, we should have brought these engineers before us; we should have constituted ourselves a court of engineers to make a pronouncement as to whether the classification was according to specifications or not. The hon. gentleman has read a letter of 7th October from Mr. H. A. Woods, assistant chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific. I am glad he has done this ; for it has the effect of pointing out to the people of Canada the fact that the Grand Trunk Pacific Company are doing everything in their power—I think I can al-

most go so far as to say everything in their power, whether fair or unfair—to keep down the cost of this work. If the people of this country had suspicions that it would cost more than it should, the conduct of the Grand Trunk Pacific engineers should dispel all doubt. Hon. members of this House can go home perfectly satisfied that, whatever scandal may have arisen in Canada, there is no scandal over the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. Mr. Woods sends a letter to the chief engineer on October 7, 1907, which was read by my hon. friend from Simcoe in full. There is also another letter of April 21, which my hon. friend referred to but did not read in full, which will be found at page 407 of the evidence. But before I take that up, I want to give the statement made by Mr. Armstrong. I said some time ago that Mr. Armstrong was assistant district engineer for the Grand Trunk Pacific, whose duty it was to go over the work in district 'B' and report to his chief what he found, and, if he found anything to his mind contrary to the contract, to say so. He was the man who did the reporting, the man who made the reports of the specific places where there was over-classification. We heard a great deal this forenoon of the amount of this over-classification. One would think from the remarks of my hon. friend from South Simcoe that there must have been millions of dollars involved in this question. I am satisfied that the Conservative newspapers to-morrow will herald all over Canada that Mr. H. A. Woods had called the attention of the chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific to the facts that millions of dollars of improper classification had taken place on this work.

Mr. LENNOX. I want to call your attention to the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the inquiry is not completed, that Major Hodgins' counsel retired on the understanding that nothing further was to be done, and the question came before the committee——

Mr. CARVELL. I have no objection to my hon. friend asking a question, but I object to his making a speech.

Mr. LENNOX. I am only asking it by permission of the hon. gentleman. Was it not ruled in the committee that we would not hear Mr. Armstrong as a witness owing to the condition in which the case stood? Is it fair now to read that statement

Mr. CARVELL. It was not so ruled—my hon. friend wants an answer.

Mr. LENNOX. Well, I say it was.

Mr. BARKER. That statement never was before the committee.

Mr. CARVELL. I admit it was not before the committee. But this is a statement of Mr. Armstrong under oath, and in this statement Mr. Armstrong says that all the work in dispute up to the 7th day of October did not amount to $50,000. My hon. friend does not want this read; I will not read it, but I will state here again that Mr. Armstrong said under oath that up to the 7th of October there was not $50,000 involved in the whole question.

Mr. LENNOX. I have no objection to the hon. gentleman reading the statement if he wishes.

Mr. CARVELL. (reading):

Dominion of Canada, Province of Ontario, County of Carleton, to wit:

I, John Armstrong, of the city of Quebec, in the province of Quebec, civil engineer, do solemnly declare:

1o. That if I had been permitted to testify as a witness before the Special Parliamentary Committee investigating Major Hodgins' charges I would have given the following evidence:

(a) That I was district engineer in district 'B' (Quebec) for the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company from August 1906 to April 1908;

(b) That I never told Major Hodgins or any other person that the over classification in the Quebec district would amount to $2,000,000, and that I informed Major Hodgins before he submitted his synopsis of charges to the special committee that I would not corroborate his statement in this regard;

(c) That when Major Hodgins visited the work in the Quebec district in June, 1907, there had been no objection to classification on the part of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, and in my opinion there was no ground at that time to justify any objection to classification;

(d) That in my opinion there were not more than $50,000 involved in the classification objected to by Mr. H. A. Woods in his letter to Mr. Hugh L. Lumsden, dated October 7, 1907, and referring to the work inspected by Mr. Woods and myself a short time prior to the writing of the said letter;

2o. That after receiving a copy of Chief Engineer Lumsden's interpretation of the specifications I wrote to my superior, Mr. Woods, stating that according to Mr. Lumsden's interpretation the classification in district 'B' could not be objected to and in some cases might be increased. This condition prevailed up to the time I left the work in April, 1908.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of the Canada Evidence Act.

Declared before me at the city of Ottawa, in the County of Carleton, this 19th day of June, A.D., 1908.

(Sgd.) JOHN ARMSTRONG.

(Sgd.) Charles Murphy,
A Notary Public.

Now, Mr. Speaker, he states that had he known of Mr. Lumsden's interpretation at that time, in his opinion there would have been no question about classification, and in many instances the classification would be increased. I want to submit what

Mr. Woods said about the classification and about Mr. Lumsden's interpretation of it. His letter is dated the 20th of February, 1908.

Mr. BARKER. Is that paper before the committee?

Mr. CARVELL. That letter was before the committee.

I beg to acknowledge receipt of your favour of the 17th instant, giving your interpretation of clauses 34, 35 and 36 of our specifications, with blue prints and explanations of same, also copy of your instructions to your engineers.

We are quite satisfied with your interpretation of the specifications and with your instructions, which are explicit.

Mr. LENNOX. I read that this morning.

Mr. CARVELL. I do not think my hon. friend did ; however, I have read it again. Now, I say in the first place, that Mr. Woods admits that Mr. Lumsden's interpretation of the specifications is correct, that is, his interpretation of the 10th of January, to which I will refer later on. In the second place, Mr. Armstrong says that had he known of Mr. Lumsden's interpretation there would not have been anything to discuss in regard to the classification in district 'B,' and in some cases it should have been higher.

Mr. BARKER. Does that letter refer to the interpretation of the specification after it was altered by the commissioners ?

Mr. CARVELL. I object to the hon. gentleman, under the guise of asking questions, making that statement. I tell him that the interpretation never was altered by the commissioners, and I am surprised that he stands up in this House and says so.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman will find a letter from Mr. Ryan, secretary of the commissioners, informing Mr. Lumsden that his modified interpretation had been approved.

Mr. CARVELL. But did the commissioners make the interpretation? My hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) was unfair enough to refer to that, he said that the commission made this interpretation. My hon. friends know they did not.

Mr. LENNOX. I did not say anything of the kind ; I read the letter.

Mr. CARVELL. My hon. friend read the letter, and the only inference to be drawn from his statements was that the commission made this interpretation.

Mr. LENNOX. I did not say so.

Mr. CARVELL. My hon. friend seeks to get away from it, and I do not blame him ; I would if I were in his place. I was surprised this morning when he made the statement, and I thought that we would see him try to crawl away from it before this debate was through. All the commissioners did was to accept the interpretation put upon these clauses by the chief engineer, and under the contract he had a right to make an interpretation for the commission. Who, under the statute and under the contract, is the man who decides all questions of classification? Is it not the chief engineer? Of course it is, and my hon. friends know it. My hon. friends know that under this law and under this contract, no matter what interpretation of the chief engineer decides to put upon any clause of this contract and of the specifications, the commission are bound by it. Therefore, when the commission state that they accepted it, they did what the law compelled them to do, and my hon. friends know it.

Now, to go on. After the receipt of this letter of the 7th of October, the question naturally arose among the commissioners, the chief engineer, the assistant chief engineer, the Grand Trunk Pacific engineers, the contractors and everybody concerned as to what was the proper interpretation of this clause for classification. I suppose it would be considered elementary if I were to tell this House that railroads are not built by a lump sum contract. Railroads are built by a contractor agreeing to do certain work for certain prices. In these contracts there are something like a hundred different items on which a price is placed. The contractor agrees that he will furnish lumber for so much a thousand, no matter how much it takes ; that he will furnish concrete for so much a yard, no matter how much it requires ; that he will remove solid rock for so much a yard and loose rock and common excavation for so much a yard. That is the way in which railway contracts are drawn. I am going to refer to three items, solid rock, loose rock and common excavation, because they form the greater part of the value of the work done. When this letter of the 7th of October was received, the question naturally came up : What is the true interpretation of the specifications laid down by the commission under which the contract was signed? Remember, the contractors agreed to build this road at so much per cubic yard, and a cubic yard of solid rock meant just what the specification says it meant. Before you could tell what this work ought to cost you had to ascertain what it took to excavate a yard of solid rock or loose rock or common excavation. Everything in these specifications is incorporated in the contract and the definition of 'solid rock' in the contract is as follows :

Solid rock excavation will include all rock found in ledges or masses of more than one

cubic yard, which in the judgment of the engineer may be best removed by blasting.

I want to call the attention of hon. gentlemen to the fact that in the punctuation of that, the comma is placed after the word 'yard.' Section 35 says:

Loose rock.

35. All large stones and boulders measuring more than one cubic foot and less than one cubic yard, and all loose rock whether in situ or otherwise, that may be removed by hand, pick or bar, all cemented gravel, indurated clay and other materials that cannot, in the judgment of the engineer, be ploughed with a 10-inch grading plough, behind a team of six good horses, properly handled; and without the necessity of blasting, although blasting may be occasionally resorted to, shall be classified as loose rock.

Hon. gentlemen opposite say there is no trouble in arriving at what solid rock is, and certainly if in this contract it meant absolute rock in ledges there would be no question about it. But, it does not say that solid rock only means what is found in ledges and Mr. Lumsden's first interpretation was that solid rock only included rock actually found in ledges or in boulders of one cubic yard or upwards. Mr. Lumsden then started out to see what other people thought about it, although he had the absolute right to say what was the proper interpretation of these terms. I think any one who reads the contract, engineer or layman, cannot help but come to the conclusion that solid rock means a little more than rock in ledges or boulders measuring one cubic yard or upwards, because the contract uses the expression: Masses of more than one cubic yard. If it would occur in the shape of a mass greater than one cubic yard which in the judgment of the engineers could best be removed by blasting then you would have solid rock although you might have a mixture of all sorts of material. Mr. Lumsden started out to find what other people thought about it and he wrote to all his district engineers for their interpretation of this clause in the specification. The first letter he received in reply was from Mr. Doucet, district engineer, and it is as follows:

Quebec, October 26, 1907.

Hugh D. Lumsden, Esq.,
Chief Engineer, Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—I have already had occasion to state to you verbally the interpretation the engineers in district 'B' have placed on the classification of solid and loose rock, and in accordance with which the progress estimates have been returned since the inception of the work.

So that our viws of this interpretation may be put before you concisely and clearly, I beg now to state: 1. That we have classified as solid rock all ledge work, all boulders measuring more than one cubic yard, all masses of small boulders and cemented material which, in our judgment, were best removed by the continual use of explosives. 2. We have classified as loose rock all detachable boulders of more than one cubic foot and less than one cubic yard, and all material which, in our judgment, could not possibly be ploughed in the practical sense of the term.

I have never had occasion to force my views on my assistants as all, to a man, have taken the same interpretation of the classification as I have. We have all used the precautions possible to arrive at a fair classification of materials, and our returns of explosives certainly show that the solid rock has not been over-classified. I have repeatedly conferred with my assistant district engineers on this matter, and they in their turn have gone over the work with the division and resident engineers and classified according to their convictions as to the interpretation of the classification. I attach herewith reports from my assistants on this important question.

Yours very truly,
(Sgd.) A. E. DOUCET,
District Engineer.

Then there is another letter from H. F. Huestis, assistant district engineer, another from C. L. Hervey, assistant district engineer, another from Benjamin Bourgeois, divisional engineer, another from Allan R. Matthews, resident engineer, all to the same effect as Mr. Doucet's letter. Then, we have the legal opinion of some of the most eminent lawyers in Canada. The question was put to these legal gentlemen how they would interpret these words in the specification, and we have printed in the evidence, first, a joint opinion from George F. Shepley and E. Lafleur, then the opinion of Mr. C. H. Ritchie, of Toronto, then the opinion of Sir Alexander Lacoste, then the opinion of Donald Macmaster, and also the opinion of Wallace Nesbitt. I do not think my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) would seriously dispute the legal opinion put forth by that array of counsel. I think we surely can put the opinions of these gentleman forward as at least equal to the opinion of any similar number of men in Canada, and they all agree in saying that 'solid rock' does not mean what Mr. Lumsden said it meant. Thus we have every district engineer, every divisional engineer, every resident engineer, and we have the opinion of these legal gentlemen to say that 'solid rock' means rock in ledges, rock in masses and boulders of one cubic yard or upwards, or any conglomeration or mass of rock no matter how small it might be so long as it is in masses and in the opinion of the engineer could best be removed by blasting. These opinions were all submitted to Mr. Lumsden and Mr. Lumsden then submitted them to the Deputy Minister of Justice. I shall read what the Deputy Minister of Justice says. My hon. friend, after a good deal of barter, this morning read a portion of the letter. I was surprised that he did not read it with a little better grace because he might as well have admitted the facts as I would assume he would wish the people reading his re-

marks to get the whole story. After Mr. Lumsden received these opinions he made a second declaration of how he construed these clauses. The second declaration was broader than the first. He said that he would construe solid rock to be rock found in ledges or masses as specified, first, rock, second in ledge, conglomerate, boulders or ledge rock displaced in pieces exceeding one cubic yard in size, rock assembled, the individual pieces of such assembled rock exceeding one foot in size, also shale rock.

Then he said he construed solid rock to include rock in ledges, boulders of one yard and upwards, masses joined together, provided the individual pieces composing those masses were of one cubic foot up to one yard in size. That was handed to the Deputy Minister of Justice, and the Deputy Minister of Justice said:

I do not understand upon what principal the chief engineer limits the size to pieces exceeding one cubic foot. The specification speaks of rock found in ledges or masses of more than one cubic yard which in the judgment of the engineer may be best removed by blasting. If 'rock assembled' may be regarded as a mass of rock, and if it may be best removed by blasting, I do not see why under the specification it is material whether the individual pieces exceed or are less than one cubic foot in size, and if 'rock assembled' is not regarded as a mass, the minimum limit of size which can be classified as solid rock exceeds one cubic yard.

After receiving this letter Mr. Lumsden again changes his opinion and sends out a third interpretation of this clause in the specification, and the third is practically the same as the second, excepting that he tells his engineers if they find rock in masses joined together, no matter what the sizes of the individual pieces may be, if, in the opinion of the engineers, it may be best to remove it by blasting, he classifies it as solid rock.

This brings us down to the 10th of January, when that is finally decided as being the proper construction of these clauses in the contract, and from that forward every engineer was told to classify according to that interpretation. He even sent a blue print picturing out how the different things could be formed together in order to make solid rock, and from that down all this work has been classified according to that interpretation.

I want to go back just for a moment to what took place as to the amounts. We have in evidence, on page 415, a letter by Mr. Doucet written to Mr. Parent, discussing the question of the over-classification alleged by Mr. Wood in his letter of October 7th, and he says that he and Mr. Armstrong went over the matter and they found that not more than 14 per cent of the classification was in question at all, and they figured out that if this 14 per cent had been classified entirely as the Grand Trunk Pacific claims it should have been it would amount to a difference of only $25,982. But later, at page 417, he says:

But on going over Mr. Armstrong's figures with him yesterday we found that several errors had crept into his calculations, so that the difference in the percentage is not 14 per cent but only 3 per cent.

And then he figures out that taking only 3 per cent, the only difference in dispute between July and August, would be $3,457, and it is upon this statement of affairs that these complaints of the Grand Trunk Pacific were made to the commission.

I wish now to direct your attention to District 'F.' We must remember that there was trouble all the time in District 'F' between the district engineer, Major Hodgins, and his assistant Mr. Heaman, and the other engineers. I think it necessary to point this out particularly in order that there may be no question about it, because I consider that this question of trouble between the assistant district engineer, Heaman, and the other engineers is a very important element in this discussion. It is stated here that Mr. Grant went out there as inspecting engineer and made a report on the work which was not very complimentary to Major Hodgins. Major Hodgins was brought down to Ottawa on the last day of July, 1907, and he made a counter report, or reply, to Mr. Grant's report. In this reply to Mr. Grant, which will be found at page 25 of the evidence, we find:

Mr. Heaman spent a good deal of his time on the work, but not as much as he wished because some of the divisional engineers did not consider that he should have got the appointment. I visited three divisions myself. I am perfectly satisfied with Mr. Heaman, and have every confidence in his ability and judgment, and, if I find there is still any friction, I must ask for authority to discharge any division engineer who is inclined to make trouble.

I do not know what better evidence we could want of friction and difficulty between Mr. Heaman and those under him than we have in this report of Major Hodgins in reply to Mr. Grant's report on his work. At the time Major Hodgins was dismissed from the service Heaman was sent to another portion of the work further inland. In a few weeks he resigned and accepted a position with the Grand Trunk Pacific, and while I am not here to find fault with the Grand Trunk Pacific, I think if we want another evidence of the fact that the Grand Trunk Pacific is not in collusion with the commission in order to make this work cost more than it ought to, we have this absolute evidence in their conduct with regard to Heaman. Here is a man who had quarrelled with all the en-

gineers under him, who had become so obnoxious that his chief, Major Hodgins, had reported to the chief engineer that if these divisional engineers did not stop finding fault with him he would have to ask authority to dismiss them, yet within one month after Major Hodgins left this work this Mr. Heaman was taken by the Grand Trunk Pacific and appointed to be their inspecting engineer over the very engineers with whom he had had the difficulty. If that is not an unfriendly act, I do not know what would constitute one; and you can depend upon it, that from that out it was Heaman's business to make things just as uncomfortable for the engineers as he could, and I think the future developments have shown that he performed his work to the very letter, because we find that he not only made report after report finding fault with the classification in that district—and it is on these reports that Mr. Wood's letter of April 21 was written—but that he betrayed the trust reposed in him and was in constant communication with Hodgins. Although he was sworn to secrecy, he was the man who was furnishing the evidence to Major Hodgins and on whose statements Major Hodgins was able to make these charges. I do not know Mr. Heaman, never saw him, but if there is a man who has appeared to disadvantage in this matter, it is Mr. Heaman. And if the Grand Trunk Pacific want to be fair, if they want to carry out the work according to the spirit and as business men should, the only fair thing they can do is to remove Mr Heaman to another sphere of operation. If they want him as district engineer, let them send him to some district where he has not had quarrels with all the engineers working in the employ of the commission. I do not know that I need say anything further about the question of classification.

After the investigation had proceeded a certain distance, Major Hodgins came to the conclusion that he was wrong, and I give him credit for his honesty. He saw that he was in error about the classifications in the province of Quebec, and as these were the basis of the whole charge, he admitted that he was wrong. When he found that his premises were wrong, when he found that the increased cost was not due to wrong classification but was due to the conditions I have mentioned, of his own free will he withdrew his charges. My hon. friend from South Simcoe has contended that these admissions were drawn out of Major Hodgins by great ingenuity. No doubt the questioning of my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) was very searching, but the withdrawal by Major Hodgins of his charges was the only thing left for him to do under the circumstances. At any rate he withdrew all charges. He said that he had not applied to the First Minister and had not been refused an investigation. He said that neither Mr. Young nor any other member of the commission had tried to influence him improperly. He admitted that he was wrong. If you want confirmation of my statement, you will find it in the evidence. He unqualifiedly withdrew all charges of improper conduct on the part of the commissioners or the government and admitted that the only question left at issue was the purely scientific one of classification. Now I have read from the reports to show the difficulty of arriving at an agreement on this question of classification—so much depends on the judgment of the individual engineer, whose duty it may be to go on the work and determine whether a certain cut can be classified 50 per cent or 100 per cent solid rock. You can take two engineers equally honest and efficient, put them on a work, and in nine cases out of ten you will find them differing in opinion as to the exact classification. There never was a railway built in which this difficulty of determining the classification has not arisen. It is an all important question in railway construction. The commission knew it and so did parliament; and when the contract was drawn in 1903, it provided for the appointment of a third arbitrator in case of any differences between the engineers. My hon. friend has tried to argue that section 7 of the contract of 1903 does not provide for arbitration in case differences may arise between the commission and the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Mr. LENNOX. As to a matter of this kind.

Mr. CARVELL. I am going to read that clause of the contract. It is as follows:

> In order to insure, for the protection of the company as lessees of the eastern division of the said railway, the economical construction thereof in such a manner that it can be operated to the best advantage, it is hereby agreed that the specifications for the construction of the eastern division shall be submitted to, and approved of by the company before the commencement of the work, and that the said work shall be done according to the said specifications and shall be subject to the joint supervision, inspection and acceptance of the chief engineer appointed by the government and the chief engineer of the company, and, in the event of differences as to the specifications, or in case the said engineers shall differ as to the work, the questions in dispute shall be determined by the said engineers and a third arbitrator, to be chosen in the manner provided in paragraph four of this agreement.

That provides that the chief justice shall appoint the third arbitrator.

The solicitor of the commission sent a letter to the board in which he expressed doubt as to whether this clause of the contract provided for arbitration in case of a disagreement between the engineers. Well, while I have great regard for the legal attainments of that gentleman, having known

him many years, I do not see how any one can come to that conclusion. An arbitration is stipulated in case of any difference regarding the supervision, inspection and acceptance of the works. If the question of classification does not come within those three expressions, then I do not know what they mean; and I do not see how you could better include classification unless you use the word itelf. But lest there should be any question about that, the Grand Trunk Pacific and the commission got together and by agreement dated January 10, 1908, they settled it. That memo. of agreement, signed by the different parties, is as follows:

Monthly estimates for contractors shall be submitted promptly from time to time by the chief engineer of the commissioners to the company's assistant chief engineer at Montreal for approval. If he has any objection to such estimate he shall promptly file the same with the chief engineer of the commissioners, and any objection from time to time filed shall thereupon be considered, and, if possible, determined by the said engineers, and in case of their failure to agree, may then or at any time before or at the time of final payment, at the option of either party, be considered and determined by arbitration as provided in the agreement of July 29, 1903, but in no case shall the payment of monthly estimates be delayed except with the consent of the commissioners.

In case the chief engineer of the commissioners and the assistant chief engineer of the company disagree as to the final payment, the same shall be withheld until the matter is determined by arbitration, as provided in the said agreement of July 29, 1903.

In the face of that agreement I would like to know how my hon. friend can have the assurance to say that there is no provision for an arbitration in case the parties do not agree on the question of classification. I would not be so much surprised at a layman taking that view, but I am surprised that a man who, in his heart, believes he is going to be Minister of Justice some day, should make such a statement. I do not think that the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) who we know is a good lawyer, will take the ridiculous position of saying that there is no reference to this question of arbitration.

Mr. BARKER. Does the hon. gentleman state as a fact that any such agreement is in existence?

Mr. CARVELL. I do most positively.

Mr. BARKER. Where is the evidence?

Mr. CARVELL. At page 439 of the printed evidence.

Mr. BARKER. That is contrary——

Mr. CARVELL. The hon. gentleman may make his speech later. I have given him the answer; he can accept it or not as he pleases. But I would ask him if he thinks that the commissioners of the Grand Trunk Pacific are such absolute scoundrels that they will bring forward a document bearing the initials of Mr. Hays and Mr. Parent and also of their engineers, and put it forward as an agreement solemnly entered into, if no agreement was ever entered into? I do not need to argue that; I do not think my hon. friend will insult his own intelligence and that of the members of this House by making a statement of that kind. I am not surprised that the only way he dare try to get it in is by asking a question.

Mr. BARKER. I do not think that any gentleman would pretend that that was an agreement.

Mr. CARVELL. If it comes to splitting hairs to that extent, I will leave it to hon. gentleman opposite. There is the evidence of the agreement as brought before the committee.

Mr. LANCASTER. Who signed it?

Mr. CARVELL. I have told you three times. I do not consider the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) in this at all. He was not on the committee; I do not suppose he has read a word of the evidence; he could not discuss the matter intelligently, even if he wanted to; so it would be only a waste of time to argue the matter with him.

Mr. LANCASTER. The people of the country may be more intelligent than the member for Lincoln, and they would like to know who signed the agreement.

Mr. CARVELL. I have told you three times.

Mr. LANCASTER. It has not been signed by any officer of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.

Mr. CARVELL. The hon. gentleman will quiet down after a while. I was just going to say when my hon. friend got excited, that, in view of these facts and of the fact that Major Hodgins had unqualifiedly withdrawn all charges of improper conduct, what was there for this committee to do but to close this investigation unless these hon. gentlemen opposite wished to give more evidence on the ground of fraud or improper conduct on the part of the commissioners or their engineer or any person in their employ? My hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) made what I thought was a very unfair statement when he alleged that the commissioners had forced their interpretation of the clauses of this contract upon the chief engineer. I want to tell the hon. gentleman that under the ruling which I gave in that committee—and I am going to refer him to it particularly—he had all the chance in the world to bring Mr. Lumsden before that committee, after Major Hodgins withdrew his charges, to prove whether the commissioners had forced their opinions upon him

or not; he had every chance to bring any man in the Dominion of Canada who could say that there was an act of fraud of wrong-doing on the part of the commissioners, or their engineers or servants. But, Mr. Speaker, with that staring them in the face, neither the hon. member for South Simcoe, or the hon. member for East Hamilton (Mr. Barker) had the assurance to ask one solitary witness to be brought before them when they state that the committee refused to hear more evidence, they are stating what has no foundation in fact. And, when my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) this morning was reading what I had said, and what my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) had said, at one meeting of the committee, in order to try to prove that at a certain time we wanted to investigate everything, and that, because we wanted to investigate everything, we should have investigated this question of classification, I say he did not treat the subject fairly. Because he did not state what I said to the committee at page 62 of the evidence. And this was all the more unfair because the matter was specifically called to his attention when he made his argument before the committee. I want to put this on 'Hansard': At the second meeting of the committee this question came up as to what was to be included in Major Hodgins' specific charges, and my hon. friend read one or two pages out of the evidence to show that my hon. friend from Pictou and myself at that time were anxious to have everything put in. At page 62, I said:

There are practically three or four branches to the charges contained in this letter. We are discussing entirely the question of classification which to my mind is a very unimportant part of the matter because that has to be settled later on by arbitration. To my mind the point in this charge is that Major Hodgins claims he was dismissed from the service of the Transcontinental Commission because he would not classify as the commissioner wanted him to do. He does not require documents in the possession of the commissioners to specify that. He can say whether it is true or not.

Following up that, the day Major Hodgins withdrew his charges, the question came up as to the future conduct of the committee. I stated my view as to the proper course to be taken, and the distance to which I was willing to go in admitting evidence or shutting it out. My hon. friend will find what I said at page 438 and at page 450 of the evidence. I will refer first to what I said at page 438. The matter came up as to whether we would receive more evidence or not, and I made this statement from my position as a member of the committee, and as a member of the committee also I made the statement which appears at page 450. This was a committee of five, and my hon. friends from South Simcoe and East Hamilton and I, if we joined together, could have carried——

Mr. CARVELL.

Mr. LENNOX. A great combination.

Mr. CARVELL. It made a majority. I made this statement at one meeting, and repeated it the next meeting. And I will read the statement and the repetition to the House. At page 438 is the following:

It is not for the committee to decide whether the engineers are exercising proper classification in different parts of the work, the question is are they doing it honestly. As far as I am concerned if Mr. Hodgins, K.C., or Mr. Lennox here wishes to call witnesses to show anything that is improper or dishonest on the part of the commissioners or the engineers under the commissioners I have no objection to having it investigated; but when it gets down to a question of a difference of opinion, it has been stated here by Major Hodgins this afternoon that it is simply a question of opinion between the engineers, one engineer saying I would classify that cut at 59 per cent of solid rock and another saying I would classify it at 60 per cent of solid rock. If there was no other tribunal possibly we would be in a position that we would have to decide, like many judges who are compelled to listen to evidence about which they have no knowledge—I do not know anything about engineering, possibly Mr. Lennox does not, Mr. Barker may know a little more about railway engineering than any other member of the committee—but a tribunal has been provided, under the statute passed at the time the Transcontinental Commission was formed, and that tribunal consists of the chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific and the chief engineer of the Transcontinental Commission, and if they cannot agree they apply to the Chief Justice of Canada who appoints a third arbitrator, and that is the right tribunal to decide whether these engineers are properly exercising the duties and responsibilities placed upon them.

Now, I want to know if that was an attempt on my part to shut out evidence? Was it not an offer to bring on all the evidence that showed wrong-doing on the part of the commissioners or their engineers? At the next meeting of the committee, I followed this up. I referred first to the fact that Major Hodgins had withdrawn his charges and that the only thing left was the question of classification which must be left to the engineers.

All we can do, to be logical, is to close up the inquiry and report to the House. While I do not want to be put in the position of burking any investigation, if any evidence is produced to show that the commissioners committed fraud, or asked Major Hodgins or anybody else to do what was wrong I do not think it ought to be excluded, but I think we ought to consider our position and let us understand where we are.

Now, Sir, there again I repeat the offer to allow them to bring on evidence.

Mr. BARKER. Go on and read a few lines after that.

Mr. CARVELL. (reading):

So far as I am concerned, I am absolutely opposed to any evidence being given by anybody as to classification that has to be decided by another body.

I have always taken that ground.

Mr. LANCASTER. How would you prove your fraud?

Mr. CARVELL. Now, let me show this engineering light from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) what would happen. He is in for knowledge and I am going to give him some.

Mr. LANCASTER. It is time you started.

Mr. CARVELL. It is time the hon. gentleman got the wax out of his ears so that he could hear and learn something. Suppose we had taken the course suggested by the hon. member for South Simcoe, and we had called 25 engineers from the Grand Trunk Pacific. I have here, but will not read them, letters written by Mr. McIntosh, by Mr. A. G. Macfarlane, by Mr. M. C. Macfarlane, by Mr. Richard, and a dozen other engineers, stating that they had classified the work according to the interpretation of Mr. Lumsden. Now, suppose we had all those engineers here, and they all swore that they had classified this work exactly according to the interpretation of Mr. Lumsden. They were on the work; they saw it being done; they exercised their judgment and they swear that they did it honestly and uprightly. Then suppose we brought this precious Mr. Heaman, the man who made the charges. Suppose Mr. Heaman was put up and said: These men classified too liberally. I ask my hon. friend from Lincoln in what kind of a position this committee would be? What position would a committee of lawyers be in to decide whether they were over classifying or not?

Mr. LANCASTER. If the hon. gentleman took the evidence without cross-examination he would probably have more information than he would be guessing at it, as he does now.

Mr. CARVELL. After all it would only amount to a guess. How would any lawyer know? Suppose he said: I am going to believe one set of engineers and disbelieve another. What position would he be in? Two months afterwards the legal tribunal, the arbitration provided by parliament, would sit, and suppose the arbitrators decided that we were wrong, what a position we would be in. Think for a moment the position we would place ourselves in by trying to decide an intricate and technical question like this by bringing on one set of witnesses saying that the work was classified wrongly, and another set of witnesses saying it was classified rightly. That shows the absurdity of the whole contention.

Now, I have discussed this matter as far as I wish to. In conclusion, I say that there are two views to be taken of this question. One, I am sorry to say, is not a pleasant view, another one is an extremely pleasant view. The unpleasant side is the eagerness of my hon. frinds to search out scandals, after having been defeated in all their scandal mongerings this session. I will refer to only one to show, after they have been trying to find scandals and have been defeated, how anxious they are for a genuine scandal. Take, for instance, the committee that has been sitting in regard to timber lands in the Northwest. After we had the sworn evidence of different witnesses that everything that was alleged was untrue, and after the unfair statements made by the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) and the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) we find the member for St. Antoine, instead of being in his place to face the music, is off down in Nova Scotia with his yatch and his moving pictures exhibiting pictures of a few clumps of good timber as a sample of all timber in the land that friends of the government have got hold of. After seaching in vain for scandals like this, and getting defeated, no doubt they would like to find a genuine scandal, and if they could prove that by the wrong-doing of somebody in the construction of this railway this country was going to pay $28,000,000 more than it ought to pay, what a glorious scandal they would have discovered. After their complete failure I am sorry they did not have the fairness to take the view that was taken by one of their leading organs in the province of Ontario, which stated that there was nothing wrong and they had better let the matter drop. Let me read a short extract from the Toronto 'News', and I earnestly commend it to the perusal of my hon. friend from South Simcoe, who probably has not seen it. The article appeared in the 'News' of the 29th of June, but I will read it as copied in the Halifax 'Herald,' and I may say that if my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) and my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) had taken the fair view that the 'News' has taken we would not now be discussing this matter:

Thus far nothing has been proved which reflects discredit upon the Transcontinental commissioners, or warrant any charge of impropriety. It is necessary, however, that the reports of the Grand Trunk engineers should receive attention, and that an authoritative reply thereto should be furnished by the commission through the government. Many millions of public money will be expended on the National Transcontinental Railway, and the country should have every assurance that the work will be honestly and economically constructed.

Questions have been raised which have still to be settled, but in the meantime, there should be no persistence in insinuations and charges which the facts disclosed do not warrant.

I commend that to the careful perusal of my hon. friends. I can only repeat that it is a lamentable thing that the Conservative party in parliament have not taken the manly view of this thing which the Conservative editor of the Toronto 'News' has taken. On the other hand, there is a pleasant feature of this question. The pleasant feature is that in a work involving so many millions as this work does, extending over three or four years already, a work in which the commissioners are compelled to rely on the honesty and fidelity of hundreds of different officials, it is a great pleasure to find that there has not been one tittle of evidence produced which shows any suspicion of fraud, dishonesty or unfair dealing. On the contrary, it has been proven to the hilt that every part of this contract has been carried out to the very letter; it has been proven that these commissioners and engineers have honestly endeavoured, and have actually succeeded in performing this work honestly, uprightly and according to the letter of the contract. Sir, I think the people of this country can well afford the time that it has taken parliament to investigate this matter in order to have the assurance that they have a body of men of such calibre as Mr. Parent, Mr. Reid, Mr. Young and Mr. McIsaac, who are so efficiently carrying out a work involving millions of public money, in which work the searchlight of the opposition has not been able to find the least flaw. Therefore, I feel that the amendment should be voted down, and the report of the committee should be adopted.

Mr. WM. ROCHE. I would like to ask the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Carvell) to tell us who this Major Hodgins is and who appointed him as engineer. There may be some members of the House who do not know.

Mr. CARVELL. I can only say that so far as I know Mr. Hodgins is a gentleman. He was appointed, I presume, by the chief engineer of the Transcontinental Railway, who is, I understand, the officer invested with the authority to make appointments to the engineering staff.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). Mr. Speaker, as I listened to the eloquent words of the last speaker, proclaiming aloud to the people of this country their good fortune that no evidence whatever had been brought out to implicate the commissioners of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway in this whole Hodgins investigation, my memory went back to a scene in this chamber only a few years ago when the same hon. gentleman, with the same eloquence, was supporting a report which I think was drawn by himself; at all events was made by a committee of which he was a prominent member, when he called the attention of this House and of the people of this country to the gratification with which he had learned that no evidence had been brought forward to show any wrong-doing in connection with that famous steamer 'Arctic,' The fact was that every motion made by certain members of the committee in order to put themselves and the committee in a position to get all the information was always voted down by the majority. I am willing to concede that the hon. gentleman and his colleagues in the committee, whose report is before the House a greater need of respect than apparently he is willing to pay to some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. I am quite willing to admit that the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) possesses the ability, legal experience and acumen which would enable that hon. gentleman to do great and glorious work in the interest of the country on such a committee, or on the Public Accounts Committee, or on similar committees. These hon. gentlemen have been afforded an opportunity in the Public Accounts Committee to show us what they can do, to show their willingness and anxiety to do something to ascertain the facts, to pry into the misdeeds of the government and to lay before the people the information which will enable them to judge as to what becomes of their money. I have great respect for the hon. member for Carleton, N.B., and his colleague the hon. member for Pictou, but I venture to say that neither of these hon. gentlemen, in the use of their great abilities in discharging their duties in the Public Accounts Committee, or in this investigation, has been painfully conspicuous. Perhaps it was on account of that experience added to the manner of which his followers were willing to employ the ability, which, I admit, they possess, that the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) placed these hon. gentlemen upon the Hodgins committee. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat spent a great deal of time in discussing this subject. I listened very carefully to him from beginning to end and I do not think I am far astray when I say that not more than ten or fifteen minutes of the time was spent by him in discussing the question before the House. We heard about the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific, we heard about the horrible character of some unfortunate engineer now in the pay of the company, we heard a great deal in connection with the Grand Trunk Pacific contract, we heard everything discussed but the question before the House. What is the question before the House? Some time ago there was a reference to a committee. Certainly something must have been referred. We

have only to look at the first volume of the evidence brought down to show what was referred. We find that Major Hodgins, having made certain charges in a letter and certain newspapers have taken up, repeated and added to these charges, the Transcontinental Railway Commissioners, whom the last speaker praised so highly, were so exercised by the reflections made upon them that they came to parliament and insisted that they should no longer be left under the stigma under which they were placed, by these, as they said, unfounded charges, flying over the country. Not at Major Hodgins' request, but at the request of the commission the Prime Minister moved :

That the memorandum of the chairman of the Trancontinental Railway Commissioners to the Prime Minister, of April 23, and laid on the table of this House on the 24th instant, and the papers accompanying the same, together with the letter of Major Hodgins to the public press therein referred to, be referred to a special committee of five members, with instructions to investigate the matters and charges therein mentioned.

So that parliament being seized of this material, referred it to a committee and instructed this committee to investigate the charges that were contained in these papers. As has been well pointed out, it is a matter of indifference whether Major Hodgins appeared or not except in so far as his absence might make more difficult the proof of these charges. The charges were referred to a committee, not Major Hodgins, and the committee met to consider and discuss these charges. At the beginning of their conference there seemed to be some little difference as to what course the proceedings would take and the majority were clear in their expression of fear that the charges would be limited——

Mr. MACDONALD. Would the hon. gentleman be good enough to give a single quotation in which I said anything to warrant him in making that statement ?

Mr. NORTHRUP. Page 59. The last speaker read it and I thought that it was not necessary for me to occupy the time of the House in reading it again.

Mr. CARVELL. I did not read anything from page 59.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Page 50, was it ? You read it yourself ?

Mr. CARVELL. No, I read nothing from page 50 either.

Mr. NORTHRUP. It is here ; I have read it half a dozen times.

Mr. CARVELL. You will find what I read at page 62.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I find at page 59 the following :

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). That is how I understand it, and the committee have the right to investigate everything contained in the order of reference.

That is very plain English.

Mr. PARENT. We have been accused in the newspapers——

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Yes, it has been spread all over the country.

Mr. PARENT. If the gentleman is allowed to limit his charges, I suppose the evidence will be confined to that.

Mr. CARVELL. Oh, no.

If Major Hodgins was allowed to limit his charges Mr. Parent was afraid that evidence would only be given on the limited charges and his vindication would not be complete.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). Do not worry about that.

Mr. E. A. MACDONALD. Is that the only evidence, because I hope to reply to my hon. friend, of my having made any such statement as he has indicated.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I did not name the hon. gentleman in the first instance because I thought it was not necessary to do more than refer to the statement which was read to the House by the hon. member for Carleton, N.B.

Mr. CARVELL. The hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) read it. I did not.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I beg pardon. 'Hansard' will show. There is a subsequent page in which it is referred to again. I do not propose to take up the time of the House reading more than that one passage. It is proved up to the hilt in that one passage that Mr. Parent was afraid that the charges would be limited, that if this gentleman was allowed to limit his charges the evidence would be confined to them and the hon. member for Carleton, N.B., said 'oh, no.' Then the chairman of the committee added :

I understand it to be the feeling of the committee that they should not be dropped.

There is no dissent on the part of any of the committee. These matters having been referred to the committee, I take the ground that Major Hodgins had nothing to drop. Major Hodgins did not ask for this investigation. It was not given to Mr. Hodgins, but when this House, in the exercise of its authority, charged five or six of its members with the duty of investigating certain serious allegations, to say that this committee was deprived of its power to investigate because a witness said that he did not take any further interest in the proceedings is the most monstrous proposition that was ever enunciated in this House. What did take place ? Major Hodgins lost his position in consequence of something with which

we are not concerned. He was out of a position and he was called as a witness to the city of Ottawa. It meant that he had to be absent from his home for forty-nine days. He had been undergoing examination day after day before the committee, he was entitled to be paid the ordinary witness fees and he was compelled to be represented by counsel day after day retained at an enormous sum. When he first appeared before the committee with his counsel application was made that the committee should report to the House in favour of Major Hodgins' counsel fees being paid. On the one hand there was the commission which was empowered to employ such legal assistance as it saw fit, there was the commission, backed by the majority in parliament, assisted by the most learned counsel that could be obtained in the whole country, and on the other hand we had a gentleman called here as a witness who was obliged to remain here at great expense, losing money every day and who perhaps incurred a counsel fee that will hang a weight around his neck for years to come.

That is the position in which Major Hodgins was put; that is the idea of fairness that filled the minds of that committee when this investigation began. Is it at all surprising what Major Hodgins did, after he had been before this committee for weeks and weeks, after he found that he was the man that was going to be the sufferer and after he found the committee coming to him with a bogus story of arbitration—because there will be no arbitration and there can be no arbitration and I say further that except from the members of the committee itself an arbitration was never suggested by anybody between the parties concerned. It was simply an attempt to draw a red herring across the scent to say that there would be an arbitration between the Grand Trunk Pacific Company and the government. That about an arbitration between the contractors and the government. The real question was whether the contractors were robbing the government. It was only incidentally the Grand Trunk Pacific was interested at all. Had it not been for the fact that the statute provides the Grand Trunk shall rent a part of the line and pay interest on 3 per cent of the cost of construction the Grand Trunk Pacific would not have the slightest interest in the matter. The real question was between the commissioners who were building the road and the contractors, and the charges are clear and explicit. Whether or not they are proven is another question but the charges are clear and explicit that the contractors were robbing the commissioners. It is all very well for hon. gentlemen opposite to come here and talk about changes in specifications and to say that the chief engineer was trying to do what was right and all that. If they take the trouble to read the papers which are laid on the table of the House they will find that the great difficulty came, not over any dispute as to what was the meaning of solid rock or loose rock, but that the charges made can only be based on deliberate and wilful fraud. These are the charges made originally by Major Hodgins and these charges are made by Mr. Woods, the engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific in his famous letter. He charged that such and such things had been done that could not have been done as the result of any misunderstanding of the specifications but, as Mr. Woods said, they must have been done deliberately under instructions from above. Not only did Major Hodgins make these charges but Major Hodgins made certain charges that are a reflection on the commissioners. I am not here to say a word against the commissioners. The evidence was shut off, and what the evidence might have resulted in I do not know. Without casting the slightest aspersion on any person I can say that there was another investigation which is within the knowledge of members of this House and some members of that commission would have been just as well satisfied I have no doubt if that investigation about the purchase of some lands around Winn had not been held. Let us see what Major Hodgins has said in the way of making charges in the statement put in by him. I quote from page 112 of the evidence:

A. And Mr. Reid said that the appointment of (Grant) was made and it would have to go, that it was their intention, it was no slight on the district engineers, the appointing of a junior man above them, that it was the intention of the commissioners to have uniform classification all over the line and that Mr. Grant had been selected.

Q. They wanted a uniform classification?—A. They wanted a uniform classification.

Q. Did they say what the uniform classification, what the standard was.—A. No. They told me afterwards that the Quebec classification was to be taken as the standard.

Now, Major Hodgins in his evidence, whether truly or untruly, has stated what he himself saw in Quebec and he has sworn to what he says he was told by one of the engineers as to 86 per cent of rock being allowed in a certain cut which was mainly sand. That would be a matter of evidence which the committee could well consider, and the alleged fact being pointed out to the committee it would be their duty to make some inquiry to ascertain whether that statement was true.

Mr. CARVELL. Is the hon. gentleman not aware that the monthly estimates were put in evidence and they showed that that particular cut in the month of June was allowed at 32 per cent solid rock, and in the month of May preceding at 29 per cent solid rock.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I am aware of that, but that does not touch the point, and in the first place it may or may not have been the same cutting.

Mr. CARVELL. Is not the best evidence you could get, the estimate on which the money was paid ?

Mr. NORTHRUP. If my hon. friend would try to understand the argument he would not interrupt me. The duty of the committee was to receive what evidence it could get but the moment my hon. friend (Mr. Carvell) got a piece of evidence that suited him he shut off inquiry and he announced that the committee would refuse to receive any further evidence unless members of the committee would take responsibility themselves of charging fraud.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Might I——

Mr. NORTHRUP. Excuse me, the hon. gentleman will have an opportunity of speaking a little later and he can castigate me as much as he likes.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I do not want to castigate you; I want to ask a question.

Mr. NORTHRUP. It is impossible for me to make a connected speech if I am to be interrupted every minute.

Mr. CARVELL. If the hon. gentleman confines himself to the facts there will not be any interruption.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I am confining myself entirely to the facts and if I make a single statement which is incorrect I will be pleased to withdraw it.

Mr. LENNOX. You are all right so far.

Mr. NORTHRUP. And so the committee absolutely declined to take further evidence unless some hon. member of the committee would take the responsibility of saying he could prove fraud and if so he could go on and prove it.

Mr. CARVELL. My hon friend is not sticking to the facts because that was not included in my conditions at all.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CARVELL. Do not get excited; I will call him to order whenever he is not in accordance with the truth.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Why, the hon gentleman (Mr. Carvell) forgets what he himself read to the House not more than ten minutes ago.

Mr. CARVELL. Read it and I will be obliged to you.

Mr. NORTHRUP. You shall have it, but if I speak for two hours as the hon. gentleman did, I want it distinctly understood that three-fourths of the time was taken up by interruptions.

Mr. CARVELL. If you stick to the facts there won't be any interruptions.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Well here is what Mr. Carvell said as will be found at page 450 of the printed evidence :

Mr. Lennox.—Then as I understand it Mr. Carvell's view is substantially as he stated it the other night.

Mr. Carvell.—About the same.

Mr. Lennox.—That is that it can be investigated only in the event that some member of this committee comes forward and says : I am prepared to establish fraud.

Mr. Carvell.—That is it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CARVELL. Go on. I submit the hon. gentleman should read what I said.

Mr. LENNOX. Order, keep quiet.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I will read every word of it if you like.

Mr. Carvell.—That is it, I take the ground that supposing Mr. Barker's contention is correct, that there is evidence to establish the fact that the engineers are not exercising proper judgment in their mode of classification, that he should take the responsibility as a member of this House to rise in his place and say so on that responsibility, and ask for the matter to be investigated, if he should do that it is a new question entirely.

Do you want me to read any more?

Mr. CARVELL. Yes.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I shall :

We are not appointed to investigate whether these engineers are properly exercising the discretion conferred upon them—

We are not, eh ?

We are not appointed to investigate whether these engineers are properly exercising the discretion conferred upon them but whether there is fraud between them and somebody else, and that brings up the question suggested by Mr. Barker, supposing there is fraud between them and the Grand Trunk Pacific, that is a proper subject for inquiry if somebody takes the responsibility of making the charge, but until somebody does I do not see that we have any right or jurisdiction in it at all.

Now, I think my hon. friend will concede that my original statement about what he said was correct. Every statement I make as to what the evidence contains will be and is correct, but at this late stage of the session and in this weather I do not think it fair to take up hours in reading the evidence. But let me point this out, that when the hon. member (Mr. Carvell) cannot remember what he said himself, is it surprising that the light he can give us on this or any other subject is very dim indeed. I repeat that the committee refused to allow any more evidence to be taken unless some Conservative member would jeopardize his

seat by charging fraud. But, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Carvell) could not confine himself to the evidence. He had to hunt around the country to bring in outside information in the shape of a statutory declaration made by a man who perhaps under cross-examination would have told an entirely different story. I only heard that declaration read hurriedly by the hon. member, but I would direct the attention of the House to one point in it and I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Carvell) should investigate this matter.

Armstrong, in this affidavit, speaks of the cuts referred to in the letter of Wood of the 7th of October, which refers to two different sections over which he had gone. The first, he said, was from 15 to 20 miles long, but he could not speak positively as he had not proper instruments ; the other section was for mile 315 to mile 332, a distance of 17 miles. As to the 17 miles, according to that statutory declaration, Armstrong completely vindicates the commissioners in the judgment of the hon. gentleman by pointing out that the over-classification would not amount to over $50,000. This railway is to be from 1,700 to 1,800 miles long, but assuming that it is only 1,700, and supposing that the over-classification amounts to only $50,000 on the 17 miles, which is a subject of such delight and surprise to these gentlemen, supposing that the boodling or stupidity, or whatever you call it, of the engineers, amounts to only $50,000 in 17 miles, if you take that same proportion for the 1,700 miles, you have to multiply it by 100, and you find that for the whole line that it amounts to $5,000,000. So that under your evidence given as a climax to complete the vindication of the commissioners $5,000,000 is the shortage, provided the amount of rake-off is the same in every other mile of the line as in the sections dealt with by Mr. Armstrong. If that is the best evidence the commissioners can find after four weeks hunting up and down the country, it is no great wonder they objected to any further evidence being given in the committee, and that such witnesses should be asked to give their evidence by statutory declaration rather than by an examination followed by a cross-examination by men competent to elicit the facts. Among the last words spoken by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Carvell) was a reference to an alleged agreement. I would not occupy time in referring to this agreement, for in my humble judgment it has nothing to do with the case, except that a justification was attempted to be set up by a majority of the committee for stopping this investigation on the ground that an arbitration was already going on and this matter might be better decided there than before the committee. I say, in the first place, that no arbitration has ever been suggested by anybody except members of the commission, or between the government commissioners and the contractors, and that is where the boodling is going on. I say, in the second place, that no agreement was ever drawn up so far as any evidence submitted to the House goes—I am not going to say that no agreement was drawn up, and then my hon. friend, who has access to documents to which I have not access, produced one of a different date, and possibly on a different subject, and says that is the agreement—but I say that the document referred to by him is not an agreement in any sense of the term, it does not purport to be an agreement; and if it was an agreement, it does not relate to arbitration in the slightest. All it does, as far as arbitration is concerned, is to point out that if the engineers cannot agree amicably they can fall back on the mode of arbitration provided in the statute. So if the hon. gentleman had taken the trouble to read the document he would have found that what he calls an agreement is a memorandum of an agreement to be drawn up between the Commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. And even that memorandum of agreement to be drawn up was not signed by anybody, a few initials appear on the side of it. My hon. friend is a learned, distinguished and successful lawyer. I wonder if he really would advise professionally that if something was done in the way of arbitration, or anything of the kind, under the alleged authority of that so-called agreement, and Mr. Hays, whose initials are supposed to be there, should pass away to his reward and someone else take his place who dissented from what had been done, that the Grand Trunk Pacific would be bound by the fact that an informal memorandum of agreement intended to be drawn up was produced with Mr. Hays' initials on it.

Mr. CARVELL. The chairman of the commission told the committee that the formal agreement was drawn up, and that they had it in their possession.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I am discussing what is before the House, and I was careful to say that I did not deny the existence of an agreement, because a document which the hon. gentleman could see and read, but to which I had not access, might be produced. But I say we are bound to discuss the matter upon the evidence before the House, and if the commissioners had an agreement of the kind to which the hon. gentleman refers, I think they were guilty of contempt of that committee in not putting it before the committee and in submitting in its stead a paltry memorandum of agreement intended to be drawn up with a few initials on the side. This particular memorandum of agreement merely provided that two engineers could go to the work, and if

they then and there agreed on what was being done, everything was lovely. That is simple enough. If they did not agree they could fall back on the statutory provision, which, of course, adds nothing to the powers then existing.

There are two clauses of the statement to which the hon. gentleman refers on which I need not spend any particular time, because they are so simple that I doubt if any lawyer would differ as to their meaning. Clause 7 is the first. Leaving out the earlier portions, I come to the operative section. It says:

And in the event of differences as to the specification——

The day for that is past and gone, the specifications are settled on.

Or in case the said engineers shall differ as to the work, the questions in dispute shall be determined by the said engineers and a third arbitrator, to be chosen in the manner provided in paragraph four of this agreement.

I do not think any lawyer will contend that when the dispute was as to the interpretation of the specification it would come under that clause. When the question was whether or not a fraudulent amount was being paid for work that really was not done, the dispute would come under clause 47, which provides:

Any dispute which may arise as to the meaning or construction of this agreement, or as to the performance of any of the obligations of either of the parties to this agreement, or as to working expenditure or cost of construction.

That would be settled by arbitration. But where do you get your arbitration? You fall back on section 47. The statute provides that one of the arbitrators shall be appointed by the government. There is no reference to the commissioners at all; the commissioners have no more authority to appoint an arbitrator under section 47 than my hon. friend or myself.

Mr. CARVELL. I did not claim they had.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Then where is the point of the argument about an arbitration going on?

Mr. CARVELL. The chief engineer is their arbitrator.

Mr. NORTHRUP. My hon. friend is entirely wrong. My hon. friend is as far astray as one of the principal ministers who, after a debate on this original matter for months, disclosed the fact that he did not know half the different items that were to be allowed under the head 'Cost of Construction.' I may point out that the only clause under which there might be an arbitration is clause 47, and an arbitrator under that must be appointed by the government and not by the commission at all. so it is evident that when Major Hodgins was—I do not like to use the expression 'buncoed,' but led to believe it was undesirable that he should waste any time in the committee, because the whole matter would be threshed out by arbitration, he was misled, because there was no arbitration, there could not be any, and there never was any pretense of one except in the minds of the members of the committee.

I was going to call attention to some of the charges made by Major Hodgins in order that we might see whether or not he was in a position to withdraw those charges. The first I was going to refer to is on page 112. I was referring to the fact that the classification was to be made uniform along the line and that the Quebec classification was to govern. Take the statement made by Major Hodgins on page 115, a very important statement made under oath. Speaking of Mr. Armstrong, he said:

He said the classification was very high, and I said, 'what are you doing about it-'? He said, 'I am reporting it to my people.' I said, 'what are they doing'? And he replied that he did not know, that they hadn't done anything just yet. I said, 'is there very much more classification of that kind'? And he said, 'it is pretty general, all over the district.' I said, 'are you going to dispute it'? And he said he presumed they would.

The engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific presumed that his company was going to dispute it.

I asked him what it was going to amount to in Quebec and he said he had not made a very close estimate of it, but he was pretty certain it would amount to nearly $2,000,000, that his company would object to.

Q. What did he say would amount to $2,000,000? —A. The difference in what we called over classification then.

There is a statement under oath by Major Hodgins that the engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific had told him that in Quebec alone his company would claim that over $2,000,000 had been paid in excess of what should have been paid. He was only speaking of the wrong-doing up to that date, and he is the same gentleman who this present month has figured out an estimate of $5,000,000 for the whole line as being the amount of over classification. On pages 141 and 144 there is further evidence of complaints and there is Mr. Mann's letter. I shall not occupy the time reading that letter, dated September 6, 1907. In it Mr. Mann says:

I find that at many points on these divisions, the classification is too liberal, while at some points it is excessive. I cannot tell in some cases just what classification has been allowed, for the reason that there is no distinction made between solid rock in classification and in place—that is solid in boulders and in mass. In some cases, however, as between Canyon Lake and the Wabigoon, where

the solid in place in some of the cuts had not been touched at the time I saw it, an amount of solid has been allowed that quite evidently was not based on the measurement of boulders found that would class as solid under the specification. Loose rock has also been allowed in quantities that could not possibly be given if the specifications were followed as the only guide.

And so all through his letter. On page 142 he gives some twelve or fifteen illustrations of work in which wrong classification was made. There again is a charge over Mr. Mann's own signature, the district engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific. How can Major Hodgins withdraw that? On page 148, we have Major Hodgins declaring under oath that McArthur, the contractor in Winnipeg, told him that Mr. Grant had been sent up to help him out. Surely that is a matter for the committee to investigate. Mr. Hodgins could not withdraw that charge. On page 154, Mr. Hodgins testified that Mr. Dutton said if he got some of the promises Mr. Grant made him, that was all he wanted, but if he did not he would pull out. On page 263, we have Major Hodgins swearing that Mr. Foss, one of the engineers, told him that something must be done to help McArthur, the contractor. On page 301, we find that Grant suggested to Hodgins that the classification should be increased. On page 307, Major Hodgins swears that loose rock had been classified as solid rock. And when asked how he knew it was not solid rock he replied: 'My eyes told me.'

I have given the House case after case in which evidence was adduced by Major Hodgins which could not be affected by his withdrawal of the charges, and his withdrawal after all had only reference to the honesty or dishonesty of the engineers.

A great deal of weight has been given to the opinions obtained from certain lawyers. As far as the individual lawyers are concerned, I agree that no more eminent men are to be found at the Canadian bar, and I have not the slightest fault to find with any of these gentlemen regarding what they did. But calmly considered what really did they do? Objections were being made by the Grand Trunk Pacific engineers to the Railway Commissioners regarding the classification. Major Hodgins was dismissed, and about that time Mr. M. P. Davis, one of the contractors at the Quebec end, for some reason best known to himself, went to Montreal and obtained opinions from Mr. McMaster and Mr. Lafleur. Then he went to Toronto and obtained opinion from Mr. Shepley and Mr. Ritchie and Mr. Nesbitt, and no better men could be found. But after all what did he get? He got an ex parte opinion from lawyers on a statement presented by a man who wanted an opinion in his favour. It was of vital importance to Mr. Davis that he should get legal opinion that the classification should be as he wanted. So he went to the lawyers, and without the other side being heard, his lawyers gave a certain opinion on Mr. Davis' own statement. That opinion may be very well as it goes, but would any one say the opinion would have the same authority as that of the same lawyers, if they sat on the bench and had heard the facts and the arguments on both sides? One would have thought that those opinions would have been held by Mr. Davis for his own protection. But no, they were fired at the commission. The chief engineer was doing his duty. When a particularly competent specialist is put at the head of a great national road and when parliament by statute decides that he is the man to decide these questions, that question of classification comes before him and he decides it. When the chief engineer appointed by parliament rules one way and the engineers another, they must give way. That is an excellent rule, but it does not apply when Mr. Davis happens to be contractor. Mr. Davis sent in the opinions he had obtained to the department and these were forwarded to the Minister of Justice, and in turn we have the opinion of the Deputy Minister of Justice which seems to be an admirable one. Those of us who are acquainted with Mr. Newcombe will know that he is a distinguished lawyer whose opinions are entitled to the utmost respect, and there is nothing in this opinion given by him which could in the slightest degree detract from that respect. One not only admires his legal ability but his astuteness when reading this opinion. There are so many 'ifs' in it that it would puzzle a Philadelphia lawyer to make out what it meant in any particular instance. But then he winds up:

It seems to me, however, that these questions are largely engineering questions, the solution of which depends principally upon the judgment of the engineer, having regard to the terms used in the specifications.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. NORTHRUP (reading):

I must call your attention to clause 15 of the contract, which provides that the engineer (this term to be construed as defined in clause 2 of the contract) shall be the sole judge of work and material, and that his decision on all questions in dispute with regard to work and material shall be final, thus expressly stipulating that such questions as these shall be submitted to the decision of the chief engineer.

Not of Mr. Davis' lawyers.

I wish to add that it is very difficult for me to advise generally upon the interpretation of these specifications, and a general ruling may not infrequently overlook the peculiar facts and circumstances of an individual case, which, if stated, might lead to an exception or modification. I would prefer to advise upon any special case as it may arise, having all the particulars and circumstances stated.

So that in the end the opinion amounts to this, that if such and such be the case, such shall be the result. And then he winds up by saying that it is a question for an engineer and that nobody's opinion, practically, is of value unless he is sure he has all the circumstances of the case before him. That opinion, in due course, reaches Mr. Lumsden, because we have a letter from Mr. Lumsden;—Now here is the chief engineer of this railway, appointed by parliament to use his judgment in these matters, a man to whom the people of this country and the Grand Trunk Pacific Company—which company has to pay interest on the cost of construction—have a right to look to use his best judgment. He exercises his judgment and gives an interpretation of the specifications. But these legal opinions are given, and with this result:

Ottawa, January 9, 1908.

The Commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway, Ottawa, Ontario.

Sirs,—I have to-day been handed by the secretary a copy of a letter from the Deputy Minister of Justice, dated the 6th instant, with respect to my interpretation of clauses 33, 34, 35 and 36 of our general specifications. After fully considering his remarks in regard to the words after 'rock assembled' (the individual pieces of such assembled rock exceeding one cubic foot in size), I have concluded in deference to his remarks these bracketed words might be omitted, as also the words 'not covered under clause 34' in items 1 and 2 under the heading 'loose rock.'

My interpretation of these clauses will now be as follows:

So here we have the chief engineer of the Transcontinental road deliberately writing to the commission that he has interpreted the specifications not as he himself would interpret them, or had interpreted them to his engineers, but to use his own language 'in deference to' the remarks of the Deputy Minister of Justice——

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to show me where the chief engineer had at any time previous to December 10, 1907, ever given any official interpretation of these specifications?

Mr. LENNOX. On October 30 he said definitely that he would not admit the specification——

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. That deals with a specific case. But where are the instructions given by him to his sub-engineers to take a——

Mr. NORTHRUP. I did not say a word about instructions. It was a case of interpretation. There had been a conflict between himself and his subordinates and it was because of this interpretation by Mr. Lumsden of the specifications that Mr. Davis went around the country gathering these opinions, so that when he was fortified with these opinions, including that of the Deputy Minister of Justice, the chief engineer says that 'in reference to the remarks of the Deputy Minister of Justice his interpretation would be, so and so. We have the deliberate case of a chief engineer deliberately abandoning his own idea of how the contract should be interpreted in deference to the opinion obtained by Mr. Davis one way and another. And the result was that the chief engineer virtually said: Whereas I said a while ago that where the chief and subordinates differ the subordinates must give way, yet as Mr. Davis, the contractor in this case, has secured contrary opinion, the chief is obliged to give way. He seemed to have some suspicions as to the propriety of what he was doing, so he sent a memo. to the commissioners telling them what he has done, and the answer comes from the commissioners as follows:

Ottawa, January 14, 1908.

Hugh D. Lumsden, Esq.,
Chief Engineer.

Dear Sir,—I beg to advise you that your letter of the 9th instant giving your interpretation of clauses 33, 34, 35 and 36, of the general specifications for construction, modified so as to conform with the opinion expressed by the Deputy Minister of Justice, was considered by the board on the 10th instant and approved.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) P. E. RYAN,
Secretary.

Of all the farcical positions in the world surely this was the most farcical—that of a chief engineer of a great railway who is to be instructed by the contractors' lawyers and the Deputy Minister of Justice, and who, on sending word to the board that he has 'in deference' to these certain remarks reached a certain opinion, the board graciously tells him that his decision is approved. Could the absurdity of government work be carried much further than in this comedy? When the hon. members consider that these serious charges were made, first in these letters and then under oath, and then that a strong committee was charged with the duty of investigating these charges, I think they will feel that it was incumbent upon that committee to return with a report that they had investigated these charges as fully as possible. Can any one say that the committee did the best they could to ascertain whether or not improprieties had gone on in connection with the classification in the case referred to by the newspapers and by Major Hodgins? Can anybody say that the commission was in the slightest degree vindicated? I do not say that anything was given in evidence to impeach the character of the commission; I think it would be most unfair for any speaker to say that the char-

acter of the commission was blackened by the evidence that was given. But there is the evidence, the sworn statement of Major Hodgins, that contractors had made statements to him—there was the statement of Mr. Grant, the statement of Mr. Dutton, the statement of Mr. Armstrong—that he himself has seen wrongdoing, and the letters put in showing that the Grand Trunk Pacific were complaining of it. Is it not rather an abdication of their powers when the committee, on so important a question, come back with nothing accomplished simply because Major Hodgins had got tired and wanted to go home? It was the direction of the House to the committee to get what information they could because this was a most important question. It is all very well for hon. gentlemen to sneer at the small amount involved. I think it has been shown that a large amount may be involved. But the great thing is that it has gone out to the people, it has been published—truthfully or untruthfully does not affect the question—that there is rank dishonesty in the construction of the road. It is known to hon. gentlemen on the other side as well as on this side that when the road was first suggested, when the Bill for the incorporation of the company was before the House, all through the country the people were charging that the reason why the government were building the road at all was that it was a scheme to get contributions from rich contractors that the duration of the government's term in office might be extended.

Mr. JOHNSTON. That was the old time.

Mr. NORTHRUP. The old time of 1903, as the hon. gentleman Mr. Johnston) suggests. It seems a long time to the hon. gentleman and also to many people in this country——

Mr. JOHNSTON. It is the old days of 1873 that you have in mind.

Mr. NORTHRUP. If the hon. gentleman will confine his attention to the present, if instead of allowing his mind to be absorbed with the delightful contemplation of the wrongs of thirty-five years ago—when the conscience of the people was so sensitive that because a minister of the Crown was willing to accept a contribution from the wealthiest man in Canada, a contribution which spread over the whole country was infinitesimally small, they rose in their might and hurled a great party from power—he will consider the state of affairs to-day, when the charge is made that dishonest dealing is going on in the construction of this Transcontinental road by which the people are being plundered, and when this matter is referred to a committee, the committee refuses to investigate—viewing this contrast he will surely admit that there has been a wonderful change in public sentiment since 1873.

Mr. JOHNSTON. You admit it all.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I admit every word I have stated. I am not in the habit of making statements that I am not prepared to stand by. I have only to say, in conclusion, that I hope the hon. gentleman who is now to address the House insead of wandering all over creation to tell us about matters in which we are not interested, such as the character of individual engineers of the Grand Trunk Pacific system, will tell why, when a certain charge was referred to a committee, that committee did not go on and investigate those charges. If hon. gentlemen opposite will vote for the amendment moved by the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox)) we will have an opportunity to learn the truth about these matters. No member on this side will take the responsibility, in these matters which we cannot be supposed to know, of saying that there has been any dishonesty in the classification. It would be monstrous for us to assume the responsibility of saying that this means dishonesty or that it means that the engineer is incompetent. All we say is that charges have been made and that they should be investigated. If they are untrue, all the better for the country that they should be proven untrue ; if true, the sooner the country learns the fact the better. Whatever may be the facts, it is in the interests of the country that they should be known. For these reasons I shall have much pleasure in voting for the amendment of the hon. member for South Simcoe.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou). The greater portion of this day has been occupied by reason of the desire of my hon. friends opposite, to cover if possible, their retreat upon this question of the Hodgins charges. The line of the abandonment of their position is one which is being successfully handled. One of the chief artificers of the position was put up to make a special argument in support of a report which was the result of several days deliberation on the part of the minority of the committee. It is true that when the gentleman who had made the charges had come before the committee and was asked to put those charges in a definite form, and had subsequently withdrawn them unreservedly, my hon. friend who spoke so cleverly this morning in defence of the theory that Major Hodgins did not withdraw his charges, argued that there was something more for the committee to consider. It is true that he and my hon. friend, the chief tactician who, I understand, is to follow me, were so impressed by the absolute certainty of their position that they favoured an adjournment of the committee in order to ascertain whether there was anything left for them to do. One would fancy, to have heard the eloquent remarks of the hon. gen-

tleman who has just preceded me (Mr. Northrup), that the members of that committee from his side of the House were so clear in their judgment that there was something more to be investigated, that the moment Major Hodgins had abandoned his position, these gentlemen at once said: We will go on and clear up these matters.

Mr. LENNOX. So we did.

Mr. MACDONALD. My hon. friend will find that he and his colleagues almost quarrelled with my hon. friend the member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) who wanted to go on. They both wanted to delay the investigation until next day, in order to see whether there was anything left for them to do. They are endeavouring to cover their retreat to-day, and what they have done is what we would have expected from these gentlemen. We have heard a great deal about scandals, rake-offs and graft, these words which hon. gentlemen opposite roll as sweet morsels under their tongue, we have seen the failures on their part all through this session to prove anything wrong, until to-day there is nothing left in the minds of the people of this country, not a single scintilla of all these wild stories they have been telling. When they saw the absolute abandonment of what their newspapers believed was going to be the pièce de résistance, when they saw this was all gone, they felt that, even if they did at the close of the session take up a day in endeavouring to deceive their own people, it was the best that they could do. My hon. friend who just sat down wanted to know whether I thought this committee was doing right when they abandoned this investigation. I ventured to say at the time this matter came up that the idea of a committee on the Major Hodgins charges, hearing evidence and considering charges, after Major Hodgins abandoned them, would be like an endeavour to play Hamlet on the boards without Hamlet being there to play. That statement was absolutely accurate. When Major Hodgins abandoned his charges and left the committee, when his counsel withdrew from the committee, who were left to be prosecutors of the charges? Who were making the charges? Where was the responsible man or company asking that committee to deliberate? Where were the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker), and the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox)? Did they ever suggest that we should call a witness? We had a few lengthy addresses from those gentlemen in which they were endeavouring to play the game, but they never moved that any witness should be subpœnaed, they never suggested that anybody should come. They made no charges. On the contrary, they completely followed the line which Mr. Hodgins has taken, and withdrew every possible imputation that had ever been made against any one of the commissioners, individually or as a body.

Talk about classification. My hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. Northrup) read the opinion of the Deputy Minister of Justice as to whose business it was to classify, and the Deputy Minister of Justice said that the commission were not responsible for the classification, but the engineer was responsible. My hon. friend knows as a lawyer that under the terms of the contract and agreement, if the chief engineer of the Transcontinental Railway Commission is an honest man, not one dollar has ever been received by any contractor, and not one dollar ever can be received by any contractor, improperly; because not one dollar can be paid for any purpose in the construction of this road except upon the certificate of Mr. Lumsden, the chief engineer. So if these gentlemen want to investigate Mr. Lumsden, let us investigate Mr. Lumsden. But do not let them attempt to befool the people any longer by talking about investigating the commission or investigating the government upon this matter of classification, because neither of these bodies have anything to do with the classification which rests solely with Mr. Hugh Lumsden, chief engineer of the Transcontinental Railway. But that is not what we started out to do. Major Hodgins made certain charges in the Victoria 'Colonist,' they were repeated with great gusto by the Conservative press all over the country. They flew from city to city, and grew constantly bigger as they went, just like all the other scandals hatched by the Conservative party. When these charges reached the east they reflected upon the commission, and it was said this commission had been going it wild, and the country was in danger of being mulcted in millions. When the commission asked the Prime Minister to appoint a committee of this House to investigate what Major Hodgins had said in the west, we were dared to investigate these charges reflecting upon the credit and reputation of the commission, and in regard to all the other questions mentioned in his letter.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou). Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock I was directing your attention to the fact that the remarks of hon. gentlemen opposite, in which they seemed to reflect upon the gentlemen composing the commission on account of what they called the over-classification, were entirely beside the mark, and I make the statement that the one man who was responsible to the people of Canada for the absolute correctness of the classification that is awarded the con-

tractors upon the construction of the Transcontinental Railway and for the payments which are to be made to them is the present chief engineer of that railway. I want to say to the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker), who I understand is to follow me that I would like him to divest himself of the tendency which seems to be characteristic of hon. gentlemen opposite to get around important questions of this character, to avoid the real point at issue if, by avoiding it they can possibly enable themselves to indulge in some of those insinuations and innuendos which is so characteristic of the language used by hon. gentlemen opposite, and devote himself entirely to the question of the responsibility of the chief engineer of the Transcontinental Railway for every bit of the classification that is passed upon and on which money is paid. Before my hon. friend gets through dealing with that question I am afraid he will have a task which will occupy all the time he ought to occupy on a hot night like this. With regard to the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup), who, I regret, is not in his place, there are only one or two things that he referred to that I propose to mention. My hon. friend's talk about impeding investigation and obstruction is rather childish—it is baby talk for hon. gentlemen occupying serious positions in this House to indulge in. It is characteristic of the irresponsibility of the Conservative press in this country nowadays to use language of that kind. It is their common stock in trade, but hon. gentlemen like the hon. member for East Hastings, know full well that with regard to the various committees which have sat during this session and during preceding sessions there has been absolutely no warrant for any such statement. These hon. gentlemen indulge in this kind of talk simply for the purpose of having themselves quoted in their partisan organs outside and thus gain the cheap notoriety of using such language in the House of Commons. I want to say to my hon. friend from East Hastings and to the hon. member who follows me, that I defy either one of them to point to a single case in regard to any matter that was investigated before the Public Accounts Committee, or the Hodgins committee, so called, during this or preceding sessions of parliament, in which the production of a single document was refused, or in which the summoning of a single witness was prevented by any hon. gentleman on this side of the House. They will be unable, no matter how much language they may indulge in, to put their finger on a single case in which the production of a single document was refused or the summoning of a single witness was prevented. Because hon. gentlemen on this side of the House desire to preserve, in some slight degree, the traditions and the rules of parliament, are they to be called obstructors? I am sorry that hon. gentlemen have found it necessary to descend to such peculiar and childish language in order to attract attention.

In this particular case of the Hodgins inquiry I would ask the hon. member for Hamilton to put his finger upon a single word in this whole report to show where hon. gentlemen supporting the government refused to produce any documents that were relevant to the inquiry, or refused to summon a single witness that any gentleman—Major Hodgins or these hon. gentlemen themselves—desired to summon before that committee. On the contrary, the only evidence that was refused was evidence which was offered by counsel representing the Transcontinental Railway Commission; we refused it because we thought it was not relevant to the issue and in that refusal hon. members on both sides concurred. In the course of what I will have to say I will probably refer to some remarks of the hon. member for East Hastings, but let me come right now to the one point about this matter as to whether or not there is any possible ground or reason for my hon. friends who were associated with us on that committee to ask this House to concur in the minority report. The consideration of that question depends on the question as to what was the matter that was referred to the committee. A committee of this House can only deal with such matters as are contained in the order of reference. Their powers are absolutely limited and defined by the order. They have no inherent rights or powers of any kind except what the House chooses to confer upon them in regard to the particular matter that may be assigned to them. What was the matter that was assigned to us? On April 16, 1908, Major Hodgins, who had been dismissed from the employ of the Transcontinental Railway Commission, in the preceding August, published in the Victoria 'Colonist' newspaper, in Victoria, B. C., a letter in which he made certain reflections upon the commissioners and upon the gentlemen who are responsible for the management and construction of that railway. The Victoria 'Colonist,' which was a good Conservative newspaper, proceeded to comment upon that letter with very large headlines and with those amplifications which are the peculiar property of the average Conservative journalist. These charges were telegraphed by the reporter of the 'Colonist' to various eastern papers, amongst them the Manitoba 'Free Press' and the Ottawa 'Citizen.' Subsequently the Victoria 'Colonist' published what they claimed to be interviews with Major Hodgins in which certain other statements reflecting upon the commission purported to have been made and this letter and the interviews were, upon the request of the commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway, referred to us by order of the House of Commons. Let me call

your attention to the memorandum of Mr. Parent, chairman of the commission:

Memorandum to the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Prime Minister.

A letter from Major Hodgins, lately our district engineer at Kenora, Ontario, has been given wide publicity in the press, namely by the Manitoba 'Free Press,' and the Ottawa 'Morning Citizen,' where it is commented upon.

There are insinuation and statements in it that should not be allowed to pass unanswered.

He continues:

Taking up seriatim the allegations in Major Hodgins' letter as printed in the papers:

1. That the government is paying padded accounts for the work done, and that the Grand Trunk Pacific people are making no objection because they merely have to pay the added interest.

This statement is without any foundation. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company make objections when they see fit, and these are looked into at once with due care.

2. They (the commissioners) wanted to change my ideas, based on a good many years experience on the construction, to the classification that is allowed to contractors in Quebec.

This statement is also without foundation. The commissioners never, at any time, requested Major Hodgins to adopt in his district any classification not in accordance with the contract and specifications. As to the classification in Quebec, it was looked over and found to be agreeing with these, and therefore perfectly regular.

3. If Mr. Poulin, the engineer appointed by Mr. Parent to replace me on the western district, has allowed the introduction of a classification similar to that allowed in Quebec, this will account for the increase in the estimated cost of the line. If this increase amounts to $3,000,000 or $4,000,000 it is time the public demanded some explanation.

Such hypothetical statements of course amount to nothing at all. In the first place, Mr. Poulin was not appointed by Mr. Parent, the chairman, who did not even suggest it, but by the board, on the recommendation of the chief engineer because he was considered to be the best man for the position and to take hold of the work of reorganizing the district, which had been left in such a bad shape by Major Hodgins. At this point it may be well to remark that classification comes from the chief engineer and not the chairman or the commissioners, as Major Hodgins puts it.

Since leaving our employment, Major Hodgins has talked a good deal openly, in fact much more than prefessional dignity and the sense of justice would seem usually to permit. It is time, we feel, in justice to ourselves and to the public, before whom there is an evident desire to misrepresent the facts, to call a halt and make it necessary for the accuser to bring facts to substantiate his charge.

You will find attached newspaper clippings in reference to Major Hodgins' letter, and all correspondence relating to the circumstances of his dismissal; also a letter from our chief engineer, Mr. Lumsden, on the same subject.

In conclusion, the commissioners would respectfully request, as they do not wish to remain under the aspersion which such reports cast on them, that the whole matter be referred to and looked into by a committee of the House and that Major Hodgins be assigned to appear before the same to repeat his charges in a specific manner in order to substantiate them if he can.

That matter was referred to us on the order of the House dated April 28, which states:

That the memorandum of the chairman of the Trancontinental Railway Commission laid on the table of the House on the 24th instant and the papers accompanying same together with the letter of Major Hodgins to the public press therein referred to be referred to a special committee of the House to investigate.

It is an axiom that you cannot have a charge made against any person unless you have somebody making the charge; a charge does not come down from Heaven nor does it come from the earth nor from below the earth. A charge is the crystallization of some statement reflecting upon somebody, and to have existence it must be made by somebody. The person who produced this charge was Major Hodgins and it was Major Hodgins's charge that was referred to us by this House, and it was the matter that the chairman of the Transcontinental Railway Commission asked the House to refer to us. We summoned Major Hodgins and he appeared personally and by counsel and through his counsel, at the beginning of the investigation, he assumed responsibility for the letter in the newspaper but disclaimed responsibility for his alleged interview, and of course in language of the strongest character he also disclaimed responsibility for what he called the wild talk of the newspapers. The only thing he pretended for a moment to stand by was his letter of April 16. My hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) asked that his counsel should be paid and the matter was taken under advisement by the committee. The charge was placed before the committee and when that was done we had the crystallization of all that had gone before and we had cognizance of the only one thing we had to consider. It will not do for my hon. friends opposite to refer to newspaper talk; newspaper talk throughout this country emanating from the Conservative press is of such an irresponsible character that if this House were to investigate it parliament would have no time to attend to any other business. Surely these gentlemen opposite do not consider this wild newspaper talk as a matter worthy of our investigation. In the course of the proceedings this was pointed out and on page 455 you will find the following:

Mr. MACDONALD. Would you say that the wild talk of every Conservative newspaper in the country in regard to the Transcon-

tinental Railway Commission is before this committee?

Mr. LENNOX. No, I do not.

Mr. LENNOX. What else did I say?

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. If I were to quote all my hon. friend did say we would never get through this debate to-night.

Mr. LENNOX. I confined my remarks to the 'wild' talk.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. The one thing and the only thing we had before us was to consider these charges contained in that letter of Major Hodgins, and when we came to go into the question Major Hodgins discovered he was under a misapprehension. He was suffering under that sense of irritation which men who are dismissed from employment generally feel and he found he had been under a misapprehension and that his views in regard to the classification had been modified. He found that the chief engineer had in January issued explicit instructions as to how the specifications should be interpreted and he said, that while he still had his opinion, he would not proceed further on that line. In regard to any reflection upon the integrity of the Transcontinental Commission, Major Hodgins absolutely and completely withdrew all his imputations of his own accord.

Now, the issue here is simply whether or not in the light of these facts the majority report of the committee is not a proper report and one which should be adopted by the House. That report says:

Your committee, therefore, find that Major Hodgins has not only failed to prove the charges as contained in the 'Colonist,' both in the letter and interviews, but has specifically withdrawn the same, and has unqualifiedly exonerated the commissioners and their engineers from any improper conduct or undue influence over officials under them, or of collusion with the contractors, and that if questions as to classification arise they should be decided by the tribunal previously provided therefor by the statute.

In the name of common sense, in the name of every precedent that can be invoked in this or any other parliament, how could it be seriously urged in this House—as gentlemen opposite seem to urge—that when the man who was the only man in this whole Dominion who could be found willing to take the responsibility of making a charge against the Transcontinental Railway Commissioners absolutely and unreservedly withdraws that charge, that there may be other report from the committee except that which the majority has presented. Has my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) or has his astute colleague from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) undertaken to say in this report of theirs that any one of the charges made by Major Hodgins is proven. On the contrary the report of the minority treats these charges as being absolutely disposed of; it treats them as being absolutely nullified and as not being before the committee at all because in this minority report they say:

As shown by the papers and documents produced by the said commissioners to your committee and set forth in the printed Minutes of the Proceedings of your committee now reported, many charges of over-classification, of excessive allowances, and undue payments by the said commissioners to the contractors.

My hon. friends would appear to have worked overtime in order to find adjectives. and so they say: Over classification, excessive allowances and undue payments. If excessive allowances mean anything at all they mean over classification, because there never was a charge of excessive allowance except with respect to over classification, nor was there any charge made by the Grand Trunk Pacific or any body at any time that there was one dollar of excessive allowance. When my hon. friend from Hamilton addresses the House, I would like to know from him what evidence there is as to any over allowance. He may find disputes about classification, but he will find no reference whatever to over allowance notwithstanding the big adjectives which he and his colleague have put in their report.

Which charges involve and are examples of enormous overpayments.

Mark the word:

—enormous overpayments——

When there is not a little of evidence to warrant the charge.

They cover and include not only the charges made by Major Hodgins, but other specific and more serious complaints of a like nature and description——

This is absolutely inaccurate and untrue, because there never was before us a single document or statement from any source to warrant any such language, and I leave it to the hon. member (Mr. Barker) to produce it if he can.

—and not merely for the period dealt with by Major Hodgins but are continuous up to the time of the order of reference to your committee.

You may search this report of theirs from end to end, but will not find a single word which evidences any belief on their part that there is extant to-day any charge by Major Hodgins. It is absolutely wiped off the slate, there is no such thing in existence; there is no one willing to say: I take the responsibility of fathering that statement. None of them do it. My hon. friend (Mr. Carvell) took a certain position as to the course which should be pursued by the committee and said that we should take further evidence along the lines of fraud if any there were.

These gentlemen would not take such a position then, and have not done so to-day. While they admit that the charges referred to the committee are abandoned and withdrawn, and while both are sufficiently experienced politicians to know that when a committee is seized of a particular fact which has been abandoned before them and withdrawn from them by the gentleman who initiated the proceedings, that there is nothing more for the committee to do, yet they wish to take up the time of the House for the purpose of enabling them to beat a retreat on this question, and to let down their press in various portions of the country. Their papers have been talking in an irresponsible and erratic way, and they wish to save the faces of some of their friends in this matter. That is the whole story, that is all there is in it, because they do not say the committee should investigate Major Hodgins' charges any longer, but ask that the subject matter be recommitted to the committee to deal with other matters altogether.

I propose to deal with one or two matters referred to in this minority report. entirely irrelevant as they are, for the purpose of disposing of and wiping away completely the last remnants that remain of all the story of insinuation and fraud we have heard upon this subject. I said my hon. friends do not pretend that anything left here involved any imputation on the commission. My hon. friend from Hamilton was reading a number of letters which he put upon the record and at page 470 of the record I ventured to interject. I said :

You are not reading these letters with the idea of showing there is anything improper on the part of the commissioners?

These are the letters the hon. member for Simcoe was reading this morning. The answer was :

Mr. Barker.—These letters will not establish that.

In other words, the letters which my hon. friend from Simcoe was reading this morning to establish that there was something wrong, according to the hon. member for Hamilton before the committee, would not establish anything of the kind. On page 475 of the evidence it was stated :

I do not understand my hon. friends to urge that there is anything improper in the position of the commissioners in dealing with the engineers, so it is purely a question of a difference of opinion between these engineers as to what the classification will be.

Mr. Lennox.—I do not want you to misunderstand our position. I am not going to charge any wrong-doing without serious reason for so believing, but I do not feel that there is set out in these letters sufficient to make it very, very suspicious.

Mr. LENNOX. The 'not' in that sentence should not be there.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. LENNOX. Do not laugh at me ; the laugh will be on my side. I have received a letter from one of the reporters calling attention to that fact. He calls my attention to the fact that in the original that 'not' did not occur, but when it was set in type it was there. It should read :

I do not understand my hon. friends to urge that there is anything improper in the position of the commissioners in dealing with the engineers, so it is purely a question of a difference of opinion between these engineers as to what the classification will be.

Mr. Lennox.—I do not want you to misunderstand our position. I am not going to charge any wrong-doing without serious reason for so believing, but I do feel that there is set out in these letters sufficient to make it very, very suspicious.

That is what I said and that is what is in the original report ; that is what was sent to the printer, and without my intervention that is what will appear in the subsequent reports that will be printed.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I am not responsible for any mistake in the record.

Mr. LENNOX. Neither am I.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Even with the explanation of the hon. member for Simcoe he still stands for this, that he will not charge any wrong-doing without serious reason for so doing.

Mr. LENNOX. Exactly.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. And he would not say, and I am sure my hon. friend would have gone to the very extreme that it was possible to go even after the correction, that there was anything suspicious about the classification.

Mr. LENNNOX. Very, very suspicious.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. But that will not help my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker). I said :

These letters——

That was from Woods to Lumsden.

—are such as would pass between engineers representing different interests in connection with the construction of any railway in this country.

Mr. Barker.—We admit that.

Mr. Macdonald.—I do not know how one engineer could say to another that there was over classification in a particular district without he used language such as is found in these letters. There is no way in which he could say there was over-classification or that he differed in his opinion with the subordinate engineers as to the classification that had been made.

Then on page 449 I was very anxious to see where my hon. friends were on this question, whether they would take the responsibility after Major Hodgins had abso-

lutely abandoned and withdrawn all the imputations against anybody of standing by any charges. I ventured to ask my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker):

Mr. Macdonald.—What is your view in regard to the charges of improper conduct on the part of the commissioners, interference as to classification?

Mr. Barker.—That will be the result of the inquiry, whether there is over-classification or not. It is not perhaps material at present whether they intended them or not; the question at present is whether there is over-classification or not, whether from mistake or otherwise is a separate question.

Mr. BARKER. That is the question.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. That is the question, and I understand my hon. friend to confirm the position he took before the committee that there is no issue before this House involving any imputation upon the commissioners of any wrong-doing.

Mr. BARKER. I do not say there is or is not. It is none of my busines to say that.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. My hon. friend then takes the position that he is unable to say whether there is or not?

Mr. BARKER. I say it is not a part of my business to say whether there is anything beyond over-classification.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. That is a matter of satisfaction, that we have got the issue down to just one thing; the issue is simply one of correct classification by engineers.

Mr. LENNOX. No, it is not that.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. What is it?

Mr. LENNOX. The first issue is was there over-classification? That being established find out if you can whether it was improper or dishonest classification. These are the two points, but if you establish the first you have established the important point.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Then my hon. friend takes this position that because two engineers who were working on this northern land of ours, several hundred miles away from this government and the commission and the chief engineer, one representing the Grand Trunk Pacific and one the Transcontinental Railway Commission took different views as to how a certain cutting should be classified, there may be fraud on the part of the commissioners and he would seriously suggest to this House by this minority report or rather ask this House now to stop at this busy season to consider such a flimsy proposition as that. If the opposition are in this position to-night, if it is simply a question of classification, I submit that this House should not be kept up with a question of that kind.

When we are dealing with the question of classification by the engineers, what are we dealing with? We are dealing with two questions. There are certain specifications provided in every contract. In this case the specifications were drawn by Mr. Lumsden, the chief engineer, in whom hon. gentlemen opposite have a great deal of confidence, against whom no one suggests anything. These contracts contain the specifications, and there are only two matters to be considered and determined in this question. First, what do those specifications mean when their technical language is reduced to plain Anglo-Saxon; and, second, are they properly carried out. These are purely technical questions to be decided by the engineers absolutely. The only point is this. Shall this question, which does not involve anything but the determination of a simple engineering problem, be referred back to the committee for consideration, or left to the chief engineers of the Grand Trunk Pacific and of the Commission and the arbitrator provided under the agreement with the Grand Trunk Pacific in case the two engineers disagree? To that question there can be but one reply. My hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) rather attempted to lead the House to believe that the Deputy Minister of Justice had not given any opinion on this question of classification. My hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. Northrup) read this afternoon the very opinion which the hon. member for Simcoe indicated had never been delivered.

Mr. LENNOX. It was exactly the same as I read it this morning.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I had some difficulty in inducing you to read it.

Mr. LENNOX. I always yield to my hon. friend.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. This is what the Deputy Minister of Justice said:

It seems to me however that these questions——

That is the question which was agitating the minds of our hon. friends opposite.

—are largely engineering questions, the solution of which depends principally upon the judgment of the engineer, having regard to the terms used in the specification.

Now, if the chief engineer of the Transcontinental is competent to perform his duty, if he is able to define what specifications mean and what is required by those specifications, where is the necessity of this House going on and debating the matter? Even the press of our hon. friends opposite indicated some time ago that instead of this question being entertained by a par-

liamentary committee of inquiry, it ought to go to this very tribunal of engineers for determination. There is no newspaper in this country so extreme in its views as is the leading organ of the Conservative party in my province; and on May 23rd, when our hon. friends opposite and ourselves were struggling with this question in the committee, that newspaper indicated in the clearest possible language, that it was a mistake for us to bother with the question at all. This is what it says:

In this connection it may be advisable to refer to a report in the Toronto 'News,' when it editorially says that there seems to be a probability that the charges preferred by Major Hodgins against the commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway of over-classification may yet be investigated by a more impartial tribunal than the committee of the House of Commons now sitting at Ottawa.

And it explains this probability by adding that it has transpired that the engineers of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway have been for some time disputing the Quebec system of over-classification and consequent over-valuation and cost of the railway excavation material approved and adopted by the commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway on somewhat similar lines as they are disputed by Major Hodgins, with the result that the engineer's dispute is about to be referred to an expert tribunal composed of the chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway and a third arbitrator to be chosen by the two engineers, or, if they disagree, by the Chief Justice of Canada.

It will be matter for public satisfaction if this important case cannot be finally disposed of by the report of the majority of a partisan committee, but will come up for full investigation before 'a more impartial tribunal.'

So that my hon. friends have been engaged in a work entirely of supererogation. Their friends throughout the country look upon Major Hodgins' charges as dead and buried, and anticipated the result of the committee's investigation by suggesting that whatever there was to be considered at all should be dealt with by this tribunal of engineers. I am only surprised that my hon. friends do not appreciate the facts, which are patent to everybody, better than to raise this great hullabaloo over the charges of Major Hodgins, which are now so effectually exploded that a thousand debates such as we have had would not resurrect them anywhere in the minds of the people.

I want to show you conclusively how the interests of the people were safeguarded when the Act was passed in 1893. We have heard a great deal about the agreement with the Grand Trunk Pacific. Let me draw your attention to a point not referred to my hon. friends. In the Act providing for the construction of the Transcontinental Railway, section 16 provides:

The commissioners shall let the work of constructing the eastern division by tender and contract after the plans and specifications therefor have been duly advertised, and they shall accept the lowest tender put in by a contractor who, in the judgment of the commissioners, is possessed of sufficient skill, experience and resources to carry on the work or such portion thereof as he has tendered for.

Thus it is provided that the commissioners shall let the work by tender and contract to the lowest tenderer, and every contract has been let to the lowest tenderer, and section 17 provides that:

The contract so entered into shall be guarded by such security, and contain such provision for retaining a portion of the contract moneys, to be held as a reserve fund for such periods of time, and on such conditions as appear to be necessary for the protection of the public and for securing the due performance of such contracts respectively.

When the souls of my hon. friends are being vexed and their press throughout the country is exclaiming about the millions of Canadian money which is being imperilled, they never venture to tell the public that the statute of 1903, providing for the construction of this road, anticipated disputes and provided that the contractors should be required to give security for the due performance of their contracts, and provided also for a retention of money, so that if any dispute should arise it would be settled in the interests of the Canadian people. Here is another provision safeguarding the public interest:

No money shall be paid to any contractor until the chief engineer has certified that the work for or on account of which it is claimed has been duly executed and that such money is due and payable, nor until such certificate has been approved by the commissioners.

So that the people of Canada have, first, the absolute responsibility of the chief engineer, whose integrity does not seem to be questioned by hon. gentlemen opposite, and over and above that there must be the approval of the commissioners to the chief engineer's certificates. I have said that this Act contemplated that every precaution should be taken to safeguard the interests of the people. These precautions were taken in every contract. Section 15 of each and every contract, including the contract of Mr. Davis, to whom my hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. Northrup) rather sneeringly referred, provides that the chief engineer shall be the sole judge of work and material in respect of both quantity and quality, and his decision on all questions in dispute with regard to work and material shall be final. It goes on to say:

Works or extra or additional works or changes shall be deemed to have been executed, nor shall the contractor be entitled to payment for the same, unless the same shall have been executed to the satisfaction of the

engineer, as evidenced by a certificate in writing, which certificate shall be a condition precedent to the right of the contractor to be paid therefor.

What is the use of talking about the question of classification and about a committee of this House investigating what the chief engineer of the Transcontinental did or did not do, especially in the absence of any suggestion of any wrong-doing on his part, or of anybody taking the responsibility of indicating that any wrong has been done? If the chief engineer has certified to payments to which he ought not to have certified, let us deal with that question. But if there are disputes between the engineers as to what is proper classification, and if the one to decide is Mr. Lumsden, no one has any right to pass him over. He stands in the path, and only on his certificate and only by his direction can money be paid. Further, let me direct your attention to section 33 of this contract, which contains the covenant to pay:

In consideration of the faithful performance by the contractor of all and singular the covenants and agreements herein contained, the commissioners hereby covenant and agree with the contractor that they will well and truly pay him on the full completion by him of all the work herein specified within the time specified and limited for the completion thereof to the satisfaction and subject to acceptance by their chief engineer and subject also as herein provided——

——certain schedule prices fixed in the contract. Then comes a section under which it is provided that the contractors are not entitled to receive payment until the completion of the work.

34. Cash payments equal to about ninety per cent of the value of the work done, approximately made up from returns of progress measurements and computed at the prices agreed upon, or determined under the provisions of this agreement, will be made to the contractor monthly, on the written certificate of the engineer that the work for, or on account of which, the certificate is granted has been duly executed to his satisfaction, and stating the value of such work computed as mentioned, and upon approval of such certificate by the commissioners; and the said certificate and such approval thereof shall be a condition precedent to the right of the contractor to be paid the said ninety per cent, or any part thereof. The remaining ten per cent shall be retained until the final completion of the whole work to the satisfaction of the chief engineer for the time being having control over the work;——

So that, at all times, there is 10 per cent of the progress estimates retained in the hands of the chief engineer. And, besides, as an hon. friend beside me reminds me, there is the deposit of 10 per cent of the estimated cost of the contact which had to be advanced by the contractor and which is a further guarantee against any mistake made by an engineer.

And section 39 of the contract provides:

The progress measurements and progress certificates shall not in any respect be taken as binding upon the commissioners, or as final measurements or as fixing final amounts; they are to be subject to the revision of the engineer in making up his final certificate, and they shall not in any respect be taken as an acceptance for the work or release of the contractor from responsibility in respect thereof, but he shall at the conclusion of the works deliver over the same in good order, according to the true intent and meaning of this agreement.

So, the commissioners have absolutely safeguarded the interests of the people by these provisions. There is this further check, which is contained in the agreement with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. There is the provision of section 7, which has been quoted, and there is that of section 47. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, which company is to pay interest on the cost of construction, where any dispute arises between their engineer and the engineer of the Transcontinental, can have the matter determined first under section where it was referred to a board of arbitrators composed of the chief engineers of each road, and in the event of disagreement by the appointee of the chief justice, and finally under section 47, which provides that when you come to the end of the enterprise, if any dispute arises between the company and the commission as to the elements that enter into the cost, it can all be reviewed by an entirely independent tribunal. In the face of all this, are hon. gentlemen opposite serious when they ask that a committee of this House be asked to investigate whether two engineers away in the north country on district 'F' of this road are correct in their opinions on a question of classification? And when hon. gentlemen opposite talk about arbitration, and as to whether it can legally be carried on under this section or not, the fact remains that these gentlemen are already at work on the arbitration. It was intimated that no request for arbitration has been made. I would direct the attention of the House to page 467 where we find the letter of Mr. Woods, dated April 28 of this year, where he asks:

Dear Sirs,—This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of April 24, in regard to classifications given on districts 'B' and 'F,' wherein you say you could confer with me, either in Ottawa or Montreal, so as to arrange dates for arbitrating the points in dispute and for the appointment of a third arbitrator, &c.

In reply thereto will say that the action you propose cannot be taken——

Mr. BARKER. Cannot be taken.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (reading):

—until after you have complied with my request of October 7, which, as you will recall, has been several times repeated, that you and I personally make an inspection of those portions of the work on districts 'B' and 'F' where it is claimed improper classification has been made.

I will let my hon. friend know, if he is not already aware of it, that the commission came to the conclusion, before a third arbitrator was appointed, that it would be proper for the chief engineer of the company and the chief engineer of the contractors to agree as far as they could, with a third to be appointed in case of dispute. And these gentlemen have been engaged for a month in settling the classification. I happened to come up from Nova Scotia with the chief engineer who was going to look into some of these quesetions on his return. When these gentlemen agree, the classification will be fixed. If Mr. Davis, Mr. McArthur or any other person, or if the sub-contractors—because they are the ones primarily interested and not the large contractors—if these contractors have at any time, as a result of wrong classification, received more than they were entitled to, then by virtue of the ten per cent retained on the progress estimates, and the ten per cent of the whole contract in the hands of the commission. every error can be rectified. Mr. Ritchie. who, I understand, is a counsel of great eminence and a peculiar friend of my hon. friends opposite, says in his letter on this subject, page 415:

Having regard to paragraph 39 and other paragraphs of the contract, I am inclined to think it would not be successfully contended that the engineer in case of a mistake in measurement or classification could not rectify the error when making up his full certificate, and that he would not be precluded by progress measurements and certificates from so doing unless indeed it should turn out to be practically impossible after the work had been completed to determine the kind and characteristics of the material in the cut, so as to be in a position to make a proper classification.

The country has the advantage of the judgment of the chief engineer in the first instance. Then it has the advantage of the arbitration going on with the Grand Trunk Pacific. Now, my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) with great adroitness for which I congratulate him, having a bad case to deal with, attempted to make the point that the engineer was induced to take a certain course. There is not the suggestion of a tittle of evidence to that effect before the committee. It exists in imagination only. And when the hon. member for East Hamilton (Mr. Barker) intimated, in interruption of my hon. friend from Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) that the specifications were altered, he knew that they were not——

Mr. BARKER. The interpretation I said.

Mr. MACDONALD. The interpretation is another thing, but that was not what you said. It is one thing to alter a solemn contract duly drawn up and signed, and it is quite a different thing to take a different interpretation of what that document means. This afternoon the hon. gentleman intimated that the document itself had been altered. Such a thing never occurred. There never was an interpretation of the specifications issued by the chief engineer until the 9th day of January last. Each engineer had the specifications and every engineer took his own view of it. The result was necessarily that there were variances in the classification. I think the chief engineer of the Transcontinental, should, long before January last, have sent out instructions to indicate what his view of the specifications was in order that there might be uniformity in classification on the Transcontinental. But he did not arrange to do so, and I am here to say that I think if he had sent out those instructions last summer, possibly Major Hodgins would never have got into the difficulty which has occurred. I think the chief engineer of the Transcontinental Railway should have been more explicit when he went up to district 'F', in telling the engineers there just what his views were, and what his interpretation was. But he never made any interpretation until January 9, of this year. Will my hon. friends venture to say that this is any fault of the commissioners? There are documents and letters on record which indicate that they asked that this should be done long ago, and they show that the district engineer in the eastern division had applied for that uniform system of classification. So when the hon. member for Hamilton now ventures to say that the specifications were not altered, but the interpretation of them was altered, he is still incorrect, because he cannot find on record any official statement made by the chief engineer in which any interpretation was put upon them.

Mr. BARKER. The commissioners writing by their secretary to the chief engineer approved of his modification of his previous interpretation.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Well, my hon. friend and his associates are doing what they usually do when dealing with any question of which they are trying to make a scandal, they are confusing language. Supposing Mr. Lumsden took a certain view of a certain cut down in the province of Quebec, his view as to whether that cutting should be classified as so much solid rock or so much loose rock, that would have nothing whatever to do with the language in the specifications or their general interpretation.

Mr. BARKER. What were all these legal letters about and letters of opinion?

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Legal letters, because they were dealing with a concrete case. These legal gentlemen were undertaking to deal with the question as to the proper interpretation of the specifications, because the question of classification was entirely in the hands of the chief engineer. Sir Alexander Lacoste, who I understand is one of the legal gentlemen our hon. friends have consulted, is not a gentleman who, as insinuated, would give an opinion merely to please a client. I am sorry the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) is not in his seat, because I would like to commend him the task of reading the opinion of Sir Alexander Lacoste, to find out in it how little there is in all the squabble over this question, because when Sir Alexander Lacoste deals with these questions, it is in such a clear manner that it makes my hon. friend's argument absolutely untenable. Therefore, we have established now that even if the allegation is that interpretation of these specifications was altered it does not avail them, because there was never any original interpretation to alter. But finally, on January 9, Mr. Lumsden issues a document in which he finds there were six conditions under which you can class solid rock: First, rock and ledges; second, rock and boulders over one cubic yard; third, conglomerate rock or plumb pudding stone; fourth, detached ledge rock in mass over one cubic yard; fifth, rock in masses of over one cubic yard; sixth, shale rock; six different defined conditions which can be classified as solid rock, and since that time they have been interpreted in that way. My hon. friend from Hastings undertook again to distort language with a view of endeavouring to show that Mr. Lumsden took that position under pressure. There is not any evidence of that. Mr. Newcombe, the Deputy Minister of Justice, pointed out when the matter was referred to him, that Mr. Lumsden had evidently overlooked the use of the words 'cubic foot' instead of the words 'cubic yard.' As a result, Mr. Lumsden corrected his interpretation which he had previously given on December 9, and used the words 'cubic yard' in deference to the suggestion of the Deputy Minister of Justice. But in no other respect did his interpretation differ from that made on December 9, as he stated at the end of it that he had made it after consultation with Mr. Schreiber, who was the consulting engineer in the western country. Now this is what the chief engineer did, and since January 9 of this year these uniform instructions as to interpretation have been in existence all over the Transcontinental. There never was any complaint made by the Grand Trunk Pacific in regard to classification previous to October 7 of last year, when Mr. Woods wrote on that subject. The hon. member for Simcoe endeavoured to deduce some argument from the statement in Mr. Lumsden's letter that Mr. Doucet at one time had taken a position in which he agreed with Mr. Woods. My hon. friend from Simcoe was not fair, or he overlooked the letter of Mr. Doucet which is to be found on page 399, in which he expressly states that he affirms the very position he took in the verbal discussion he had with Mr. Lumsden. But this letter of Mr. Woods, which has been made so much use of by the Conservative press, has been completely disposed of. It is disposed of by the letter of Mr. Doucet on page 398, it is disposed of by the letter of Mr. Huestis, on page 400, in which Mr. Huestis says:

Although Mr. Woods distinctly stated on the trip to La Tuque just completed that his interpretation was different to that as expressed by me, yet Mr. Armstrong told me that when he and Mr. Woods visited the work in the early part of October cut from station 5950-5969 which is classified by Mr. Bourgeois to be 88 per cent solid rock, 12 per cent loose rock was judged by Mr. Woods to be 100 per cent solid rock, which he could not possibly state on his declared interpretation of the specifications, as the eastern end shows a cut where masses of material rather than ledge rock occurs.

Also by Mr. Bourgeois' letter on page 402, where Mr. Bourgeois, who is the local engineer, states that he had kept gangs of men in these cuts measuring the boulders that came out in order to verify their size, and to make it clear whether or not they should be classified as solid rock. As a matter of fact, I am prepared to state that Mr. Woods does not pretend to suggest that this error in classification, which he claims existed in October, occurred through any instructions that came from any superior.

Mr. LENNOX. All the more reason why that should have been done.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Mr. Lumsden was there, who could speedily correct it. My hon. friend from Simcoe knows as well as I do that the decision of an absolutely technical question as to whether any cut should be classified one way or another, is a matter peculiarly for engineers, and not for lawyers or members of parliament. Not only that, but you will find Mr. Woods' letter written in February 20 of this year, on page 469, in which he absolutely accepts the interpretation which was put upon the specifications by Mr. Lumsden in the previous January, and in which he says:

We are quite satisfied with your interpretation of the specifications and with your instructions, which are explicit. I do not know the date of these instructions or when they are supposed to become effective, but from reports from my assistants at Winnipeg and Quebec, there does not seem to have been any change in classification of work previous-

ly estimated was not classified according to your recent instructions being over estimated in both loose and solid rock.

Mr. Woods and Mr. Lumsden know better than the member for Simcoe and the member for Hamilton what is right, and they will so decide, if they are honest men. I do not think it is necessary to detain the house any longer. The conference between these arbitrators is now going on. If any interpretation of the classification upon any portion of this railway should, upon investigation by the chief engineer of the Transcontinental, appear to be incorrect, he will deal with the matter. There is no use talking moonshine about the people of Canada losing thousands and thousands of dollars. There is not a contractor who has not got 20 per cent, or 10 per cent of all the money that can possibly be given to him and 10 per cent of the whole value of his contract in the hands of the commission. Not one of the commissioners, not Mr. McIsaac, not Mr. Reid, not Mr. Young, not Mr. Parent, not one of them, can give to any one of these contractors a five cent piece unless Mr. Lumsden, the chief engineer, says so, and if any one of these men has got a five cent piece as a result of any incorrect classification, every five cent piece, every dollar, every thousand dollars that he has got incorrectly can be got back from him in consequence of the required certification of the chief engineer. The whole thing is in his own hands ; the responsibility is his. It is part of the political game of hon. gentlemen opposite, as they play it, to make the people believe that the gentlemen composing this commission have something to do with the question of classification. I do not know that I could conclude very much better than by asking the hon. member for Hamilton to show how a member of the commission, or a member of the government, could give to a contractor, or a sub-contractor, one dollar unless the chief engineer said not only that he should have it but that if he had got it he had a right to keep it. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that while we have had under the consideration of this House and of the committees various absurd and ridiculous charges which have emanated from hon. gentlemen opposite, who have deserted every tradition of their party, abandoned every alleged policy, the absolute fiasco which has followed their attack upon the management of the Transcontinental Railway is the worst that has marked their whole career, and this fact is so apparent that I need not argue further. My hon. friends are simply covering their retreat, and I should apologize to the House for detaining it so long.

Mr. SAMUEL BARKER (East Hamilton). Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a good deal of pleasure to the hon. member (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) who has just sat down. I give him credit for making a very ingenious speech on this subject and evading as carefully as possible any of the questions that are really involved in the report and the amended report now before the House. In rising to second the amendment I do not intend to follow the very able speech of my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) who went so fully, elaborately and completely into the facts of the case that it would be more than useless to occupy the time of the House in repeating what he has said. I wish to make a few remarks upon the argument of the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell). That gentleman has a peculiar faculty of putting facts wrong end foremost. He is noted for that and he does it with all the apparent sincerity in the world, but he has only to be watched closely to see where the art comes in and how far he departs from the real facts. For example, he started off by asserting that Major Hodgins charged that if what he saw in Quebec were followed by Mr. Poulin, his successor, it would make a differencce of $3,000,000 or $4,000,000 in the cost of district 'F.' No such language was ever used by Major Hodgins. The hon. member for Carleton, N.B., simply reverses the facts and puts upon Major Hodgins' language that was used by the contractor. The contractor, in an interview with a newspaper, had made certain statements in regard to the increase in the cost of his work and in referring to that he had eulogized the changes made in the work and had said that the increase was a proper one and would produce a fine piece of work. It was in reference to that that Major Hodgins made his statement. Major Hodgins never said anything like what was asserted by the hon. memebr for Carleton, N.B., and I think that the hon. member for Carleton, N.B., must have known that at the time. I shall show in a moment exactly what Major Hodgins did say and how he came to refer to the contractor's statement. The hon. member for Carleton, N.B., also said that Major Hodgins signed the estimate for September. Major Hodgins had been dismissed before the estimate for September was prepared and Major Hodgins, on the contrary, said that some one had signed that estimate who did not know anything about the facts. I do complain somewhat of one thing done by the hon. member for Carleton. In the committee an effort was made by Mr. Murphy, counsel for the commissioners, after the case had been closed, to call Mr. Armstrong. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat objected to that. He was against Mr. Armstrong being called. The hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) and I did not object to Mr. Armstrong being called provided the case was opened, but we did object to Mr. Murphy calling one or two witnesses when the case was closed if we were to be barred from calling such wit-

nesses. It was a very plain position. There is not an hon. gentleman on the opposite side of the House who will say that we were not perfectly reasonable in that. We would not have objected, we were trying our best to go on with the inquiry and to call further witnesses, but they having closed the inquiry and then desiring to put in more witnesses of their own, we said: If you open it you must open the whole case and we will call further witnesses. That ended Mr. Armstrong.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) denied that this afternoon and contradicted me.

Mr. BARKER. The facts are as I have stated them. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) strongly objected to Mr. Armstrong being called because he knew it would open the case and give us an opportunity of calling witnesses if we desired to do so. It was most unfair, it appears to me, and I hope hon. gentlemen opposite will not regard it as right or proper, that the hon. member for Carleton, N.B., failing to call that witness because of the case being closed, should read to the House a statement made by Armstrong, when we have no opportunity of cross-examining him or bringing him face to face with any other witnesses. The hon. member for Carleton, N.B., took credit to himself that he had invited us to prove anything more after the closing of the case. Over and over again he repeated that they had challenged us to call witnesses to prove any fraud, but the hon. gentleman carefully kept back from the House what he really did say. How could we, he said, be allowed to call witnesses to prove fraud if no member of the House would take it upon himself to charge fraud? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Carvell) was very prudent in his offer. He was quite willing that we should go into a case of fraud provided one of us got up and formally charged the commissioners with fraud. He knew perfectly well that no member of the committee could with propriety make any such charge. We were not there as prosecutors. We were there under the order of this House to investigate, and it would have been improper for any member of the committee to make a charge of fraud against any person. We were there to receive testimony, and the proposal of the hon. member (Mr. Carvell) that we should make a charge of fraud was simply humbug and he knows it. Then, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Carvell) said, as showing how defective Major Hodgins was in his knowledge of what passed on section 'B' that Hodgins represented that at La Tuque cutting, he was told certain work was classified at 86 per cent solid rock, and the hon. member said that Major Hodgins himself conceded that it ought to have been classified at 40 per cent. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Carvell) went on to add that in fact it was not classified at so much as 40 per cent but at only 32 per cent and had been on a previous occasion classified at 29 per cent. The facts about that are very simple and the hon. gentleman knew them as well as any member of the committee. Major Hodgins was taken down to section 'B' in Quebec; he knew nothing about the country, he had no plans and no profiles; he was just taken there to look at the work. He was shown a particular piece of work, and asking how it had been classified he was told by one of the men on the spot that it had been classified at 86 per cent solid rock. Major Hodgins may or may not have been correct in his recollection of that. He left shortly after for Ottawa, he had no memoranda about him, but nobody who knows Major Hodgins believes that he would wilfully misrepresent. I would not say that Major Hodgins may not have been mistaken; he may have made a mistake in describing the exact location of the piece of work he was speaking about.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. That cutting is the only cutting on the eastern division of the Transcontinental that has 100 feet in depth. I know well what I am speaking about and I may say that the cutting is not all out yet and they were only working upon a very small portion of it at that time.

Mr. BARKER. La Tuque is a general designation of the place Major Hodgins went to, but he went over several places in the neighbourhood and he did not confine his walk to that particular cutting. He had firmly in his mind one spot which was represented as being classified at 86 per cent.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. He specially mentions a cutting 100 feet deep and La Tuque is only one of that depth.

Mr. BARKER. It is clear that Major Hodgins is not alone in referring to 86 per cent classification in that neighbourhood, because the Grand Trunk engineers find a similar classification, and what Major Hodgins says is that it was quite possible for him to have made an error as to the exact spot when he was speaking several months afterwards. I assert, that when the member for Carleton ((Mr. Carvell) tells us that Major Hodgins is an honourable man and a straightforward and a truthful man, it is neither fair nor right for that hon. gentleman at the same time to represent him as wilfully misrepresenting the classification. That is all I have to say on that subject.

The hon. member (Mr. Carvell) went on to refer to force account, and he very strongly condemns Major Hodgins for the advice he gave with regard to it. But Mr. Lumsden the chief engineer expressly stated that he did not find fault with Major

Hodgins as to his advice about force account nor was he dismissed on that ground, and I shall show later that Major Hodgins was treated most unfairly and most unjustly by the commission with regard to that matter. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) claims that Major Hodgins unreservedly withdrew his charges. That is putting it very strongly indeed as any one who has heard or read the evidence of Major Hodgins must admit. Major Hodgins was confronted with these legal opinions that we have heard so much about and in reply to the member for Pictou he said he did not know of those opinions when he wrote his letter. He was then asked if he would have modified his own judgment as to what he said in his letter, had he known of these legal opinions. Major Hodgins confessed that it would have had an effect upon his mind and might have altered his opinion as to the acts of others, but as to his own division and as to the cases in which he found fault with classification he never withdrew one he had uttered, and he had remained of precisely the same opinion. He was manly enough to say that if the engineers acted upon legal advice, accepted by the chief engineer, that certainly would modify his opinion as to the conduct of these engineers. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald) carefully concealed the fact that the over classification as to which Major Hodgins gave evidence was all done before the change was made in the interpretation. The action taken by McIntosh had altered the estimates from January to June and July, 1907, but the legal opinion were later so they could not affect the charges made by Major Hodgins himself. The hon. member (Mr. Macdonald) went on to speak of obstructors and the press, but there is no question of obstruction before us here and it would be useless to follow him in that line of argument. The simple question is: The House having referred a certain subject to the committee, whether the committee should deal with it or whether they should take the opinion of Major Hodgins that another body could deal with it better than the committee. It is not for the committee, it is not for Major Hodgins to decide that. The House, knowing the facts, knowing the statute which provided for arbitrators, the government knowing all about that agreement of January 10, 1908, knowing every fact that we know today, appointed the committee and directed us to investigate. By what authority does the committee accept from Major Hodgins who is a mere witness the opinion that some other body can deal with it more satisfactorily than a committee appointed by this House. Then the hon. member (Mr. Macdonald) tries to make out there is some excessive verbiage and he says we charge over classification, excessive allowance, and undue payments. There might be over classification by the resident engineer and it might go no further, but still that might be a matter for proper inquiry. But there was not only over-classification, it was allowed, and undue payments given.

Those are the specific charges made and the amendment urges that we ought to continue the investigation of these subjects.

The hon. member also comments upon the fact that in putting in before the committee the various letters that have been referred to to-day I had said that those letters did not charge or prove fraud against the commissioners; I say so still. There is nothing in those letters that indicates any fraudulent conduct on the part of the commissioners. That has never been pretended. The letters do not say there was any fraud, but they prove what is on their face, that over-classification was allowed by the resident engineers. That is all the letters say, and that is all we put them in to show. If the inquiry had gone on, the committee would not have rested with those letters; we would have sent for those Grand Trunk engineers, would have sent for Mr. Armstrong and Mr. Woods, and would have heard all the evidence, we would have brought these witnesses face to face with the government engineers, and would have found out what the truth is about all this. But when the committee got to that point, and with those letters before them, showing most grievous errors apparently, certainly enormous amounts at stake far beyond anything that Major Hodgins knew as to his own division, the committee shut down and said they would investigate no more, although they were ordered to investigate by the House. That is all I have to say in answer to the speech of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. E. M. Macdonald).

I propose to take up what I understand to be the real questions submitted to us and to deal with them in as brief a manner as I possibly can. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) says: What is the question which was submitted to us? That can be answered very simply. In April, 1908, certain letters, interviews and comments appeared in the newspapers commenting upon charges affecting the commissioners of the National Transcontinental Railway, and these were of such a character that the commissioners considered it their duty to bring the matter before parliament, which they did by memorandum to the First Minister, appearing at page 15 of the printed evidence. That is the starting point, the bringing up of that memorandum of Mr. Parent by the First Minister. The First Minister made a motion to refer that memorandum and other papers to a committee. The motion is printed at page 5 of the evidence, and as it appears here is somewhat altered from the form in which it was at first introduced by the Prime Min-

ister, the words 'together with the letter of Major Hodgins to the public press therein referred to,' having being inserted before the motion passed. It is dated 28th April, 1908, and reads :

Resolved, that the memorandum of the chairman of the Transcontinental Railway Commissioners to the Prime Minister, of April 23, and laid on the table of this House on the 24th instant, and the papers accompanying the same, together with the letter of Major Hodgins to the public press therein referred to, be referred to a special committee of five members, with instructions to investigate the matters and charges therein mentioned, and that the said committee be composd of:

Messrs. Carvell, Macdonald (Pictou), Geoffrion, Barker, and Lennox; and that they have power to send—

Not to send for Major Hodgins, but

—to send for persons, papers and records, to examine persons on oath or affirmation, and to report from time to time.

That was the reference, but when you come to the papers themselves which were referred to the committee you find that to the memorandum were appended Major Hodgins' letter and various newspapers and other papers. For the letter Major Hodgins of course accepted full responsibility. As to the interviews he did not repudiate them in the sense that the repudiation has been represented here. He simply said that he had an interview with a newspaper reporter; that the newspaper reporter took a short memorandum from him, perhaps as he described it, it would occupy a space of two or three inches, and having got, in newspaper reporter fashion, the substance of what he wanted, the reporter elaborated that out into a rather lengthy article, and so Major Hodgins says: I do not accept responsibility for the elaboration, I only accept responsibility for what I told him. That is not withdrawing the charge, that is not repudiating anything he said; he over and over again repeated that he stood by whatever he said, and especially he stood by the letter. In that letter Major Hodgins made very distinct charges about which there could be no mistake. First of all he said that the root of all the trouble between the commissioners and himself was the question of over-classification; that is, his refusal to certify work done as of a higher and more costly class than the facts justified. There was a distinct charge that he had been in trouble with the commissioners, and because he refussed to certify for a higher class of work than the facts justified. That charge would be confined to his own district. He had, he said, refused to be more liberal in classification than he was allowing, and he had suggested that the commissioners, not being railroad men, should leave the engineering department alone. That was charge No. 2. He also said that one of the commissioners had advised him to go to Quebec and see how things were managed in that respect where the contractors were not kicking and get an object lesson. That was charge or statement No. 3.

In his letter he alluded to the interview of Mr. McArthur, and this brings up the statement with which I find fault in the speech of the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. McArthur was the contractor for 250 miles of district 'F' near Winnipeg. A statement had appeared in the Toronto 'World' of March 14, as coming from McArthur, that whereas the first estimate of the cost of the 230 miles had been $13,000,000, the actual cost would be close to $16,000,000, because so many changes had been made. That was the statement of Major Hodgins, as the member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) put it, but it was a statement made by McArthur, the contractor. As to this Major Hodgins replied, in his letter, that changes in location had really reduced the probable outlay by almost $1,000,000. So that the total cost should be reduced to about $12,000,000 instead of being increased to about $16,000,000. He did not say, and did not pretend to say, that the probable cost had increased to $16,000,000; that was Mr. McArthur's statement. All that Major Hodgins said was that the alterations in location really reduced the $13,000,000 by about a million and that there should be a reduction to about $12,000,000 instead of an increase to $16,000,000. Commenting upon the McArthur interview, Major Hodgins in his letter said :

If Mr. Poulin, the engineer appointed by Mr. Parent to replace me on the western district, has allowed the introduction of classification similar to that in the province of Quebec, this will account for an increase in the estimated cost of the line.

He did not say that Mr. Poulin had allowed that, but that if he had, that would account for an increase.

If this increase amounts to three or four million dollars (33⅓ per cent), it is time the public demanded some explanation from the government.

Mr. Hodgins made no assertion there except based upon what had been said by Mr. McArthur. What he said was that if the increase was caused by using the Quebec classification, as it was termed, it was about time the government should inquire into it. Major Hodgins, in his letter, went on to say :

The quickest way for the government to find out if the classification allowed is extravagant or not will be for the Minister of Railways to ask for the monthly reports of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway engineers, who

are stationed on the Winnipeg district and the Quebec district, Messrs. Mann, Heaman and Armstrong; these reports are, I think, sent to the assistant chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific in Montreal. These engineers are well known in the west, and their reports contain much more information on the subject than I have.

Here we have a clear statement involving, not merely district 'F,' near Winnipeg, but district 'B,' in the province of Quebec. Major Hodgins made no pretense of knowing anything of district 'B' of his own knowledge, but he did know about district 'F.' It must be borne in mind that Major Hodgins did not know what Messrs. Heaman, Armstrong and Mann could prove; and he could not, by this statement, have expected anybody to believe that he was himself in a position to prove anything about excessive classification in the province of Quebec. But the engineers of the Grand Trunk Pacific could give that evidence. Major Hodgins could give evidence as to district 'F.' It was as to these charges among others, appearing in the papers appended to the memo. which the chief commissioner wrote to the First Minister, that an inquiry was ordered. These charges involve, not merely the Winnipeg end, but district 'B'—not merely information within the knowledge of Major Hodgins but information that could only be obtained from the Grand Trunk Pacific and their engineers.

Now the chairman of the Transcontinental Commission used these words at the close of his letter to the Prime Minister:

> In conclusion, the commissioners would respectfully request, as they do not wish to remain under the aspersion which such reports cast on them——

Those reports include not Major Hodgins' district alone but district 'B' as well.

> —that the whole matter be referred to and looked into by a committee of the House and that Major Hodgins be assigned to appear before the same to repeat his charges in a specific manner in order to substantiate them if he can.

Thereupon the House, on April 28, referred all those papers to a special committee with instructions to investigate the matters and charges therein mentioned. I have stated the matters contained in that letter, not with the view of discussing whether they have been proven or not but to bring clearly before the House what was the subject matter referred to the committee. It is absolutely clear that what was recognized by the commissioners as affecting their reputation was not merely the charges as to district 'F,' not merely things within the personal knowledge of Major Hodgins, but the matters also referred to regarding district 'B,' and the evidence that could be given by the Grand Trunk Pacific engineers. It must be quite clear to hon. members, when they have read the evidence, that it was absolutely impossible for Major Hodgins to have known all the facts contained in these charges. He had reason to suppose there was foundation for the charges when he made them, but he could no more prove them on oath than he could prove what was going on in China. He had nothing to do with district 'B,' but he had reason to believe that things were not going on as they should in that district? He knew that the Grand Trunk Pacific engineers were finding fault with the classification there, but he knew none of these things of his own personal knowledge.

If the House desire to understand exactly what occurred with regard to Major Hodgins, they should know precisely what his position was and what were the relations between him and his chief and the commissioners. He had been district engineer, at first in charge of location, and then of the construction of about 380 miles lying immediately east of Winnipeg, known as district 'F.' He had under him the usual staff of engineers, and they apparently were quite satisfactory to him until the troubles arose to which I shall refer. Mr. McArthur was contractor for 250 miles of that district and had sub-let portions to other contractors. The classifications on which the contract prices were based were ordinary excavation, loose rock, and solid rock, and the prices were solid rock, $1.70 per cubic yard, loose rock, 60 cents and ordinary excavation, 30 cents. Mr Hodgins was under the impression—and I think that was generally understood—that McArthur had taken his contract for ordinary excavation at too low a price, and no doubt the sub-contractors were lower still. After McArthur began his work labour became scarce and wages increased which made it harder for all of them as regards common excavation. There are some gentlemen in this House who have had some practical experience of this sort of thing; but anybody who knows anything about it is quite aware that these conditions are sure to breed trouble, and the position both of the district and subordinate engineers became an exceedingly difficult one. That was the position of Major Hodgins. The progress of Mr. McArthur and his sub-contractors was very unsatisfactory. Major Hodgins seems to have found serious fault with him, but he rather sympathized with the difficulties Mr. McArthur was in. It was very difficult to get labour, the prices were known to be low, and it was supposed that some of the sub-contractors were losing money.

In December, 1906, and again a few months later, Major Hodgins had formally notified the contractor that he must increase his force, and had forwarded this notice to

the chief who had also given similar notice. In May or June, 1907, the chief engineer met Major Hodgins in Winnipeg. The commissioners were there, all of them, and it is curious to see how soon these commissioners began to meddle with the engineers. I shall not take the time to read these letters. The evidence shows the conversations with the commissioners, and the hints received by Major Hodgins that he should try and relieve matters, and the difficulties he had generally, so that he finally said to one of the commissioners, 'You don't understand the matter; you had better let the engineers alone.' I mention that as indicating that there was an interference by the commissioners that was certainly likely to lead to insubordination. Anybody who knows anything about these matters must see that it was a most improper thing for these commissioners to meddle between the contractors and engineers. It should have been left for the chief engineer. Nobody would expect to see the board of directors of the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Grand Trunk going out and interviewing contractors, engineers and subordinate engineers, consulting with or directing them apart from or otherwise than through the chief engineer.

Then, in June, Mr. Gordon Grant was sent up to Major Hodgins' district, as it was said, to report. Apparently, he was sent as an inspecting engineer over the whole district 'F,' but it was not intended that he should do more than inspect and report to headquarters. In fact, at page 116, Major Hodgins is asked:

Q. Did Mr. Lumsden tell you what instructions he had given to Mr. Grant?—A. I asked him whether we were to take instructions from Mr. Grant and he said no. Mr. Grant had been appointed against his wish and he would see that he did not give any instructions to the engineers.

Now, it has been said that there was a feeling of hostility on the part of Major Hodgins towards Mr. Grant. I think that is not improbable. Major Hodgins was in charge of District 'F.' Mr. Gordon Grant, without any communication to Major Hodgins, was sent up to be inspector of the whole district in Major Hodgins' charge. And it is here in evidence that the chief engineer said that Mr. Grant had been appointed against his wish and that he was not to interfere with the engineer, but to report direct to him, the chiet. This is confirmed in a rather singular way by a letter which appears at page 93, a very significant letter, showing how, at that date at all events, the commissioners or some of them had begun to intermeddle with engineering matters, going behind the back of the chief. This letter is from Mr. C. A. Young, one of the commissioners:

Mr. BARKER.

Commissioners of Transcontinental Railway.
Ottawa, Ont., June 4, 1907.

(Personal.)

A. E. Hodgins, Esq.,
District Engineer,
Kenora, Ont.

My Dear Major,—I am in receipt of yours of the 1st instant, and note fully the bundle of reports that Mann——

Mr. Mann was inspecting engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific. Or, at that time, he may have been with the commissioners, but afterwards with the Grand Trunk.

—has brought up concerning the appointment of an inspector. The position of inspector was one that I had been working on for a long time.

Here is the commissioner writing to a district engineer a personal letter behind the back of the chief, telling him that this position of inspector for District 'F' was one that he, the commissioner had been working on for a long time.

I realize that, both at the head office and the district offices, there was so much office work to be done when construction was going on that it made it impossible for the engineer and staff we had to devote the time that they should devote to going over the work.

One would have thought that this was a matter for the chief engineer to consider, at all events that Mr. Young, instead of working on it for a long time, would have advised the chief and allowed the chief to make his own selection. But the commissioner worked on it, and the chief said that Mr. Grant was chosen against his will.

Finally we decided to appoint a man whose duty it would be to remain on the work constantly and not have any office work whatever. I may tell you privately that in the selection of a man for this work, it was considered by some of the board——

Not the chief engineer.

—that we should have a high class and a high priced man, and Mr. Barclay (who no doubt you know) was offered the position, but he did not consider the remuneration sufficient, and declined. It was never offered to any of our district engineers, for the reason we did not wish to disturb them in their present positions; and in looking around, Mr. Grant—who was represented as a very good man—was suggested; I think the suggestion came, in the first place, from Doucet, and Grant was appointed.

There is the connection of Mr. Grant with District 'B' in Quebec. Mr. Doucet, who was in charge of District 'B' in Quebec, recommends Mr. Grant, who was to go up as inspector of District 'F.' Mr. Young goes on:

The appointment of this man cannot possibly be considered a reflection on our dis-

trict engineers. The position was not offered to Doucet, Hoare or any one else, outside of Barclay. It is certainly promotion for Grant,——

Mr. Grant was junior to Major Hodgins and was practically put over his head.

—and might have the appearance of his being promoted over your head, from a minor position, but, as stated, did not wish to disturb the district engineers in their positions, and we preferred taking a man, if at all suitable, already in our employ rather than bring in an outsider.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. Was any evidence given to show the status of Mr. Grant as compared with Major Hodgins?

Mr. BARKER. I think it was said that he was a junior engineer to Major Hodgins. That seems to be clear from the letter.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. I do not ask the question with reference to his standing before, but after his appointment.

Mr. BARKER. You will see what comes presently within that month of June:

The question of his being a western or an eastern man of course cuts no figure; as a matter of fact, Grant was brought from British Columbia to take the position in Quebec in the first place. As for any complaints regarding classification——

There has been some discussion about classification.

—we have not heard them, and do not think there is anything in the report. I expect to see you when I go west, and will discuss the matter more fully with you. In the meantime, keep your shirt on. Would it not be well that both yourself and inspector go over the work with Mann.

Now, I submit to the business men of this House that here was a highly improper letter for a commissioner to take upon himself to write to a subordinate of the chief engineer. I have already mentioned the meeting of the commissioners with Mr. Hodgins at Winnipeg. All the commissioners were there. I may say that Mr. Young, the commissioner who wrote this letter, is a Winnipeg man, and McArthur, the contractor, lives at Winnipeg also. Mr. Young spoke to Mr. Hodgins about the trouble with McArthur, that something ought to be done, that McArthur complained he was not getting enough classification. Mr. Young referred to the prices in Quebec which he said, were lowest there, yet the contractors all seemed to be satisfied. There was a row on in District 'F' and no trouble in Quebec. And Mr. Young said: Why do you not do as Quebec does? There again you see meddling, which was most improper. Mr. Hodgins replied: That was an engineering matter, and that he (Mr. Young) had better leave the engineering question alone. Mr. Young said Mr. Hodgins had better go to Quebec and get an object lesson. Well, following that, Mr. Hodgins, as has been stated here today, was taken to Quebec to section 'B,' and the commissioners, the chief and a batch of engineers went along. Now, I say again as to this visit to section 'B,' in the province of Quebec, to give an object lesson, that I think these commissioners would have been doing better service to the country if they had attended to their own particular duties and allowed the chief to take his subordinates to visit these works if he thought it necessary, to show them how things were managed in Quebec. Why should five commissioners travel all the way from Winnipeg to Quebec upon such business as that? What could they do? The chief was there; had they any right to interfere with the chief? Apparently they could, but not openly, and the only supposition I can draw from it is that they went there in order to see that what they wanted done should be done. Now, I have already referred to the possible mistake at La Tuque. I will not go into that any further. It is quite true, as has been said here, that a witness called by the commissioners said that what he alleged to be the material referred to by Mr. Hodgins in section 'B' had been originally classified as 29 per cent, and I think it is quite possible there was an error. But I have not the slightest doubt that Mr. Hodgins did not wilfully misstate anything. Anybody acquainted with Mr. Hodgins knows that he would not do such a thing. The whole of his testimony before the committee showed that he was always trying to keep within the mark and avoid exaggeration. I repeat that Mr. Woods, the assistant engineer of the Grand Trunk, more than confirms, in his letters written to the Commission, all that Mr. Hodgins has said as to over-classification.

Now note this: Hodgins says that the chief engineer being present on section 'B,' in Quebec, during that 'schooling,' held aloof and took no part.

The chief, who was the man who ought to have been taking an active part, held aloof and took no part. What does that mean? Evidently he objected to this intermeddling of the commissioners between him and his staff. Mr. Hodgins went over to speak to him, the chief turned away. He received no help, no guidance, no instructions from the chief. So, he says, having looked at what was going on he made up his mind that he would stand by what his own experience and judgment taught him, and he would not follow what he saw in Quebec.

It was immediately after that trip to Quebec that Grant was sent up, by the commissioners in fact, though nominally by the chief, as inspector of District 'F,' and within a month,—although Mr. Young wrote that let-

ter in which he represented that Grant would have nothing to do with the engineers along the line, and would have to report only to the chief as to his inspection —within a month, on the 26th of June, I think it was, Grant wrote a most drastic condemnation of everything that Hodgins was doing, condemned him all along the line, everything was wrong, he was neglecting the work, not getting it ready for the contractors, doing nothing that he ought to have done. The report is one of the most severe that a man could write and I would ask the House: Is it possible to conceive that Grant, a junior to Mr. Hodgins, being sent up, as he was supposed to be sent up, merely as a travelling inspector, not to interfere with Mr. Hodgins or his staff—can we conceive that he would have written such a report as that unless he had been told to do it? There can be no doubt that he was told by the commissioner to write a report on Mr. Hodgins and Grant knew what was wanted.

But matters got worse with the contractors. McArthur, so far as one can make out, was probably not a very good contractor, not a man of experience, he was not pushing the work as it ought to be pushed, his sub-contractors were in trouble, they were complaining they were not getting sufficient classification, and everything was going wrong. Major Hodgins was found fault with, and everybody was in trouble. Some of the sub-contractors were threatening to throw up the job. That would have been very serious at the time. Whether they meant to throw it up or not, they were talking that way and Major Hodgins could not fail to see the danger and what a disaster it would be to everybody concerned if Mr. McArthur or any of these men did throw up the job. So the chief engineer having gone up to Kenora to look over the line, Major Hodgins had an interview with him and got his own subordinate engineers about him. He pointed out to the chief what the difficulty was, that the contractors were dissatisfied, that they said they were losing money on the ordinary excavation and that something would have to be done to relieve the situation. Mr. Hodgins reminded the chief that on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and some other railways that he mentioned, a force account had been allowed in a similar situation, and he suggested to the chief that they might allow 'force account' to Mr. McArthur and his sub-contractors. That meant that they would keep a particular account of the force employed, an actual account of the cost of the ordinary excavation and of the loose rock and allow, instead of the contract figures, that cost, plus 10 per cent profit. That was not to include solid rock. It was to be confined to what was called mixed material and he suggested it only as a means of relieving the sitaution and avoiding a stoppage of the work. Mr. Lumsden immediately said he had no authority, that he could not do it. In the presence of the sub-engineers Major Hodgins urged that something of that kind ought to be done at once, but Mr. Lumsden declined to take the responsibility. Major Hodgins then said to him: You go back to Ottawa and you can within five days stop me; in the meantime I can make preparations; you can stop me within five days and no harm will be done. If the commissioners say that it is all right you will have saved a great risk and the contractors will push on with their work. Mr. Lumsden went away then, telling Major Hodgins again that he would take no responsibility. But he was acting upon Major Hodgins' recommendation, for he went back immediately to Ottawa and laid that proposition before the commissioners. The commissioners declined it. They then wrote that most remarkable letter, that the hon. member for Carleton, N.B., thinks is one of the finest pieces of business he ever got his eyes upon, in which they condemned Major Hodgins for making this most awful suggestion of allowing force account in connection with the common excavation and loose rock in order to prevent a disaster. All Major Hodgins had said was submit the matter to the commissioners and if they do not approve stop me; you can do that by wire within five days. This most marvellous letter, which evoked the admiration of the hon. member for Carleton, N.B., condemned Major Hodgins for that and the man, insofar as the commission was concerned, was practically dismissed for making that proposal.

Mr. LENNOX. Or something else.

Mr. BARKER. Including something else. The man did not propose to do it without authority, but feeling that it was a case of emergency, he asked his chief to go to Ottawa, saying to him: You can stop me in five days and no harm will be done. Yet, because he dared to make such a suggestion he was condemned. The commissioners who wrote that latter which received the admiration of the hon. member for Carleton, N.B., wrote it with an object. He was not writing to educate or reprimand the engineer. He was putting himself on record for such a gentleman as the hon. member for Carleton, N.B.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. Would the hon. member tell me if, as a member of the committee, he called Mr. Lumsden to have his statement in reference to this matter?

Mr. BARKER. No, Mr. Lumsden was never called. We were stopped from doing anything of the kind. The whole thing was wound up with Major Hodgins in the witness box. We would have heard Mr. Lumsden and all these other engineers but

this thing was all choked off by the majority of the committee. At page 153 will be found the letter of Major Hodgins to his chief, dated the 4th September, 1907, in which Major Hodgins gives fully to the chief the grounds on which he had made this suggestion in regard to a force account and in that letter he puts it practically as I have said—a little more at length, but he gives his reasons for, explains everything fully and confirms parts of his story by memoranda from the sub-engineers. If the chief engineer had thought there was anything improper in the suggestion of his district engineer why did he not tell him so promptly? Why did he not say: You must not do that; I forbid it. Surely, if he thought there was anything wrong, that would have been the manly course and the one he should have pursued. But, he showed clearly that while he did not wish to take the responsibility, while he was willing to leave the responsibility upon poor Major Hodgins, he so far felt that it was the right thing to do that he went back to Ottawa, all the way from Kenora, to lay the suggestion before the commissioners. I do not think we could have any better justification of the good faith and common sense of Major Hodgins than that.

Now, I think the House will see that Major Hodgins was in a pretty bad corner just about August, 1907. His fate was practically decided. The sending of Grant up as inspector, the condemnation for daring to suggest force account, the bringing Major Hodgins down to Quebec to see how work was classified there, his refusal to change his own opinion—all this condemned the man, and it was not long before he found it out.

I now propose to take up the question of the over-classification that occurred on Major Hodgins' division. That over-classification occurred, while Major Hodgins was on the work, only in the case of a man named McIntosh who had been in charge of the residency from the beginning and this man had, so far as Hodgins knew, always classified properly and in strict accordance with the judgment of Hodgins himself. Grant went over the district and made his report on the 26th of June, and on the 27th of July, 1907, McIntosh writes to Hodgins:

Dear Sir,—Inclosed herewith please find estimates for the month of July. I have made some changes in the classification——

He makes no pretense that he had asked the consent of his chief or anybody else unless it may be Grant:

—changing certain amounts which were returned as loose rock into solid and common excavation into loose rock on residencies 25 and 26.

There is the very beginning of anything of that kind on district 'F' under Hodgins:

On residency 25 the items are shown on memorandum attached. These transfers I have deemed advisable to make at the present time as having regard to the cost of working and material they should be promptly classed as rock excavation.

Could there be anything more satisfactory to the hon. member (Mr. Carvell) than that?

Mr. CARVELL. Nothing except Major Hodgin's letter to the chief engineer endorsing it.

Mr. BARKER I will show what kind of an endorsation that was. At page 133 he gives the changes made in residency 25 and he shows there 875 yards deducted from common excavation and 4,980 yards deducted from loose rock, and both added to solid rock 5,055 cubic yards. On 6th August, Mr. Hodgins writes to the chief engineer:

Dear Sir,—I send you to-day per Dominion Express A. D. McArthur's progress estimate for month of July. —— I inclose herewith a copy of a letter from Mr. McIntosh relating to an error of 100 cubic yards of loose rock on residency 25. This item was erroneously entered in June and has been deducted in the current estimate.

A statement is attached to form 4, residency 25, showing certain amounts, which were previously returned as loose rock and common excavation, now returned as solid rock.

Mr. McIntosh writes to same:

These transfers I have deemed it advisable to make at the present time, as, having regard to the cost of working and material, they should be properly classed as rock excavation.

You will also notice on residency 26, that 33 cubic yards of dry masonry have been deducted, and a like amount has been added to item 17, paying.

Now I would ask just here whether having regard to the facts that he, Hodgins, had refused to change classification, and that Grant had been there for a month was it unreasonable for Hodgins to suspect that Grant had interfered in this. Any man in Hodgins' position would have suspected that and that would account for some of that feeling that seems to be regarded as a crime on the part of Hodgins. Mr. McIntosh made that change off his own bat unless Grant had interfered, and Hodgins sends it on to the chief engineer with an exact copy of what Mr. McIntosh said. I quote from page 135 of the evidence:

Q. Well, I understand that Mr. Lumsden went up there about August 12 or 13?—A. I saw Mr. Lumsden up there. It would be about the time he was in Winnipeg.

Q. About August 6?—A. And I spoke to him about it, and told him I had sent it to him.

Q. What discussion took place between you and him as to these July estimates?—A. I said I had noticed that there were several cases where the solid rock estimates had jumped in that month out of the usual average, and the only way I could account for it was that somebody had suggested to the men, the en-

gineers on the line, to return solid rock with more liberality than I was inclined to do.

Q. Did you mention to him to whom you referred?—A. Yes. I said to him, 'Mr. Grant has just been over the line and the solid rock estimate has jumped.'

That was not confirming Mr. McIntosh's over-classification:

Q. Did you get any instructions from him?—A. He told me to go over the work with reference to these——

Q. Now I will fix the date of that interview accurately a little later?—A. 'Mr. Lumsden,' I said, 'I do not like the look of that sudden jump and McIntosh has not given me a very satisfactory answer.'

Q. What did the chief engineer tell you to do?—A. When I told him I was going he said 'Yes, you had better go as soon as possible.'

It appears form the evidence that month after month from January to June, 1907, Mr. McIntosh had been regularly making his estimates and classifying everything precisely according to Hodgins' view of what ought to be done. But in this July estimate he went back over the different estimates all the way to January and for the five or six months rolled up that 5,055 yards of solid rock, previously certified as either common excavation or loose rock.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. Could the hon. gentleman state or does he know whether Hodgins had been in the habit of going over the line to inspect the work of his different residents?

Mr. BARKER. I think he had not been going as often as perhaps would have been prudent. He had full confidence in these men, who were experienced men, and in McIntosh among the rest. He had also a great deal of work to do. He had been locating engineer and was making changes in location and the commissioners seem to have recognized that he had too much work to do, because they took Major Hodgins away and put Mr. Poulin in his place, they left Mr. Grant there along with Mr. Poulin, so there were two men to do the work Major Hodgins had been doing.

Mr. CARVELL. Does my hon. friend mean they left Gordon Grant, the inspecting engineer, there?

Mr. BARKER. He was there for some time.

Mr. CARVELL. I have no recollection to that effect.

Mr. BARKER. He was certainly there in July.

Mr. CARVELL. But Poulin did not go there until September.

Mr. BARKER. But somebody was acting. The hon. gentleman makes a mistake in saying that Hodgins certified the September work. Hodgins said somebody had certified that estimate who did not know anything about the facts.

Mr. BARKER.

Mr. MACDONALD. I think my hon. friend is in error, he is talking about Mr. Foss who was transferred there from St. John for a week or two after Major Hodgins left, not Mr. Grant.

Mr. BARKER. At page 139 Major Hodgins reports after he had got through part of his examination of McIntosh's work at the chief's request:

Private and confidential.

Kenora, Ontario, September 9, 1907.

H. D. Lumsden, Esq.,
Chief Engineer, Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—In looking over Mr. McIntosh's estimate I notice that his monthly return for common excavation amounted to very little over 385 cubic yards for July estimate, the estimate immediately following Mr. Grant's inspection, and then jumped to 14,005 cubic yards during August.

Common excavation, McIntosh's division, to end—

	Cubic yards.
January	5,287
February	5,742
March	6,672
April	9,326
May	13,334
June	25,276
July	25,661
August	39,666

He gives there all the common excavation on McIntosh's division, and shows how it progressed. There was an increase in April of 2,654 yards of common excavation above the quantity from January to end of March, in May there was a further quantity of 4,008 cubic yards and in June a further 11,542. Of course at that season the work was progressing, but in July, that is the estimate after Grant's first month on the line, the common excavation went down to 385 yards. The next month, August, it went up to 14,005 yards. It was in that July estimate that the common excavation and loose rock were turned into solid rock. Major Hodgins' letter goes on:

The amount of common excavation returned in July as solid rock, it having previously been returned as common excavation, and which I altered on the August estimate, is only 875, so that it does not account for the large falling off of common excavation in July.

I went over Mr. McIntosh's division just before the August estimate was put in, and I told Mr. McIntosh I would not allow some of his classification. I did not go closely into discussion in each cut, as resident engineers were busy on their estimates. I told Mr. McIntosh his classification was high generally.

I am now going up to go over the 13 cuttings where common excavation and loose rock were transferred to solid (5,055 yards) in July, and am taking Mr. Heaman to go over the whole division with Mr. McIntosh and report. I canot understand why 12,942 cubic yards common excavation were moved in month of June 385 cubic yards common excavation were moved

in month of July, and 14,005 cubic yards common excavation were moved in month of August.

I may not be able to prove it, but I am inclined to believe that McIntosh was influenced by Grant's ideas of classification, which in my opinion are extravagant.

Previous to July estimate, Mr. McIntosh's classification was not alarmingly high. I will report to you later.

That letter was written and sent to Ottawa September 9, calling clear attention to the facts and mentioning his suspicion that Grant had influenced McIntosh's mind. Three days afterwards, on September 12, 1908, the following personal and confidential letter was written by the chief from Ottawa :

Personal and confidential.

The Commissioners, Transcontinental Railway.

Ottawa, September 12, 1907.

My Dear Hodgins,—Owing to the state of feeling in regard to the work under your charge I have come to the conclusion that it will be necessary for me to recommend that a change be made and some one else put in charge, but before doing so I am dropping you these few lines, and would suggest to you that you at once make application for a month's leave of absence, so as to give you time to look round.

Please wire me in cipher on receipt of this if you concur in my suggestion.

That was the response he received to that letter of the 9th calling attention to those changes in classification by McIntosh and intimating that they were due to Mr. Grant.

Now as to confining the inquiry to Major Hodgin's evidence. I have already said that Major Hodgins could not of his own knowledge have known anything about any over classification, except that between July and his dismissal. No doubt over-classification continued, and no doubt at all such over-classification was charged in the letter, but all that Major Hodgins could possibly give evidence about was as to the two estimates of July and August and would it not be absurd for this committee to examine Major Hodgins about those two months and then to refuse examination of the Grand Trunk Pacific officials? He could not prove what occurred after he was dismissed and yet, according to the contention of the majority of the committee, Major Hodgins was bound to prove, out of his own mouth, all the charges he made or if he could not prove them they must be dropped. I do not see how there could be a more absurd conclusion than that and yet it is the only conclusion from the contention of these gentlemen, repeated over and over again, in the committee, that Major Hodgins should not have made a charge unless he could prove it. That was told him to his face over and over again and by no one more frequently than by the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell); before you made the charge you should have known that you could prove it. All Hodgins could know about were those two cases concerning McIntosh and he reported these instantly to his chief. He had no doubt, I have no doubt, that these over-classifications continued and no doubt the charges covered the subsequent cases. Major Hodgins could only prove later cases by calling the Grand Trunk Pacific engineers or some of the staff of the commisson. Yet the contention of the majority of the committee was that unless he could make the proof himself, none should be allowed. Precisely the same with regard to section 'B.' Hodgins could not prove out of his own mouth the charges of over-classification there. All he could do was to say: I have no doubt from what I saw when I was taken to Quebec, but if it is to be proved before this committee, I must ask you to call the engineers of the Grand Trunk Pacific and, as I said in my letter, you must get from them their reports. However the majority of the committee ruled otherwise. We were not allowed to call in the Grand Trunk Pacific engineers and go into their reports, in spite of the fact that when the committee ordered the Transcontinental Commission to produce all the paprs relating to the subject-matter of inquiry, they themselves produced letters they had received from the Grand Trunk Pacific complaining of over-classification in section 'B.' Although these letters were there before us we were not allowed to call witnesses to prove anything in respect of them. Was that common sense ? Was that carrying out the order of the House to investigate? We had positive charges in the reports of the assistant engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific of over-classification outrageously larger than anything Major Hodgins knew of his own knowledge, yet we were not allowed to call the engineers to prove them.

With all this evidence, with all the letters read here to-day showing charges of over-classification, showing that Mr. Lumsden himself wrote to the commission that he would pass no more of these certificates, that he would not sign another certificate for payment unless the commission got a classification agreed to by both parties—in the face of all these letters, we were not allowed to go on because Major Hodgins did not think that the committee was as good a tribunal to inquire into this evidence as a board of arbitration. Therefore, the majority of the committee decided not to obey the order of the House, not to go on and complete the investigation. That is what the majority of the committee thought was their duty. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) asked why should we inquire into a thing that may be settled by arbitration ? But are we to allow this thing to go on as long as it suits the officials of the Grand Trunk Pacific and the com-

missioners? Are we to let the public money be wasted and trust to an arbitration setting it right by and by? I wonder would my hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell) do that in his own affairs. Suppose some one were acting for him, would he go on paying until there was a settlement by arbitration when he had reason to believe he was paying improper charges?

Mr. CARVELL. I would do exactly what is provided by the agreement of the 10th January. I would call on this arbitration and have it settled within reasonable time.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman knows that on the 7th October, 1907, Mr. Wood, of the Grand Trunk Pacific, wrote to the commissioners and to Mr. Lumsden finding fault with these classifications and requesting Mr. Lumsden to go over the line with him and see if they could not agree on a proper method. On the 28th April, the very day this special committee was appointed, he was still continuing to urge Mr. Lumsden to go over the line with him.

Mr. CARVELL. And they have since gone over the line.

Mr. BARKER. I do not suppose they would have done so if the committee had not got to work. But are we to disobey the order of the House and refuse to investigate on that account? Suppose the commissioners and the Grand Trunk Pacific are content to let this thing go on a couple of years, are the people of Canada willing that we should go on paying and trust to an arbitration by and by? Are they willing to trust to a settlement by arbitration after a large amount of the money has been spent and paid to the contractors and subcontractors, and when there will be but little chance if any of getting it back again. One of the reasons why this committee was appointed was that there should be prompt inquiry, and yet no action has been taken. I do not want to charge anything improper against the Grand Trunk Pacific. No doubt they are as honourable as their neighbours, but the Grand Trunk Pacific may have other interests conflicting somewhat with their interests in this McArthur business. Suppose the Grand Trunk Pacific would like to do a little McArthur business themselves and get some over-classification on their own contracts? They might be well content to set off the over-classification in the McArthur contract against a larger amount of over-classification in their own case. I find in the last report of the Transcontinental Railway Commission that the Grand Trunk Pacific are contractors for 245 miles of this railway. It may suit the Grand Trunk Pacific to get a little over-classification themselves, and I can quite understand if they got many thousands of yards of 30 cent work paid for at $1.70 they could stand a good deal of over-classification being paid by the country.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. The Grand Trunk Pacific are only the nominal contractors.

Mr. BARKER. In the commissioners' report the Grand Trunk Pacific have got that contract.

Mr. CARVELL. Does the hon. gentleman not know that all this work is sublet?

Mr. BARKER. I do not care whether it is sublet or not. Here are three distinct contracts reported in the last report of the commissioners, namely, 150 miles about 8 miles west of the Abitibi river, crossing easterly a distance of 150 miles, let to the Grand Trunk Pacific of Montreal; district 'B', from a point designated on the plan of the commissioners, about 150 miles west of Quebec, proceeding westerly a distance of about 45 miles, let to the Grand Trunk Pacific of Montreal; district 'A', from a point designated on the plans of the commissioners, at or near Moncton, N.B., westerly for a distance of 50 miles, let to the Grand Trunk Pacific. Here you have this company on both sides of the question. In the one case it may be willing to pay a little interest in the way of rent on what McArthur could get too much, and so on the other hand it would get a big increase directly into its own pockets. As I said before, I do not want to charge that company with any impropriety; I do not say they would do that sort of thing. But it is not business-like to overlook these things in matters of such importance. That company has its contracts for 245 miles of railway, just as Mr. McArthur, Mr. Davis and other gentlemen have, and if they were to consent to a generous, liberal classification to Mr. McArthur and Mr. Davis, of course, they would get a generous, liberal classfication for the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) will allow me to make a statement, so far as that is concerned, the Grand Trunk Pacific have not got the contract to-day, nor have they kept them in their hands, any of them at any time in the same way that McArthur, Davis and the other contractors have. They have simply sold them out.

Mr. LENNOX. We have these cloaks all the way through with regard to the Grand Trunk Pacific; we never know where we are at.

Mr. BARKER. I say it is not business-like for this country to have disputes unsettled for over a year with these people on the McArthur and Davis contracts.

Now, after what I have said, perhaps I should remind the House of some of the remarks made by an engineer who has already been quoted here. Let me refer to

the letter of October 7, 1907, from the assistant chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific to Mr. Lumsden, p. 393, regarding District 'B.'

He here makes complaints that were hanging over and unsettled when this committee was appointed :

'At the request of District Engineer Armstrong——'

That is the gentleman whose affidavit was read. He did not come before the committee—the committee would not call him. But the member for Carleton, N.B., used his affidavit.

'—he was furnished recently with a statement of classification for the heavier work on the above section, which were, when given in detail, so different from his expectations that he requested the writer to visit the work.'

That is hardly consistent with the affidavit of this gentleman, Armstrong.

'During the past week we passed over portions of the work from the Batiscan river west for fifteen or twenty miles, and later from 115 to 132.'

This seems to be the very place Armstrong was talking about in that affidavit.

'With reference to the former portion, the classification was given in distances of from three to five miles, and as we did not have total quantities of graduation, could not judge with reference to any particular cutting, although percentages for entire distance seemed excessively heavy in both loose and solid rock.

With the latter portion we had detailed percentage for each cut, and were greatly surprised at the allowances made for solid and loose rock. In nearly every case where the cuttings were not entirely all ledge the estimate given for solid rock is double, or more than double, what it should be. In fact, the specifications had been entirely ignored and an excessive allowance made, not by reason of an error in judgment, but, as I understand, by special instructions from the assistant district engineer.

Let me give you some illustrations:

Take the cutting from stations 5818 to 5826, estimated 71 per cent solid rock and 29 per cent loose rock, slopes taken out 1½ to 1.'

That was explained to-day, and I do not need to go into it.

'Very little ledge in this cut. Some large boulders, but a very large percentage is common excavation.

Station 5842 to 5860.—Classified 94 per cent solid rock, 6 per cent loose rock. Slopes taken out 1½ to 1. Solid rock over-classified at least 100 per cent.'

That is, instead of being ninety-four it should have been forty-seven.

These were before the committee, and the committee did not think it was necessary to investigate. Now, I call particular attention to this next case. It will be remembered that it is from Mr. Armstrong from whom came the wonderful affidavit.

'Station 5882 to 5901.—Estimated 78 per cent solid rock, 22 per cent loose rock. A large amount of this cut wasted with slip scrapers, and ploughing being done with two horses. There are hundreds of yards of earth here without a stone, large or small.'

'Station 6030 to 6046—Estimated 40 per cent solid rock, 10 per cent loose rock. This is the large sand cut west of O'Brien's camp. Of the 95,000 yards moved to August 31 in this cut, at least 80,000 yards were pure sand.'

I give these to show what value can be placed on an affidavit from Mr. Armstrong who joined in making this examination. Has not he been dismissed from the Grand Trunk Pacific?

Mr. CARVELL. No, he has not.

Mr. BARKER. I do not think he is there now. Now, it was said that Mr. Lumsden was supposed to have approved of these estimates. On Octobe 18, he writes : p. 395.

Sirs,—Referring to the September estimates in district 'B,' which I now beg to hand you, I may say that from the complaint made by the assistant chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway in a letter to me of the 7th instant, and from a verbal statement made to me on the 12th instant, by Mr. Doucet——

The engineer in charge of district 'B.'

—it would appear to me some material may be classified as rock which should be classified otherwise, still as the amount of security held by you for the completion of the work seems to me ample, and the holding back of the estimate at this date without notice to the contractors might be a serious matter, I have approved of these estimates, on the distinct understanding that before any further estimates are passed time be given and full investigation made into the matter of classification throughout district 'B.'

I do not wish at this late hour to quote further from letters appearing in the evidence, but let me refer to that wonderful agreement of January 10, 1908. I deny that the document read by the hon. member for Carleton, N.B., is a reference to arbitration.

Memo. of agreement to be drawn up between the commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific Company.

Monthly estimates for contractors should be submitted promptly from time to time by the chief engineer of the commissioners to the company's assistant chief engineer at Montreal for approval. If he has any objection to such estimate he shall promptly file the same with the chief engineer of the commissioners, and any objection from time to time filed shall thereupon be considered, and, if possible determined by the said engineers and in case of their failure to agree, may then or at any time before or at the time of final payment at the option of either party be considered and determined by arbitration as provided in the agreement of July 29, 1903, but in no case shall the payment of monthly estimates be delayed except with the consent of the commissioners

In case the chief engineer of the commissioners and the assistant chief engineer of the company disagree as to the final payment, the same shall be withheld until the matter is determined by arbitration.

The paper is initialled 'C.M.H.' 'H.D.L.' 'S.N.P.'

It is absolutely clear that the whole purport of that agreement is to keep these disputes in suspense, open, that neither party shall be prejudiced by inaction. Accounts are to be passed through or paid, but either party can from time to time call them up again for consideration. That is the agreement, not to arbitrate, but to postpone an investigation, and that agreement was entered into while this House was in session. I leave the House to infer what was the object of that. I will make one more remark. On April 6, 1908. I put this question in the House,

1. Are there any matters in dispute or question between the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the government, or the National Transcontinental Railway Commission, respecting the route or the right of way or the works of construction, or cost thereof, upon the eastern division of the National Transcontinental Railway?

2. What is the nature of such disputes or questions, if any?

3. Has the consideration or settlement of any such disputes or questions been postponed or suspended? If so, at whose request, and until what time or event?

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

There is no matter in dispute or question between the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and the National Transcontinental Railway Company respecting the route, or the right-of-way, or the works of construction, or the cost thereof, upon the eastern division of the National Transcontinental Railway.

Now, that agreement of January was in existence when that answer was given, all this correspondence had been going on since October 7, about these disputes, and what is the answer by the government, formally given to a formal question? It was that there were no such disputes, no such agreement, no question between the commissioners and the Grand Trunk Pacific. That is an astounding reply. There are only two ways of looking at it: Either the government knew the facts, and misled the House by an untruthful reply; or they were deceived by the commissioners; I do not care which way they put it. I was not satisfied with that reply, and I put this further question on April 13:

1. Has either the government or the National Transcontinental Railway Commission received from the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company or the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, or from any person on behalf of either such company, any protests or objections respecting the acquisition of lands for the eastern division of the National Transcontinental Railway, or as to the cost thereof, or respecting any works of construction upon the said division, or as to the cost thereof?

2. What was the nature of such protests or objections, if any?

3. Have all such protests or objections, if any, been finally disposed of and settled?

4. If not disposed of and settled, has any and what arrangement been made to postpone or suspend the matters involved?

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). As to the first part of the question, no; or as to the cost thereof, no. As to the third part of the question no dispute has arisen as to any work of construction. Mr. H. A. Woods, assistant chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, by a letter dated October 7, 1907, objected to the classification, as to grading material on certain portions of the work in district 'B.' The matter was investigated by the chief engineer of the commissioners, who gave his ruling as to the interpretation of the clauses of the specifications relating to the classification; and Mr. Woods' objections were found not to be correct. Nothing further has been heard by the commissioners of such objections.

And yet from October 7, 1908, down to the day this committee was appointed, 28th April, 1908, there were continuous letters from Mr. Woods repeating these objections. What are we to think of answers of that kind in the House about the most inportant matters that can be brought before parliament? I say that either the government knew the facts, in which that answer was false, or the commissioners deceived the government, I do not care which way you take it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are many important matters dealt with in this evidence. But I think I have shown that there were many very important matters properly before that committee, which required that the engineers of the Grand Trunk Pacific be called to prove them. But the majority of the committee prematurely closed the inquiry, and dismissed nine witnesses that had been called but not examined. I beg to second the amendment.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Lennox).

YEAS:

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Lancaster,
Armstrong,	Lennox,
Avery,	Lewis,
Barker,	MacLaren,
Barr,	McCarthy (Calgary),
Beattie,	McLean (Queens, P.E.I.),
Bennett,	Martin (Queens, P.E.I.),
Bergeron,	Morin,
Blain,	Northrup,
Borden (Carleton),	Owen,
Boyce,	Paquet,
Brabazon,	Perley,
Bristol,	Porter,
Broder,	Pringle,
Chisholm (Huron),	
Christie,	

Clare,
Cockshutt,
Crocket,
Daniel,
Elson,
Ganong,
Henderson,
Herron,
Hughes (Victoria),
Jackson (Elgin),
Kemp,
Lake,
Reid (Grenville),
Schaffner,
Stanfield,
Staples,
Taylor,
Walsh (Huntingdon),
Ward,
White,
Wilson (Lennox & Addington),
Worthington,
Wright (Muskoka)—53.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Aylesworth,
Beland,
Borden (Sir Frederick),
Bourbonnais,
Brodeur,
Brown,
Caldwell,
Calvert,
Carney,
Caron,
Carvell,
Cash,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Conmee,
Copp,
Crawford,
Cyr,
Delisle,
Demers,
Dubeau,
Dugas,
Emmerson,
Fielding,
Finlay,
Finlayson,
Fortier,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,
German,
Girard,
Gordon,
Graham,
Harty,
Hughes (Kings, P.E.I.),
Hunt,
Jackson (Selkirk),
Johnston,
Kennedy,
Lachance,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),
Lanctot (Richelieu),
Lapointe,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Lavergne,
Loggie,
Lovell,
Macdonald,
Maclean (Lunenburg),
Maclean (York, S.),
Macpherson,
McCarthy (Simcoe),
McColl,
McCool,
McCraney,
McIntyre (Perth),
McKenzie,
McLean (York, C.),
McLennan,
Marcile (Bagot),
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Martin (Montreal, St. Mary's),
Martin (Wellington),
Mayrand,
Meigs,
Miller,
Oliver,
Pardee,
Parmelee,
Paterson,
Parent,
Pickup,
Power,
Proulx,
Pugsley,
Ratz,
Reid (Restigouche),
Rivet,
Roche (Halifax),
Ross (Cape Breton),
Rousseau,
Savoie,
Schell (Glengarry),
Schell (Oxford),
Sinclair,
Smith (Nanaimo),
Smith (Oxford),
Stewart,
Talbot,
Telford,
Templeman,
Tolmie,
Turgeon,
Verville,
Walsh (Montreal, St. Anne),
Watson,
Wilson (Russell),
Wright (Renfrew),
Zimmerman.—98.

PAIRS:

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Logan,	Lefurgey,
Boyer,	Monk,
Turriff,	Roche (Marquette),
LeBlanc,	Foster,
Clarke,	Sproule,
Bickerdike,	Wilmot,
Sifton,	Haggart,
Greenway,	Tisdale,
Fisher,	Maclean (York, S.),
Guthrie,	Seagram,
Tobin,	Osler,
Ross (Yale-Cariboo),	Fowler,
Grant,	Leonard,
Galliher,	Smith (Wentworth),
Sloan,	Marshall,
Hall,	Lalor,
Black,	Clements,
Ethier,	Forget,
Gervais,	Macdonell,
Devlin,	Ames,
Knowles.	Thompson.

Amendment (Mr. Lennox) negatived.

Motion (Mr. Geoffrion) agreed to.

QUESTIONS.

USE OF BLACK STAMPS ON CIGARS IN BOND.

Mr. DUBEAU asked :

1. Has the government taken steps to authorize manufacturers to make use of the black stamps on the cigars in bond since June 1 last?

2. If so, what are the conditions on which the manufacturers may take advantage of that privilege?

Hon. W. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue) :

1. Yes.

2. That the cigars are entered ex-warehouse for consumption prior to the 15th of August next.

MR. JOSEPH NIXON.

Mr. HERRON asked :

Is Mr. Jos. Nixon, formerly sub-land agent at Macleod, Alberta, employed in any capacity by the government or Transcontinental Railway Commission? If so, in what position and at what place and salary?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). Joseph Nixon is not in the employ of the Transcontinental Railway Commission. He has been employed as time-keeper, but left in June, 1907.

FISHERY INSPECTORS IN ALBERTA.

Mr. HERRON asked :

1. Who are the fishery inspectors employed by the government in the territory south of the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway to the international boundary line, in the province of Alberta?

2. What is the date of their respective appointments, their salaries and allowances?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. The special fishery guardians employed in that section of Alberta for the year ended 31st March, 1908, were :

	Wages.	Dis-bursements.
W. A. Dunlop..	$139 50	$351 75
T. G. Brown..	46 50	54 95
H. A. Donovan..	138 00	297 85

2. Such guardians are not permanently appointed, but are employed from year to year at per diem rates, for periods when their services are required.

DIRECT COMMUNICATION BETWEEN CANADA AND FRANCE.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Bergeron—asked :

1. Has a contract been entered into by the government in order to secure direct communication between Canada and France, during the present season?

2. If so, with whom has such contract been executed, and for what number of trips has provision been made?

3. What is the cost to Canada a trip?

4. What amount has been paid on account of said contract by the government?

5. Is there a provision in the contract for the contingency of non-ratification of the proposed treaty with France? If so, what are the terms of the said provision?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). 1. No. The Department of Trade and Commerce is now in correspondence with Messrs. H. & A. Allan with a view to an extension of the contract with Messrs. Allan, which expired on the 9th of February last. Of course, until the terms are decided upon no announcement can be made.

ROYALTY ON COAL MINED IN ALBERTA AND SASKATCHEWAN.

Mr. LAKE asked :

What sums have been received by the government on account of royalty on coal mined in each of the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan during each of the financial years ending June 30, 1906 and 1907?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

During the financial year ending the 30th June, 1906 :

Alberta..	$3,828 20
Saskatchewan...	175 71

During the financial year ending the 30th June, 1907 :

Alberta..	$7,597 12
Saskatchewan...	329 20

PURCHASES OF SEED OATS.

Mr. FOWLER—by Mr. Lancaster—asked:

1. Were seed oats purchased in Prince Edward Island for the western farmers under the Act for the distribution of seed grain? If so, who made the purchases on behalf of the government?

2. What prices were paid for the oats per bushel, how many bushels were purchased, and what was the total sum paid for said oats, exclusive of other expenses incurred in their purchase?

Mr. BRODEUR.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Yes. C. C. Castle, purchasing agent.

2. 65 cents per bushel, free on board at Pictou, N.S. There were 100,712 bushels purchased at a cost of $65,462.80, delivered at Pictou, N.S.

PURCHASE OF SEED OATS IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. FOWLER—by Mr. Lancaster—asked:

1. Is the government aware that the firm of Rattenbury & Company is said to have purchased seed oats for the west in Prince Edward Island, as agents of the government?

2. Is the government also aware that the said Rattenbury & Company is said to have bought these oats on credit, and have since assigned for the benefit of their creditors, leaving the oats unpaid for?

3. If this statement is true, is it the intention of the government to pay for these oats?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. No. All the Island oats were purchased from J. Read & Company.

2. No.

3. Answered by Nos. 1 and 2.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of the Whole to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Canada Shipping Act, chapter 113, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, by repealing section 958 and substituting therefor,

958. The Governor in Council may from time time—

(a) by order in council declare that the foregoing provisions of this part shall not, while such order in council is in force, apply, either throughout Canada or in any specified waters of Canada, to the ships or vessels, or to any specified ascertained or ascertainable class or number of the ships or vessels of any foreign country in which British ships are admitted to the coasting trade of such country, and to carry goods or passengers from one port or place to another in such country; and

(b) revoke or vary such order in council.

2. That the Act founded on this resolution shall not come into force until His Majesty's pleasure thereon has been signified by publication in the 'Canada Gazette.'

He said: His Excellency having been informed of the subject matter of this resolution recommends it to the favourable consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

SALARIES OF JUDGES.

Mr. AYLESWORTH moved that the House go into Committee of the Whole to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that in the opinion of this House it is expedient to provide for the payment to one additional county court judge in the province of Manitoba, and two additional district court judges in the province of Ontario, each $2,500 per annum during the first three years of service, and after three years of service each $3,000 per annum.

He said: I beg to state, that the subject matter of this resolution having been communicated to His Excellency the Governor General, he approves the same and commends it to the consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 198) respecting a certain patent of William B. Smith.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 130) to amend the Naturalization Act.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

POST OFFICE ACT—AMENDMENT.

Consideration of amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 162) to amend the Post Office Act.

Mr. BERGERON. What are the amendments ?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). Briefly, the radius enjoyed by the weekly press for free circulation is extended from 40 miles to 60 miles. Some years ago, Sir William Mulock established for the daily press a zone of 300 miles from the place of publication within which zone the rate was a quarter cent per pound and outside of that zone the rate was half a cent a pound. In future we will have one flat rate on newspapers of one quarter of a cent per pound without respect to distance.

Amendments read a second time and concurred in.

BOARDS OF TRADE ACT—AMENDMENT.

House in committee on Bill (No. 133) to amend the Boards of Trade Act.—Mr. Fielding.

Mr. FIELDING. When this Bill was last before the committee attention was called to the fact that it seemed to prevent a man being a member of two boards of trade. Acting on the suggestion made then I am proposing to make the changes that would be necessary to permit a man to be a member of the board of trade in the district in which he resides, and also a member of the board of trade in the district in which he is doing business, if there is such a board of trade, and if he chooses to be a member.

Amendment agreed to, Bill reported the third time and passed.

DOMINION LANDS ACT—AMENDMENT

House resumed adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Oliver for the third reading of Bill (No. 181) to consolidate and amend the Acts respecting the public lands in the Dominion and the proposed amendment of Mr. Lake thereto.

Mr. SPEAKER. Since Saturday I have considered whether the amendment then moved by the member for Qu'Appelle to the motion for the third reading of Bill (No. 181), is in order or not. The said amendment plainly contemplates the setting aside, appropriation and transferring to the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan of certain of the Dominion lands.

In the last edition of Mr. Bourinot's work on Parliamentary Procedure at page 628, in a foot note, it is stated that since 1874 all grants of public lands are initiated in the Commons. This is upon the theory that public lands are in the same position as public revenues. (See page 627).

At page 568 of the same work it is expressly stated that :

> No cases can be found of any private member in the Canadian Commons receiving the authority of the Crown through a minister to propose a motion involving the expenditure of public money. No principle is better understood than the constitutional application that rests upon the executive government of alone initiating measures imposing charges upon the public exchequer.

I must, therefore, rule the amendment as out of order.

In connection with the same point of order a question was raised on the Bill, which I might as well dispose of now.

A discussion also arose as to whether in view of certain clauses in the Bill a previous sanction of the Governor General should not have been obtained and announced to the House before its introduction, and such introduction preceded by a resolution.

Having regard to the precedents in the House, I find that this has not been considered necessary. In the year 1883, a similar Bill was passed, which now appears in the statutes for that year as chapter 17, intituled: 'An Act further to amend and to consolidate, as so amended, the several Acts respecting the Public Lands of the Dominion therein mentioned.' This Bill was introduced by Sir John A. Macdonald. No consent of the Governor General was announced at any stage nor was any resolution passed previously to the introduction of the Bill. This seems to be a precedent exactly in point.

This Bill is a consolidating and amending Bill and in the case of such Bills it is only when there are clauses imposing new burdens that it is necessary to consider these first in a Committee of the Whole.

The object aimed at in such Bills is to give the old law a new and more convenient form.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This Bill is not only an amending and consolidating Bill, but distinctly provides for the granting of pre-emptions and purchased homesteads not provided for by the Act as it stood before. It is in part an amending and consolidating Bill but it is in many respects an entirely new Bill and contains entirely new provisions for alineation of the public domain.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not find that it provides for the setting apart for the purposes of the Bill of any wider area of lands and I think it will be found that the Bill of 1883 to which I referred, also provided for an extra homestead in certain cases as this one appears to do. I cannot find any very substantial difference and following the rule laid down by Dr. Bourinot in his work, relating to consolidating and amending Acts, I would rule that this Bill does not require any preliminary resolution or consent.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of course it is true that the Bill does not cover a wider area of land than was provided in the enactments previously on the statute-book. The same observation is also true of the amendment of the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake). It does not propose to go outside the area of land previously dealt with by the enactments on the statute-book.

Mr. LAKE. I beg to move then, seconded by Mr. Chisholm——

Mr. SPEAKER. I have ruled, of course, that the first amendment is out of order, and now this, I assume, is a new amendment.

Mr. LAKE. I beg to move:

That the said Bill be not now read a third time but be referred back to Committee of the Whole House with instructions to amend the same by providing,

That the Governor in Council shall forthwith institute such proper inquiries as may be necessary for the purpose of ascertaining what quantity of Dominion Lands in each of the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan should be set aside and appropriated for the purposes of higher education with a view to setting aside, appropriating and transferring to the said respective provinces the said lands so ascertained for the purposes aforesaid.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that probably that amendment is in order although it comes close to the line too.

House divided upon amendment (Mr. Lake).

YEAS:

Messieurs

Alcorn,
Armstrong,
Barker,
Barr,
Beattie,
Bennett,
Bergeron,
Blain,
Borden (Carleton),
Boyce,
Brabazon,
Christie,
Cockshutt,
Crocket,
Daniel,
Ganong,
Henderson,
Herron,
Hughes (Victoria),
Kemp,
Lake,
Lancaster,
Lennox,
Lewis,
MacLaren,
McCarthy (Calgary),
McLean (Queens, P.E.I.),
Martin (Queens. P.E.I.),
Morin,
Owen,
Porter,
Reid (Grenville),
Schaffner,
Stanfield,
Staples,
Taylor,
Walsh (Huntingdon),
White,
Wilson (Lennox & Addington).—39.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Aylesworth,
Bourbonnais,
Brodeur,
Bureau,
Calvert,
Carvell,
Conmee,
Crawford,
Delisle,
Demers,
Dubeau,
Fielding,
Finlayson,
Fisher,
Fortier,
Gauvreau,
German,
Girard,
Graham,
Harty,
Jackson (Selkirk),
Johnston,
Lachance,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),
Lanctot (Richelieu),
Lapointe,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Lovell,
Macdonald,
Maclean (Lunenburg),
Macpherson,
McCarthy (Simcoe),
McCool,
McCraney,
McIntyre (Perth),
McLean (York, C.),
McLennan,
Marcile (Bagot),
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Martin (Montreal, St. Mary's),
Mayrand,
Miller,
Oliver,
Pardee,
Paterson,
Pickup,
Power,
Proulx,
Pugsley,
Reid (Restigouche),
Rivet,
Roche (Halifax),
Ross (Cape Breton),
Schell (Glengarry),
Schell (Oxford),
Sinclair,
Smith (Nanimo),
Stewart,
Talbot,
Telford,
Templeman,
Tobin,
Tolmie,
Turgeon,
Verville,
Zimmerman.—65.

PAIRS:

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Parmelee,	Worthington,
Logan,	Lefurgey,
Clarke,	Sproule,
LeBlanc,	Foster,
Turriff,	Roche (Marquette),
Boyer,	Monk,
Black,	Clements,
Emmerson,	Wilmot,
Sifton,	Haggart,
Greenway,	Tisdale,
Lavergne,	Maclean (York, S.),
Copp,	Northrup,
Beland,	Seagram,
McColl,	Osler,
Law,	Ward,
Gordon,	Fowler,
Rivet,	Elson,
Carney,	Avery,
Sloan,	Leonard,
Hall,	Broder,
Devlin,	Wright (Muskoka),

McKenzie,	Pringle,
Watson,	Clare,
Grant,	Marshall,
Guthrie,	Chisholm (Huron),
Finlay,	Lalor,
Major,	Forget,
Wilson (Russell),	Macdonell,
Lennox,	Ames,
Savoie,	Perley,
Dyment,	Bristol,
Ratz,	Jackson (Elgin),
Caron,	Paquet,
Kennedy.	Thompson.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. JOHN HERRON (Alberta). Before the Bill receives its third reading, I wish to draw attention to clause 16. That clause provides :

16. Every entrant for a homestead shall, except as hereafter otherwise provided, be required, before the issue of letters patent therefor (a) to have held the homestead for his own exclusive use and benefit for three years from the date of entry, (b) to have resided thereon at least six months in each of the three years from the date of entry, or the date of commencement of residence, (c) to have erected a habitable house theron, (d) to have cultivated such an area of land in each year upon the homestead as is satisfactory to the minister, and (e) to be a British subject.

I would draw attention to the fifth line of this clause : 'to have resided thereon at least six months in each of three years from the date of entry, or the date of commencement of residence.' I have seen a good many cases of great hardship to settlers coming from any part of the empire or even from foreign countries to the Northwest owing to this particular clause. I have always considered it a great mistake to have this clause dealt with in the arbitrary manner in which it is. The head of a family has to reside on the homestead six months of each year during three years before he can obtain his patent. But what better proof can you have of the good faith of the homesteader than in the fact that he has left a foreign country or even some portion of our own land and has gone out to the prairies and taken up a homestead there in order to provide a home for his family. It may be argued that if you allow any leniency in the regulations, he may sell the land just as soon as he obtains his patent and go back to the country from which he came. But I would draw attention to the letter of the law which provides that the head of the family must reside on the land during six months of each year for three years before he can obtain a patent. A man might leave his family and come even from a foreign country, enter for a homestead in our country, to which he was attracted by the prospects of bettering himself ; he might leave his family in a foreign country, enter for a homestead, comply with the letter of the law by living on the homestead six months in each year for three years and perform homestead duties, and then he might sell his homestead, put the money in his pocket and go back to his own country. So that there is nothing under this clause to prevent his selling out any more than there would be if this residence obligation were not required. I admit that it is necessary to impose some restrictions so as to have some evidence that a homesteader has the necessary qualifications to entitle him to a patent. But I claim that we often work out hardship by insisting that the head of the family must reside on the land the precise time of six months each year during three years. That same point has been drawn to the attention of this House before now and has been considerably discussed in the country. I would recommend a change in the regulations to this effect. If you were to provide by your regulations that either the entrant for a homestead or his family should reside continuously on the land for three years, I would see no objection to that. What I object to is that the man himself must reside on the land so that even if he left his family on it, while he himself was working elsewhere, he could not obtain his patent. What better evidence could you have of his sincerity than the fact that he has put his family on the land. He might be so situatetd that he could not comply with the condition of personally residing on it himself.

But I say that the very fact of having the head of the family live on the homestead for six months in each year has worked great hardship in many cases in our new country. There is another very important factor in this question. There is a great portion of our population which should be seriously considered in this relation—the female population of our country. If the law which I suggest were put in operation, it would encourage young men to marry and would give our young women opportunities to assist in providing homes for themselves, their husbands and their children. This is a very important subject as every intelligent person will agree. In my observation of conditions in the west for the last thirty or thirty-five years, I have known men, even from outside our own Dominion, enter for homesteads, erect homes for their families, bring their families to this country and place them on the homestead. Then, through unforeseen and unavoidable misfortune they found themselves unable to maintain their families on the homestead, and so were compelled to go to the town, perhaps a short distance, perhaps a long distance away, to get employment. Perhaps they get into debt, perhaps further into debt, as I have suggested, through circumstances beyond their own control, and so were unable to go back and live on the homestead as required by the regulations and the law

providing that they had to live on the homestead for six months of every year. The result being that his homestead was cancelled and thus Canada lost a good citizen, settler and his family. I agree that the government, in days gone by, has been lenient in many cases. Still, there was a limit to what could be done under the law. I consider there never was a more iniquitous law upon the Canadian statute-book than this clause 16 which provides that the head of the family must reside upon the homestead for six months in each year for three years before he can obtain a patent. For these reasons, I move, seconded by Mr. Staples :

That the said Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to Committee of the Whole House for the purpose of amending section 16 and other relevant sections of the said Bill by providing that the residence of the wife and family of any entrant for a homestead shall be accepted as equivalent to the residence of the entrant himself, subject to such regulations necessary or expedient for the purpose of securing actual permanent settlers.

Amendment negatived on the same division last recorded.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

JUVENILE DELINQUENTS.

Bill (No. 190) respecting Juvenile Delinquents—Mr. Aylesworth—was read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. We passed the second time, and House went into committee I presume because it comes from the Senate. Perhaps the Minister of Justice will be good enough to state the purport of the Bill and explain what its effect will be.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). The general effect of this Bill I think I may summarize by saying that it is intended to obviate the necessity for children, when accused of crime, being tried before the ordinary tribunals. The provision at the conclusion of the Bill is that the Act may be put in force in any province, or any portion of a province, by proclamation after the passing by such province of a Bill providing for the establishment of juvenile courts. And the intention is that wherever any province has established, or may hereafter establish, a special court for the trial of young persons, under the age of sixteen years, all offences against the criminal law by children under that age shall be disposed of by these juvenile courts. The case of an indictable offence committed by a young person over fourteen is excepted, but with that exception the provision of the Bill is in short, that all infractions of the criminal statutes, whether of the Dominion, of the province or municipal by-laws, shall be dealt with by this special court, instead of being tried in the ordinary way. There are many details, which are self explanatory, governing the trial. It is to be of a summary character. Notice is to be given to the parent or guardian and to the probation officer, he being an officer appointed under the provisions of the provincial statute in that behalf, or, where there is no provincial statute on the subject, he may be appointed under the provisions of this Act. Instead of the juvenile court imposing sentence of imprisonment, as of necessity under the existing criminal law, the child may be released on probation.

Under no circumstances is it to be sent to jail, but if not released on probation, or a home found for it, either in some public institution or with some private family, provision is made with regard to the disposition that the court can make of the child. The court is empowered to appoint in any community a small committee, to be called the juvenile court committee, the duty of which is to assist the court in the way of suggestion, advice, and looking after the child, who is treated, from the time when found guilty of an offence, as a ward of the court, with the idea of being reclaimed rather than punished by imprisonment. In some of the provinces there is already legislation with regard to the care of neglected or abandoned children, to which this legislation is necessarily of an ancillary character. In the province of Ontario there is elaborate statutory provision designed for the protection and reformation of neglected children, and an officer of the government, a superintendent, having charge of such matters appointed by the government, and children's aid societies established in a great number of communities. These children's aid societies have felt the necessity of legislation of this character. I want to prevent the possibility of children who might be reclaimed if treated otherwise than as criminals, being sent to the ordinary prisons of the country with the older and possibly hardened offenders.

On section 17,

Mr. LANCASTER. I am going to protest against the passing of a serious law like this in this hasty way. Here is a statute which is going to affect the character and the liberty of every little child, and I protest most seriously against the levity that is going on in this chamber.

Mr. TALBOT. The hon. member for Simcoe is the only one who made a joke about it.

Mr. LANCASTER. This levity is altogether out of place. Just because the Minister of Justice, who cannot hear a word, wants this Bill to go through it is to be laughed through as a joke. Here is an Act resepecting juvenile delinquents, a brand new law, brought in during the dying

hours of the session by the Minister of Justice, containing thirty-five sections, and after midnight we are asked to pass, but not consider it. It affects the liberty, the character and the treatment of every little child in this country. I am not going to stand for this Bill going through with this most uncalled for haste, and I think the Minister of Justice is not doing his duty in trying to rush it through in this way.

Mr. BERGERON. I was the one who asked the chairman to read the side notes instead of the clauses, because I had been looking at the Bill and I saw there was no amendment to it. I supposed it was well considered by the Senate.

Mr. LANCASTER. If the Senate passed this Bill, that is all the more reason why we should consider it carefully. Are we going to rush a law through this House simply because it has come from the Senate? I think that is a reason why it should be twice considered instead of being put through with this undue haste. My experience of legislation which has come from the Senate would lead me to the conclusion that it should be kicked out body and bones.

Mr. TALBOT. Has the hon. gentleman any amendment to propose?

Mr. LANCASTER. If the hon. gentleman will tell me what the Bill is, I will tell him what amendments I have to propose.

Mr. TALBOT. Read it.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. gentleman had better read it himself and not try to laugh the Bill through the House. I want to understand every clause of this Bill before it passes.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Then it will never be passed.

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not say that it never will pass with the majority that the government has to force it through, but, speaking for myself, it never will pass if it is going to be put through in this ill-advised, hasty and deplorable way in which it is attempted to put it through to-night. It is an outrage upon common decency and upon the respect that we should have for the little boys and girls of this country.

Mr. TALBOT. Will the hon. gentleman explain his anger about the matter?

Mr. LANCASTER. If the hon. gentleman chooses to call it anger, my anger is caused, if it is anger, by the fact that the so-called Minister of Justice brings into this House——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is he not called the Minister of Justice?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That term should not be used.

Mr. LANCASTER. If he is not called the Minister of Justice I will withdraw it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think that should be withdrawn.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. He has withdrawn it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He has not withdrawn it.

Mr. LANCASTER. I have withdrawn the word 'so-called.' This Bill may be all right, but I am not going to allow the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) to assume that this Bill is all right and to swallow it holus bolus because it is brought in by the Minister of Justice or anybody else. I am responsible to my constituents for what goes on here. This Bill is dealing with a most serious matter. I do not see one word in it, for instance, in the hurried glance which I have been able to give to it, providing for the protection of the child or as to how he is to be defended. He seems to be entirely at the mercy of a person called a probation officer. There should be some provision for the child being able to say he is not guilty if he is not guilty. Whatever the probation officer chooses to do with the child is to be done. It may be all right if we had time to consider it carefully, but what I am pleading for, and I do not care if the whole House gets angry with me for doing so——

Mr. JOHNSTON. You are the one who is angry.

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not care whether the hon. member for Cape Breton is angry or not.

Mr. JOHNSTON. He may be sorry for you but he is not angry.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. gentleman's sorrow does not amount to anything. His are crocodile tears. I am going to protest against this Bill going through without being carefully considered. We might do it in five or six hours but we cannot in five or six minutes. I think the Minister of Justice will be well advised if he moves that the committee rise and report progres and let us take it up when we have more time. Is there any provision in this Act corresponding to the amendment made by a Bill introduced by me some years ago, providing that when a child was charged with any indictable offence no election for trial could be made without the parent or guardian being notified so as to advise the child.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Section 8 provides for that.

Mr. ALCORN. Is this Bill modelled on some other law as to which there has been experience? I presume that a Bill of this kind consisting of a mass of detail is not

put upon the statute book simply as an experiment.

Mr AYLESWORTH. I can only answer in a very general way as I have not prepared the Bill myself. The whole subject is one to which those interested have given a great deal of attention and I have been favoured during the past 12 months with a mass of literature dealing with this question. It is stated by writers on the subject that Canada is almost alone among civilized nations in being without legislation of this character. That assertion is too sweeping because there is in Ontario a very elaborate statute going no doubt as far in the direction of this legislation as the provincial legislature felt itself constitutionally empowered to go. There is legislation of a more or less similar character in other provinces. I understand this measure has received very careful consideration from the Senate and has been passed with a view to filling a need, in order that the provincial legislation might have its full effect. The enactment goes into only as and when it is proclaimed in respect of some section of the country which asks for it and where there will be some general feeling of the necessity if it. It must be borne in mind that where this Act is not in force, if any one under the age of 16 years commits an offence, the only recourse under the present law is prosecution leading to fine and imprisonment. This statute will confer upon the court a much wider discretion so as to avoid going the length of imprisonment where it is a young offender.

Mr. ALCORN. Probably sections 34 and 35 will remove any objection to the Act that I am aware of.

Mr. CROCKET. Is there any discretion left to the magistrate as to whether proceedings shall be taken under this Act or under the general criminal law.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. When it is an indictable offence and if the child is over 14 then by section 7 the court may in its discretion order the child to be proceeded with in the ordinary way, but unless such an order as that is made all offences of a criminal nature by children under 16 will be tried under the provisions of this Act and not in an ordinary public court.

Mr. LANCASTER. If section 7 means that the child is deprived of the right to have a trial by jury I protest against it. That is although it is an indictable offence and the child is over fourteen years, the court may in its discretion let the case go to the criminal court with a jury, to the assizes or to the sessions. That magistrate ought not to have the discretion to say a child shall not have the right to a jury when it is over fourteen. My objection is to denying to that child the inherent right to trial by jury which we have all enjoyed since Magna Charta, and which cannot be denied to even a hardened criminal. The right to elect as to trial by jury should be vested in the person accused and not in some other person, in this case this level-headed judge.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. My hon. friend is right in the view that this Bill would prevent the advantage of trial by jury, but possibly there are countervailing advantages to the person accused which would be of even greater value. The provision is distinctly made that a child is not to be sent to a common gaol before or after sentence. That in itself is a greater privilege and protection against the danger of the child being destroyed by what is perhaps a comparatively venial offence than the privilege of trial by jury. Cases are continually arising, I have one in mind which has occasioned a great deal of anxious consideration to officials in the Justice Department and actual distress to the judge before whom the child was convicted. A child of some twelve years of age killed another while at play. The jury convicted of manslaughter and there was no other recourse to the judge than to sentence, and feeling that he was obliged to sentence he felt he could not do otherwise than sentence to a substantial term of imprisonment and that youngster is possibly having its life destroyed at the present time in a penitentiary because it was impossible to treat it otherwise than as if it had been a grown man.

Mr. LANCASTER. In such a case you could provide for a less severe penalty without depriving the child of the advantage of trial by jury.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The objection to trial by jury is the publicity; the whole idea is to avoid that. There is even a provision to prohibit the publication of offences of young people in the newspapers.

Mr. GRAHAM. This clause 7 is at the discretion, of course, of the magistrate and the enforcement of the law will depend altogether on his judgment. The Act strikes me as one which will be of great benefit. Any one who has read the record of Judge Lindsay's court at Denver cannot but be impressed with the great good he has done for boys and girls of that city, in fact he is known the world over as the children's judge. It is just on the lines of this Bill that he acts, but of course the usefulness of such Acts depends altogether on the men enforcing them. He must be a man who is trying to reclaim rather than to condemn the child. In Ontario we have Mr. Kelso the head of a department and the work of the department has resulted in the emptying of at least one institution for boys in the province, these boys have all been placed in homes and the latest reports I have is that only two have turned out badly. The

Act will accomplish as much good comparatively as Judge Lindsay has in his vicinity.

Mr. LEIGHTON McCARTHY. If the child is allowed the inherent right of trial by jury, which he undoubtedly has under the British constitution, it is put in the hands of the child to do away with the entire benefit of the Act. We are passing extraordinary legislation for the protection of the child, and to amend that as my hon. friend suggests would be to do away with the benefit of the Act.

Mr. LANCASTER. You are providing that the parents shall be notified. On being notified, if the case is a serious one, the parent will employ counsel, and the child will have the advice of both the parents and the counsel, and the decision can be safely left to them. But you are leaving the decision entirely in the hands of some one who has no direct interest in the child's welfare.

Mr. LEIGHTON McCARTHY. It is the converse of the case which the hon. gentleman puts. We are passing an enactment for the benefit of the juvenile delinquent.

Mr. LANCASTER. How do you know it is ?

Mr. LEIGHTON McCARTHY. If the hon. gentleman thinks it is not, he should have moved the six months' hoist on the second reading. Having read the Bill the second time, we have admitted the principle and we are providing a special court where the juvenile delinquent will be guarded against publicity and from being sent to the common jail. We are providing a special place for his incarceration. Assuming that this is for the benefit of the juvenile delinquent, we still provide—which is the converse of the case the hon. gentleman puts —that the magistrate shall have the discretion of giving a trial by jury where he thinks the seriousness of the case demands it.

Mr. LANCASTER. By section 7 you are taking away the very thing which my hon. friend says is such a wonderful benefit that this wonderful Bill is going to accomplish. Instead of leaving the discretion to the whim of the magistrate, who has no experience of trials by jury and consequently knows nothing about them, I would leave the election to the parent of the child assisted by counsel.

Mr. CARVELL. My hon. friend assumes that every criminal case in the Dominion is tried by jury. We have heard him declaim about this inherent right of trial by jury conferred by Magna Charta, but does he not know that ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, where youths of fourteen years and under are brought before the court, they are tried by the magistrate without a jury? There are numberless instances all over Canada of criminal cases tried without a jury.

Mr. LANCASTER. When the accused elect for summary trial?

Mr. CARVELL. Without any election at all. The hon. gentleman does not know what he is talking about. For the last hour he has been trying to get his friends to help him out of his wrangling over this matter. Does he not know that more than three-quarters of the cases of assault tried in this country are tried by a magistrate without a jury and the accused has no right to a jury?

Mr. LANCASTER. They are not indictable offences.

Mr. CARVELL. I know they are not. The hon. gentleman is simply talking against time, and I want him to try and have a little sense.

On section 35, any city or town may ask for this law.

Mr. LANCASTER. Taking section 35 in conjunction with section 34, it would strike me as being rather repugnant. Perhaps the Minister of Justice will explain how it would work out. Section 34, apparently, makes it a condition precedent that the province shall issue a proclamation bringing the Act into force. But under section 35 the Act may be brought into force by proclamation, notwithstanding that the provincial legislature has not passed an Act, if the Governor in Council is satisfied. The Governor in Council would be the Governor in Council of the Dominion, I presume, and the proclamation under the section would be the proclamation of the Dominion government.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) is going to move a section to meet that.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I move that the following section be added, in these words :

This Act shall go into force only when, and as, proclamations declaring the same in force in any province, city, town or other portion of a province, are issued and published in the 'Canada Gazette.'

Motion agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

BOUNTY ON CRUDE PETROLEUM.

House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution :

Resolved, that it is expedient to provide that the bounty of one and one-half cent per imperial gallon payable on crude petroleum from Canadian wells authorized by chapter 28 of the Act of 1904 shall apply also to crude petroleum produced from shales or other substances mined in Canada.

Mr. FIELDING. The existing bounty legislation respecting crude petroleum covers the case of petroleum drawn from Canadian wells. In the province of New Brunswick they are proposing to produce petroleum not by drawing it from wells but by mining shale and manufacturing petroleum from the shale. The object of the change is simply that the bounty shall apply to any oil produced in that way.

Resolution reported, read the second time and agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 199) to provide for the payment of bounties on crude petroleum.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SALARY OF SUPERINTENDENT OF INSURANCE.

House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution :

Resolved, that it is expedient to provide that the Superintendent of Insurance be paid such salary, not exceeding five thousand dollars per annum, as the Governor in Council may from time to time fix and determine.

Mr. FIELDING. In the legislation of many years ago, $4,000 was fixed as the maximum salary of the Superintendent of Insurance. We propose to fix the maximum now at $5,000. The Bill to be founded on this resolution will repeal the old clause and insert a new one, simply changing the figures.

Resolution reported, read the second time and agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 200) respecting the salary of the Superintendent of Insurance.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CANADIAN ASSOCIATED PRESS.

House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution :

Resolved, that it is expedient to continue for a further period the granting of aid towards the maintenance of an independent and efficient service of telgraphic news from Great Britain for publication in the Canadian press, and that for such purpose it is expedient to provide for the payment of a sum not exceeding $9,000 for the period from July 1, 1908, to March 31, 1909, both days inclusive; for the payment of a sum not exeeding $12,000 for the fiscal year terminating March 31, 1910; and for the payment of a sum not exceeding $3,000 dollars for the period from April 1, 1910, to June 30, 1910, both days inclusive.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Is it the intention that this news shall come entirely through British and Canadian channels ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH.

Mr. FIELDING. This is a continuation for two years of the existing arrangement. The old arrangement provided that we might pay to an organization of Canadian newspapers sums of money from time to time, aggregating in five years $60,000, or $12,000 per annum, on the average. The association desires that we should continue that for a further period of five years. There was some difference of opinion as to the wisdom of binding the government for so long a period, and we concluded to continue the promise for two years, at $12,000 each. It is practically a continuance of the present arrangement whereby an association in Canada, with an agent in London, supplies every day cable news affecting Canadian affairs.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Is it to a news company ?

Mr. FIELDING. No, it is to an association of Canadian newspapers entirely.

Mr. FIELDING moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 201) to assist in maintaining an independent and efficient service of telegraphic news from Great Britain for publication in the Canadian press.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

TIMBER MARKING ACT.

Bill (No. 193) to amend the Timber Marking Act—Mr. Fisher—read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Mr. LANCASTER. What will be the effect of the change.

Mr. FISHER. To apply the Timber Marking Act to the province of New Brunswick. It now only applies to Ontario and Quebec.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY—BRANCH LINE FROM HARMONY TO ELMIRA.

House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution :

Resolved, that it is expedient to provide that the Minister of Railways and Canals may, with the authority of the Governor in Council, construct a branch line railway from Harmony, on the Souris branch of the Prince Edward Island Railway, to Elmira, in Kings county.—Mr. Graham.

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). If the House will kindly advance the resolution through the successive stages the discussion can take place upon the Bill.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I noticed that some days ago the minister had a notice on the Order Paper providing for the construction of two branch railways in place of one as

proposed in this resolution. I do not know whether it is an oversight that he has omitted one. Perhaps on second thoughts this one will disappear also and then we will have none at all. I suppose this means a sop for the hon. member for Kings, Prince Edward Island (Mr. J. J. Hughes) who, I am sorry is not in his seat. If the minister wishes to delay the discussion on this Bill we should know when it is coming up for the second reading.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will be ready to take it up just the moment I will be allowed to, but I think we will all have to stay in our seats to get the business through.

Mr. TAYLOR. I presume the minister will give notice when he proposes bringing on the second reading ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I will be glad to tell my hon. friend if I have the opportunity.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Will I and the members from Prince Edward Island get notice as to when the Bill will be taken up ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Suppose we take it up on Friday.

Mr. A. MARTIN. All right.

Resolution reported, read the second time and agreed to.

Mr. GRAHAM moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 202) to authorize the construction of a branch line of the Prince Edward Island Railway from Harmony on the Souris branch to Elmira.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the leader of the House inform us what business will be taken up to-morrow ?

Mr. FIELDING. To-day, I presume my hon. friend means.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes.

Mr. FIELDING. The resolution concerning the All Red Line will be the first order, then the motion will be made for Supply upon which my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden) wishes to make a statement.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1.25 a.m. Thursday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, July 9, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE.

Mr. MACKENZIE moved :

That the second report of the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization be concurred in.

Mr. SPEAKER. This had better stand as a notice of motion for Monday next.

QUESTIONS.

MONTMORENCY FALLS.

Mr. ROBITAILLE—by Mr. Morin—asked :

1. What is the length in feet of the present supporting wall at the Falls of Montmorency?
2. What is its width?
3. How many cubic feet of wood are in that wharf?
4. What kind of wood is it?
5. How many cubic feet of stone?
6. What sort of stone?
7. Was the last money voted for that wharf after the outlay already made?

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

1. 1,325 feet.
2. 12 feet.
3. 27,000 cubic feet.
4. Pine and spruce.
5. 203,000 cubic feet.
6. Ballast stones.
7. No work was started before money had been voted by parliament.

THE CORBY DISTILLERY.

Mr. ROBITAILLE—by Mr. Morin—asked :

1. Has the Corby firm ever had a deficiency in their spirit production from the still? If so, how many and in what years?
2. What amount in proof gallons and in money represented the respective deficits?
3. How were said deficits adjusted with the Excise Department?
4. For the last deficit, how many days were given in order that the production in that distillery be computed on the whole quantity of grain used during that given period in order that over-production would reduce deficiency?
5. For any deficit, has the Excise Department pressed a demand of payment from the Guarantee Company?
6. Has any official demand been made upon the principals by the department through their legal representatives?

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue) :

1. Yes. One in the year 1906-7.
2. 5,528·13 proof gallons. Duty $10,503.45.
3. The period was extended to the end of the fiscal year.
4. 89 days.
5. No, the deficiency being more than overcome by surplus production in the balance of year.
6. No, for the reason given in answer to question 5.

GOODERHAM & WORTS DISTILLERY.

Mr. ROBITAILLE—by Mr. Morin—asked:

1. Has the Gooderham & Worts distillery ever had a deficiency in their spirit production from the still? If so, how many and in what years?
2. What amount in proof gallons and in money represented the respective deficits?
3. How were said deficits adjusted with the Excise Department?

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue):

No deficiencies of the character referred to have arisen in the distillery of Messrs. Gooderham and Worts.

SUPERINTENDENT OF PRINTING.

Mr. ROBITAILLE—by Mr. Morin—asked:

1. Is it the intention of the government to appoint a French Superintendent of Printing?
2. If it be not advisable to make a principal appointment, would the government consider the appointment of French Assistant Superintendent?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The attention of the Secretary of State has been called to this question and the matter is under consideration.

THE 'BESSIE BUTLER.'

Mr. SAM. HUGHES—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. Has the government a boat on the Trent canal named the 'Bessie Butler,' or a similar name? If so, what are its dimensions, cost, material and uses?
2. In what service was the boat engaged on July 1, instant, Dominion Day?
3. Does the government or its officers ever lease or hire out this steamer?
4. Was the boat used by the Roman Catholic Bishop and priests of Peterborough locality on July 1, during the greater part or any considerably part of the day? If so, at whose cost?
5. Is the boat placed at the disposal of the clergy of all other denominations for picnics or other entertainments?
6. If so, will the government be good enough to order it up to Victoria county waters for the entertainment of the clergy of that county and for picnic purposes?

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

1. Yes. The government has a tug, called the 'Bessie Butler' on the Trent canal; her dimensions are: Length 78 feet, beam 17 feet 6 inches; length of engine room 22 feet; gross tonnage, 76·99; registered tonnage, 52·36. Cost in the neighbourhood of $18,500. The tug is used for towing and inspection purposes.

2. The tug 'Bessie Butler,' went to Hastings to bring up to Peterborough a drag scow which was being used by the engineer's department. On the same day July1, the St. Peter's Total Abstinence Society were holding their annual picnic at a point about two miles below the city. When passing the street railway wharf at the south end of the city, the superintendent found that several hundred persons were in an awkward predicament. The society, which had arranged the picnic, had chartered two boats, the 'Rainbow' and the 'Beaver,' the latter boat, through unforeseen difficulties could not fill its contract, and did not put in an appearance. There were as a result, about two or three hundred people who had taken the street car to the railway terminal, but were unable to obtain boat transportation to the picnic grounds, two or three miles distant. They hailed the government boat and explained their position. The superintendent took as many on board as he could, and conveyed them to the picnic grounds. About the same number returned on the government boat. There was a number of women and children, who otherwise would have had no means of getting up that evening. The superintendent states, that his action is nothing more than it would have been under like circumstances, had the picnic been under the auspices of any other church, society, lodge or other organization. The tug made its trip to Hastings and returned to Peterborough, with the scow as originally arranged.

3. No, it does not.

4. The boat was used in the manner above set out for a few hours on July 1. The department was offered pay, for the service in this connection; but did not accept any, as the superintendent felt that he had only done a friendly act when the excursionists were placed in an awkward position.

5. The boat is not placed at the disposal of the clergy of any denomination.

6. Under similar conditions the superintendent would feel that he was not doing anything wrong in according similar treatment.

RICHIBUCTO WHARF.

Mr. GANONG—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. What is the length of the wharf at Richibucto, New Brunswick, for which the amount of $2,000 is included in the main estimates, and what depth of water will be obtained at this wharf at low water?
2. Has this wharf been purchased? If so, when, from whom, and at what price?
3. Is the wharf now in good repair? If not, what amount will be required for repairs?

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

1. (a) 680 feet. (b) 13 feet of water at L.W.O.S.T. along the outer face.

2. The municipal council of Richibucto offered to sell its wharf to the government

for $1,500; the offer is now under consideration.

3. (a) No. (b) Resident engineer estimates the cost of rebuilding approach at $4,500. The addition of a pierhead would cost $7,000.

SOULANGES CANAL.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Bergeron—asked:

1. What is the amount claimed for his services and expenses by commissioner L. Boyer in connection with the inquiry into matters on the Soulanges canal?
2. What action has the government taken upon the report of said commissioner?
3. Why was not said inquiry conducted by the Railways and Canals department itself?

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

1. Mr. Boyer's remuneration was fixed by order in council at $25 per day, and his account was rendered in accordance therewith and paid; $485 for services and $47.85 for expenses.
2. Mr. Sauvé, superintendent, has been suspended without pay.
3. Mr. Boyer was appointed by order in council as commissioner in pursuance of the provisions of Part II. of the 'Inquiries Act,' chapter 104 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, to investigate for the Department of Railways and Canals and report to that department.

MR. F. T. CONGDON.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

Will the Minister of the Interior instruct the commissioner of the Yukon by telegraph to wire him what steps, if any, have been taken to make investigation into and audit of the accounts involved in the estates and trusts that came into the hands of F. T. Congdon, as public administrator of the Yukon; and forward to him, to be laid on the table of the House, a list of those estates and trusts, with the disposition made of the same?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The Commissioner of the Yukon Territory is being communicated with by wire.

SUDBURY COUNTY COURT JUDGE.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Bergeron—asked:

1. When is the government going to provide a county court judge for the district of Sudbury?
2. Is the government aware that its failure to appoint the said judge is said to be causing inconvenience in the said district?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice):

1. When parliament has provided for payment of a salary to such judge the question of an appointment to the position will have careful consideration.

2. Arrangements were some time ago made for having the judicial work of the district attended to, and such arrangements seem to have been satisfactory.

QUEBEC TERCENTENARY POSTAGE STAMPS.

Mr. McCOLL asked:

1. Is it the intention of the Postmaster-General to have a special issue of postage stamps in commemoration of the Quebec Tercentenary?
2. If so, what different denominations will be issued, and what number of each denomination?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

1. Yes.
2. (a) ½c., 1c., 2c., 5c., 7c., 10c., 15c. and 20c. (b) Since the arrangements as to the respective quantities comprising the series are thus far of a necessarily tentative character, being largely dependent upon the extent of the demand therefor that may arise, no final estimate has been made of the number to be issued in each denomination.

THE ALL-RED LINE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER rose to move the following resolution:

That at the Imperial Conference lately held in the city of London, England, the following resolution was unanimously passed:

That in the opinion of this conference the interests of the empire demand that in so far as practicable, its different portions should be connected by the best possible means of mail communications, travel and transportation; and that to this end it is advisable that Great Britain shoud be connected with Canada, and through Canada with Australia and New Zealand, by the best service available within reasonable cost; that for the purpose of carrying the above project into effect, such financial support as may be necessary should be contributed by Great Britain, Canada, Australia and New Zealand in equitable proportions.

That it is desirable that steps should be taken with all convenient speed to achieve the results aimed at in the said resolution.

That this House doth hereby endorse the terms of the said resolution, affirming that Canada is prepared to assume her fair share of the necessary financial obligations.

That in the opinion of this House it is desirable that the governments of Australia, Canada and New Zealand should, with as little delay as possible, agree upon a definite plan for carrying into effect the terms of the said resolution of the Imperial Conference, the same to be submitted for the consideration of the imperial and colonial parliaments.

He said: Of the advantages which would accrue to Canada if such a scheme as is here outlined were to go into effect I do not propose to speak. I have followed pretty carefully the expressions of public opinion

on this subject from the time, now twelve months ago, when it was first brought to the attention not only of Canada, but of the whole British empire; and, so far as my own observations have gone, I may say that though there have been some carping criticism, on the whole the scheme seems to have commanded universal approbation—I do not say unanimous, because I must recognize that some expressions of dissent have been heard. But while the expressions of opinion have not been unanimous, they have been pretty generally in favour of such a scheme. One thing at all events seemed to be certain: if such a scheme were to become a fact, its advantages to Canada would not be disputed. Canada would undoubtedly be on the highway, not only between Great Britain and her distant possessions on the other side of the globe, but also between Europe generally and the Orient. This scheme, which would primarily affect the British empire, would not in its usefulness be confined at all to the British empire; but all the countries of Europe and all the countries of the Orient would necessarily seek this route as a means of communication between each other. Canada has the advantage of geography in this matter. We have the shortest route, I believe, both on the Pacific and on the Atlantic. At present the only available route between Great Britain and Australasia is by way of the Suez canal, and the disadvantages of this route as compared with the Canadian route are manifest. First of all, the duration of a trip from London to New Zealand by the Suez canal is no less than 29 days, and the discomfort of the trip to one of European blood is pretty severe. A trip through the Suez canal, and then through the Red sea and then east by way of Colombo is a very trying one to Europeans. A similar trip by way of Canada would certainly obviate all these discomforts. There is, I may say, an alternative route by way of San Francisco, and at the time of the conference Sir Joseph Ward, the Prime Minister New Zealand, who spoke with authority on this subject, stated that he had made a trip from New Zealand to England by way of San Francisco in 29 days. I think, however, that this route is practically no longer in existence; since the earthquake at San Francisco some two years ago, I believe it has been abandoned. I speak under correction on this point, but I think I am correct. At all events, if that route is not now in existence, it may be revived at any moment. So that, in all our calculations, we have to take into consideration not only the route by way of the Suez canal, but also the possibility of having a line of communication at any time from Liverpool, by way of New York and San Francisco to Australasia in 29 days. Therefore, it behooves us, if we are to attain what we have in mind, to make the journey by the line we have organized inside of 29 days and some days

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

more. The line may be divided into three parts—the Atlantic part, the continental part and the Pacific part. When we speak of the Atlantic part, we know exactly what we can do; we know the conditions that prevail to-day between Europe and the American continent; and we know that it is possible, with a line of steamers of the highest type afloat, such as the 'Mauretania' and the 'Lusitania,' to cross the Atlantic from British territory to Canadian territory within four days. We have the advantage on our side of distance to the extent of some about 1,000 miles, which would enable us to have easy communication from land to land with vessels of that type in four days. I do not, however, lose sight of the fact that vessels of the type of the 'Mauretania' and 'Lusitania' are still in the experimental stage, commercially speaking. So far as navigation is concerned, the stage of experiment is past. These vessels have proved their adaptability to the service in which they are engaged; but, so far as the commercial aspect of the case is concerned, we are still in the dark, and no one can say yet that these two vessels, which have been heavily subsidized by the British government, will prove a success commercially. It is a well-known fact that all such high-class steamers have not been a success commercially, and it is an essential in all countries that they should be assisted out of the public treasury. The Germans do it, the Americans have done it, the English have done it, and the Canadians have done it. But although all these high-class steamers have been subsidized by their respective countries, there is a limit beyond which such assistance is not possible, and it is a question whether or not vessels of the type of the 'Mauretania' and the 'Lusitania,' even with the assistance they have received from the British government, can be called a commercial success. Their owners say that the time will never come when they can dispense with such assistance.

Even if at the present moment we are not prepared to provide vesels like the 'Mauretania' and the 'Lusitania' it is possible for us to entertain the hope that we can have twenty knot or twenty-one knot steamers and these will easily cross the Atlantic within five days. Assuming that even it should take five days to cross the Atlantic I think I can hopefully if not confidently say that we can secure a train service which will cross the continent in at least five days; may be in four days but as to that I would not speak positively. We are, however, on absolutely safe ground when we say that the train journey across the continent can be accomplished in five days. There then remains the service on the Pacific and as to that we are to a large extent in the dark. At present there are two Pacific services subsidized by the Canadian government, one to China and Japan, and the other to Australasia. The Pacific service by

the Empresses is in every respect excellent, but the steamers have a speed only of thirteen knots and consequently the voyage from Vancouver to Hong Kong is considered somewhat slow in these days of fast transportation. The service between Vancouver and Australasia has not up to the present time given the satisfaction we had reason to hope for, and we are now negotiating for its improvement. For this service we have been paying something like $40,000 a year. The mail service on the Atlantic costs us at the present time about $500,000 a year, and, therefore, for the ocean mail service on the Atlantic and the Pacific we are paying about $540,000. It is for us to consider to what extent we will have to implement the present service in order to achieve what we now contemplate. Sir Joseph Ward, Prime Minister of New Zealand, expressed at the conference his decided preference for a Pacific service equal to the service now on the Atlantic, namely, steamers of twenty-knots or twenty-two knots, in order that Auckland may be made in ten or twelve days from Vancouver. Such a scheme is perhaps too ambitious for us now. I wish for my part I could view the matter with the same enthusiasm as my friend Sir Joseph Ward, who stated that New Zealand would be prepared to pay a subsidy of £100,000 sterling to such a line as that. This is a very large subsidy, indeed, for a country lke New Zealand with a population of less than 1,000,000, but Sir Joseph Ward attached so much importance to a fast all-British line that he was prepared to advise the parliament of his country to grant this very handsome subsidy to secure it. Whether or not it is possible to have such a service on the Pacific seems to me of somewhat doubtful possibility. We must recognize that these mail subsidies have to be calculated largely upon the basis of the population which is served. The population of New Zealand is about 1,000,000, the population of Australia is under 5,000,000 and the population of our Pacific coast is not much more than 200,000. It may be that this population is not so large as to justify a twenty knot or twenty-two knot service on the Pacific, and so we have to consider if we cannot do with less. It is quite possible I think that we might have an eighteen knot service from Vancouver to Auckland and from Auckland to Sydney, and with steamers of that speed they ought to make the voyage from Vancouver to Auckland in about sixteen days. From Vancouver to Auckland is about 6,355 miles, from Vancouver to Sydney the distance is 6,824 miles and from Auckland to Sydney the nautical distance is about 1,200 miles. That means that the voyage between Vancouver and Australia could not be covered in less than twenty-two days by eighteen knot steamers and this is not entirely satisfactory from the point of view of Australia which has perhaps the right to ask for a more expeditious service. It is, therefore, for us to consider whether it is possible to come to an agreement for a twenty knot service on the Pacific. I am not prepared now to give an opinion as to whether or not such a service cannot be attained; it is a question which has to be very carefully considered and so for the present we do not propose to ask the House to give us endorsation to this scheme in any concrete form. The only thing we ask the House now to do is to authorize us to approach the subject with the governments of Australia and New Zealand so as to give the best possible consideration to the question and at a later day to come before the House with some concrete proposition if that be possible. That the idea is an excellent one every one admits; that the idea is one which will commend itself to the best judgment of every one in this country we all recognize, but at the same time the government does not close its eyes to the fact that the scheme may present so many difficulties as to render it impossible of absolute accomplishment.

And so the question has to be considered very carefully and looked into in all its details. We know where we are on the Atlantic, we know where we are with regard to the train service across the continent, but so far as the Pacific is concerned, the matter is still in the dark and, although the idea is one which should be exploited, we do not say that it is absolutely sure or feasible. That is the reason why we are asking the House to ratify the idea of the resolution which was passed by the conference. We have no intention of saying that the thing is absolutely beyond peradventure, that it is an absolute certainty. We do not want, in approaching this subject, to give to the House more confidence than we have ourselves; we do not want to lead the House to understand that we are sure that the project is absolutely feasible, because there are things which have to be taken into consideration, which have to be determined and which must engage our best attention. There are on the Pacific ocean physical conditions which have to be looked into very carefully and which, if possible, have to be overcome. The climatic conditions are such that it is perhaps possible that the complete execution of the idea may not be feasible. I understand that vessels have the same difficulty there that we have in winter in making steam, that climatic conditions exercise nearly the same influence over the making of steam on the equator as on the frozen ocean, and, for all these considerations, whilst we bespeak the sympathetic attention of the House to the scheme, we do not in any measure commit ourselves to it as a scheme as to which we may have an absolute condition of certainty. The House will remember that all we are asking is that it shall endorse the

terms of the resolution. All we are asking it to do at the present time is to authorize us to enter into negotiations with our fellow subjects of Australasia in order if possible to find the means of having such a line as is now contemplated, and if it is feasible then to bring it before parliament for its consideration.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Mr. Speaker, we have all listened with a great deal of interest to the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who introduced this resolution. I think the House and the country will agree with me that the mover of the resolution has not been at all as positive in his statements in this House as he was in the imperial conference of 1907 when he moved, not this resolution, but a certain resolution with the same object in view. At that time my right hon. friend had no doubts. He was not only in favour of the idea, he not only believed that the idea was practicable, but, if I mistake not, his demand upon the conference at that time was to at once establish a service between Great Britain, Australia and New Zealand through Canada. I think it is of sufficient importance that, just at this point, in view of certain expressions and of the assumption that has been made, to take up a little time in presenting the history of the growth of the idea of improved steamship communication between Canada and Great Britain, between Canada and Australia and between Great Britain and Australia through Canada as a land route. It is not true that the idea, which was broached to the conference in 1907 and which the right hon. gentleman spoke of when he came to Quebec in the latter part of that year, was a newly discovered idea. It is well just here to quote what the right hon. gentleman said in his Quebec speech. He said:

During the last five days of the conference I announced a new idea which has almost become historic—the All-Red Line. My proposition was the establishment at once of fast boats on the Atlantic and the Pacific. I am thoroughly convinced that my ideas are in the interest of Canada and the empire and, although I have grown old and white in the service of the country, I am prepared to work with all my energy to further the cause.

The hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), who made a very exceedingly comprehensive statement in reference to this idea a few months ago in this House, also declared, in express terms, that the resolution of Sir Wilfrid Laurier in the conference of 1907 included the genesis and included the history of this idea of intercommunication between Great Britain and the overseas dominions. Another point I want to call the attention of the House to in connection with it is the extremely different position which my right hon. friend occupied in the conference of 1907 and occupies to-day in the advocacy of this resolution, as compared with his ideas upon this as well as some other questions as long ago as 1887, 1889, 1890 and 1896. This idea has been one of growth. It has not flashed all suddenly into the mind of my right hon. friend or into the mind of any other single man. As most ideas this has had a period of incubation, of gradual birth, so to speak, and of growth towards its more advanced and more completed form. Canada, from the time of the old Allan line steamship mail contract, has been gradually forging ahead towards a continuously better and better service. The old nine, twelve and thirteen knot steamers which plied across the Atlantic and on which we were dependent for our mail carriage and for our passenger traffic were soon seen to be inadequate to the needs of united and progressive Canada. Farsighted men living then, as farsighted and less farsighted men who live now, saw that it was necessary that this service should be broadened and bettered, and they worked towards that end as far as their resources and circumstances admitted.

In 1886-7, tenders were called for by the Liberal-Conservative government then in power for a fifteen to seventeen knot service; and in 1888, these proving unsatisfactory, negotiations began for the co-operation of Great Britain and Canada on both the Atlantic and Pacific. That was the first statement in this parliament of the idea, which has grown since, of inter-communication or co-operation between Great Britain and her oversea dominions. Well, in 1887, if I mistake not, it had its first practical embodiment in the Canadian Pacific Railway monthly service to China and Japan, which company received then and has kept ever since a contract with the British government for the carriage of the mails, a very substantial subsidy which enabled it then to inaugurate a service on the Pacific between Vancouver and China and Japan. Then we come to 1889, and the idea is still active. In that year, as Finance Minister of this Dominion, I myself had the honour of introducing three resolutions to the House, and the House will see to what extent these resolutions carried the idea of this inter-communication. One resolution was to bring about a Canadian Australian and New Zealand system of transportation for freight and passengers. £25,000 sterling or $125,000 was asked for and obtained from this parliament for the inauguration of a fortnightly service, or, if that could not be had, a lesser amount for a monthly service between Vancouver, Auckland and Sydney or some other port in Australia. A second resolution was introduced looking to the encouragement of a fortnightly service between Canada, China and Japan, in which this parliament was asked for the sum of £25,000 on condition that Great Britain would give a much larger subsidy for the

same service and put it into a permanent position. Then a third resolution was introduced with reference to the providing for a service between Great Britain and Canada with connection at a French port. We asked for and obtained $500,000 annual subsidy for a period of ten years on the basis of the negotiations and agreements which had been actually entered into with reference to that service with the mother country which was to provide a substantial contribution. Now what was the attitude of my right hon. friend and of the gentlemen beside him on that question? With reference to the Canadian Australian service, they criticised and criticised but ventured no amendment. With reference to the Canada, China and Japan service they criticised; and my right hon. friend himself moved an amendment to the resolution intended to postpone the consideration of the subject for, as he said, lack of perfect information. With reference to the service between Great Britain and Canada, for which we asked a subsidy of $500,000, my right hon. friend opposed that and moved an amendment on the ground that he did not see that the service was going to compensate this country for the large subsidy required. Mr. McMullen was dead against all three. Mr. Mills was very doubtful indeed. Sir Richard Cartwright was very critical as usual. Mr. Jones, of Halifax, declared that the whole scheme was no good. The present Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) declared that it was no good so long as the country had protection—that there was no use providing for improved communication between the two countries when we were by our tariff endeavouring to prevent the goods of the one coming into the other. Mr. Davies, with his usual vehemence, declared that the policy was as fatuous a one as could be proposed, and you will find that statement on page 1384 of the 'Hansard' of 1889. And you will find my right hon. friend's amendment for postponement on pages 1329 and 1389 of the same 'Hansard.' But was not the idea of uniting the British empire in co-operative work for inter-communication as good then as now? Was not the idea which, even if it did not bring equivalent commercial advantages, would tend to unite the British Dominions more closely and put Canada, which had been hitherto on the back road, upon the highway, as good then as it is to-day? Has nature shifted the highway since 1889 or do we lie under a different latitude and longitude than we did then? I do not understand that Australia has changed her geological position since that day or that Great Britain lies in another quarter of the ocean. The same geographical conditions, the same ideas of unity and of jointure, of co-operation, the one with the other, were all involved in those propositions; but at that time my right hon. friend could not discover the idea and you could not beat it into his head with a mallet. Why? I do not know. Well, things went on and the year afterwards matters took a still more advanced stand with reference to inter-communication. I am not going to take up time reading from 'Hansard' but will come from 1890-1 to another period, and a somewhat noteworthy period, in the history of Canada and the empire. I allude to the Intercolonial conference of 1894, in which a representative from Great Britain in the person of Lord Jersey, who was president of the conference, and representatives from the Australian colonies and New Zealand and from the South African Dominions took part. They all met here in the city of Ottawa and for a fortnight or so devoted themselves to the study and discussion of matters in common affecting the various branches of the empire. What took place? Among other things discussed at that time there was a prominent place given to this, which my right hon. friend declares to be a new idea that he discovered on May 15, 1907, and flashed, as though it were by limelight, into that conference. What do I find? I find that the representative from New Zealand, Mr. Lee Smith, moved the following resolution:

> That this conference take into consideration the question of mail service between Great Britain and Australia via Canada.

There is your All-Red route exactly as it is defined by my right hon. friend today. Start from London, Liverpool, or any other British port, land in Canada, tranship and traverse the continent by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, take ship at Vancouver, land in New Zealand and then go to Sydney—in one line and a half exactly what is laid down by this resolution. I had the honour to second that resolution, and the resolution was unanimously—not only sympathetically, but unanimously—upheld by every representative in that conference. But that was a general resolution, and not only was that resolution moved, but, shortly afterward, Sir Adolphe Caron moved—directly in the same line—a more concrete resolution which was unanimously passed, and which I will read to the House:

> 1. That this conference expresses its cordial approval of the successful efforts put forth by Canada and New South Wales for the establishment of a regular monthly steamship service between Vancouver and Sydney and affirms the advisability of the reasonable co-operation of all the colonies interested in securing the improvement and permanence of the same.
>
> 2. That the conference learns with interest of the steps now being taken by Canada to secure a first-class mail and passenger service, with all the modern appliances for the storage of perishable goods across the Atlantic to Great Britain, and the large subsidy which she has offered to procure its establishment.

Of which we, at that time, were officially advised. To-day, my right hon. friend cannot put his finger on a single pound that Great Britain will give or that any colony will give towards the general plan.

3. That it regards such an uninterrupted through line of swift and superior communication between Australasia and Great Britain as is above contemplated as of paramount importance to the development of inter-colonial trade and communication, and to the unity and stability of the empire as a whole.

Every idea is taken in that my right hon. friend contemplates in the resolution which the Prime Minister has moved to-day.

4. That as the imperial post office contributes towards the cost of the mail service——

The same argument, you see.

—between England and Australia via Brindisi or Naples, the sum of £95,000 per annum, while the sea postage amounts to only £3,000; and to the mail service between Vancouver and Japan and China, £45,000, less £7,300 charged against the Admiralty; this conference deems it but reasonable to respectfully ask that assistance be given by the imperial government to the proposed fast Atlantic and Pacific service; more particularly to the British Post Office, while paying the large subsidy of £104,-231, a year to the line from Liverpool to New York, has so far rendered no assistance in the maintenance of a direct postal line between Great Britain and Canada.

That is the complete resolution. That resolution did not find a dissenting voice in that colonial conference. It was given careful attention in a long debate, every sentence of which was sympathetic. And, though there were difficulties and acknowledged difficulties in the way, you could not find a sentence which shows a greater difficulty than that shown by my right hon. friend to-day when he says that, with reference to the Pacific side, it is all in the dark and encompassed with difficulties. Lord Jersey himself, representing Great Britain, took the most intelligent and sympathetic interest, was pregnant in suggestions as to the proper forms of expression ready, with his great personal assistance, as well as his great interest in the empire, to promote the idea. That resolution, as I stated, carried unanimously. Now, how any man who has any regard for the verities can, in 1907, rise and say that this idea is his new discovery, I cannot see. But, Sir, the words had not left the lips of my right hon. friend in the conference in London before the representative of Australia rose and said that for the last ten years they had been advocating that very thing in that country, and that they had named it the 'All-Red Route.' So that neither in the idea nor in the naming of the idea was there any originality. How in the name of historical truth the Prime Minister of Canada can put himself in the position of making assertions like that is not for me to say—I cannot answer the question. But, Sir, what did he say in 1894? I do not need to quote what Sir Adolphe Caron said, what Lord Jersey said, what any other person said—or what I myself said. But I do wish to quote to this House and the country what the hon. gentleman opposite, now Prime Minister of this country, said with reference to that which was discussed and passed in the 1894 conference:

'It has been argued that we should establish a line of steamers between England and her possessions, by virtue of which trade would be cultivated between Canada and the British empire to the exclusion of the rest of the world. I have only to say regarding such an idea, it is absolutely absurd.

That is the best word he had for the idea in 1894. Now what does he say? The House has heard what he says. More, with the idea that was pregnant then and that underlay the action of that conference, with the idea which was stable then, which had the promise of a subsidy of £75,000 from Great Britain on the Atlantic side and on the Pacific side as well as a large subsidy towards the China and Japan service, with the good opinion of the delegates from Australia, that they would be prepared under that scheme, if it could be worked out, to vote their quota of some £50,000 per year—in addition to all that, a contract was absolutely secured for a 20-knot service between Canada and Great Britain and that contract was handed over to my right hon. friend when he came into power in 1896. My right hon. friend tore up that contract, he went into an absurd series of negotiations about bottle-necked steamers, and came back in 1897 from Great Britain, and, on October 7, 1897, at the time, I believe, of a political contest in the city of Toronto, electrified the board of trade and the citizens by reading a telegram which he had received from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), 'Peterson has to-day signed the contract and placed his deposit.' And my right hon. friend said that, by 1900 or 1901, this new fast steamship line would be in operation, and at an expense of $250,000 or more below what Canada had proposed to pay in 1896. Sir, the history of the negotiations with Peterson are patent to this country and remain in the memory of the people. The deposit was placed; but my right hon. friend gave back the deposit later and did not get the fulfilment of his contract. And immediately afterwards, or almost so, the prices of shipbuilding, owing to the demand by the British navy and other circumstances, increased 25, 30 and 40 per cent, so that the government had to face a market in which they could not have built at anything like the cost of steamers in 1896.

Sir, if the 1896 contract had been carried out, by 1900 we would have had a 20-knot

service between this country and Great Britain. To-day my hon. friend crawled down to a 20-knot service. When he was in London he shook his fist metaphorically into Lloyd George's face, and said: Nothing less than a 24-knot service on the Atlantic—and he got the enthusiastic support of Sir Joseph Ward who asked and got the assent of my right hon. friend for a 22-knot service on the Pacific. Now he is willing to have a 20-knot service or less on the Atlantic and a 17 or 18-knot service on the Pacific. He said here to-day, and it is true, that Sir Joseph Ward declared that the service he wanted was 24 knots on the Atlantic and no cargo, with 22 knots on the Pacific. For that New Zealand would give £100,000 but unless those conditions are fulfilled you might as well cry for the moon as to ask New Zealand for £100,000. To-day my hon. friend has clambered down to a 20-knot service on the Atlantic and an 18-knot service on the Pacific. He knows as well as he knows anything that Sir Joseph Ward's £100,000 cannot be got for any slow service of that kind. I think it is well that this country should know the kind of a proposition which my right hon. friend placed before the 1907 conference. There were three things which in reading the report of that conference grated particularly on me. One was the puny and puerile statement made by the maladroit Minister of Marine and Fisheres in answer to the plea that Canada should do something towards the naval defence of Canada in connection with the naval defence of the empire. I will not take that up to-day. He hunted out all the small punts and flat boats and little steamers that had been paid for in patrolling obscure fishery areas and the larger areas of the Atlantic and Pacific and toted up the magnificent sum in 10 years of $3,000,000 expended on Canada's protection of her own fishery service. He said: That is our contribution and our sufficient contribution to the navy and the defence of the empire and it is a sufficient one. My hon. friend went into that conference—and that was the second point that grated on me—on the last day of the conference; his failings follow him in London as they follow him here, he is the unready until everybody else is tired out and then he brings in his big schemes. On the last day of the conference he produced his resolution in the conference and demanded instant treatment and instant accord. How long did he consume in placing that immense proposition before the assembled imperial conference? Less than three minutes. What information did he give? Absolutely nothing but some geographic memoranda of knots and hours. That is all. His speech contains absolutely nothing more than the reading of his resolution and a statement of the distance between the different ports. If he was no clearer in his distances then than he was to-day when he got upon that dark Pacific, I pity the conference as to the amount of real knowledge they got from him. To-day he was going to have us get from Auckland to Sydney in 500 odd miles of sea navigation. The actual distance is 1,280 miles. His appreciation of distances is beclouded by the darkness which seems to overspread the scheme in his mind in relation to the Pacific. Thus a scheme which was revolutionary, which was advanced before an imperial conference of the best representatives of the empire, was proposed with absolutely no information accompanying it except these geographical and time measurements by knots and by hours. What was his resolution? It was very different from the resolution that was passed and consequently very different from the resolution that was brought down here to-day. Here is what the right hon. gentleman proposed:

> That in the opinion of this conference the interests of the empire demand that in so far as possible its different portions should be connected by the best possible means of mail communication, travel and transportation; that to this end steps should immediately be taken to establish a fast service from Great Britain to Canada, and through Canada to Australia and New Zealand, and also to China and Japan.

It will be noticed that he then said in so far as possible, not as far as practicable. Everything is possible if you have a mind to climb up to it.

> That such service upon the Atlantic ocean should be carried on by means of steamships, equal in speed and character to the best now in existence, and upon the Pacific ocean by steamships of a speed of not less that 18 knots, and in other respects as nearly equal to the Atlantic ships as circumstances will permit; that for the purpose of carrying the above project into effect, such financial support as may be necessary should be contributed by Great Britain, Canada, Australia and New Zealand in equitable proportions.

In all of his short speech he did not even hint at a computation of actual costs and charges, but took occasion to say that he would, on behalf of Canada, guarantee that she would contribute more than her one-third share and intimated that Canada would be willing to contribute from $1,000,000 to $1,300,000. When that airy scheme, even more airy than what he has presented to-day, taking into account the paucity of the information on which it was based, was thrown into the imperial conference, it immediately met practical men. Mr. Deakin at once expressed his sympathy but he wanted to know about things, what about its commercial possibilities, what about its cost? Will it be a cargo line, for it is a cargo line that Australia is interested in. What is its cost? for while we are willing to pay something for the imperial idea we have our taxpayers to consider and

consult with and we cannot be pressed beyond what is reasonable.

Mr. Lloyd George interrupted when Mr. Deakin was talking about the commercial capabilities and the cost and said: That is one of the questions I wanted to put. Mr. Deakin said among other things:

Consequently, we do not look coldly upon this proposition, though I am bound to say that its economic possibilities on our side are so limited that the subsidies required may be quite beyond our means.

And he pleaded for information and knowledge as to those important matters. Sir William Lynne said:

My Lord and gentlemen, this route has been advocated very often in Australia. It is known to us as 'the All-Red route' being through British territory all the way, and it is very much desired that we should get it, but I am afraid, with my Prime Minister, that the subsidy would have to be very large.

Sir Joseph Ward has been quoted, Sir Joseph Ward was enthusiastic, wonderfully enthusiastic for the project in its completed and highest form, 24 knots on the Atlantic and 22 knots on the Pacific. His idea was that passengers must get to Auckland from Vancouver in thirteen days; that would satisfy them, and nothing less than that would satisfy them. He said:

I may be taking too sanguine a view of it, but I base all my remarks upon the one potential factor, that if you want to have this close connection you must pay sufficient money for steamers of large tonnage—passenger and mail steamers only, I should say, except for the purpose of carrying certain cargo between Canada, Australia and New Zealand.

He pointed out the difficulty of transhipment, asking how it was possible that freight steamers starting from London could afford the cost and delay of two transhipments, one from the ship to cars on the Atlantic side and the other from the cars to the ship on the Pacific side, and, therefore, he argued, and I think rightly, that the only thing that would satisfy New Zealand would be a high standard swift communication, cutting out the freight factor almost entirely.

I want to go a little further and show what Mr. Lloyd George thought of the proposition. He said:

Lord Elgin and gentlemen, I am very glad Sir Wilfrid Laurier has brought forward a proposal which we can examine without coming into conflict with any popular mandate and highly controversial topics like the fiscal question. I am only sorry that we did not get this in time to enable us to give real consideration to it, and to enable us also to put forward considered views before the conference. The first I saw of this scheme was yesterday. I think I saw the resolution last night, and the resolution which is placed on the paper to-day is different in one or two material particulars. We have done our best in the very short time which has been placed at our disposal for considering such a very important business proposition, and we have made some inquiries with regard to it.

Even this discussion has shown what a very difficult problem it is, and what a many-sided problem it is. You have to consider a good many things. You have to consider the best route. As to the desirability of bringing New Zealand and Australia nearer to the mother country, there can be no doubt at all, and we shall, as far as the government are concerned, adopt the first three lines of Sir Wilfrid Laurier's resolution by way of establishing our agreement with the general proposition. But it is a matter that has to be gone into very carefully, and here I agree with Mr. Deakin, that it is a matter which ought to be gone into very carefully by experts.

That is a very sensible thing. To imagine that the representatives of the British government would vote a proposition to establish a fast service on the lines laid down, and do it without expert evidence—I do not see how any man could expect it; and that shows the utter futility of bringing forward a business proposition of that kind in that way. Mr. Lloyd George goes on to say:

We cannot examine it apart from the question of the carriage of goods, too. We must take that into account. It is not only a matter of a fast mail service, but also a question of the cheaper transportation of goods and materials from the colonies.

Well, Sir Wilfrid Laurier butted up against that idea. He is almost at once upon his feet, and amongst other things he says:

We cannot do anything more with regard to improving our communication with Canada than to have a service that is equal to the best that is now in existence between New York and England. So far, I think, it requires no expert knowledge or evidence at all. If you are not prepared to do that, then it is blocking the whole system.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier, true to his traditions, requires no expert examination or evidence with regard to great schemes. Then he goes further, and says with reference to the whole question:

I do not think it is a question of experts in this matter, but a question of policy. We want to have an All-Red route, as it has been very happily termed in Australia over British territory absolutely. If that be the case it requires no experts at all. If you have a company in which you would have such a man as Lord Strathcona, who will undertake it for such a sum, you will have to determine whether you are prepared to pay the sum or not. No expert would be required there.

There is wisdom for you—pay the sum, and do not inquire as to whether or not you are able to pay the sum for the compensations proposed to be given to you. He goes on to say:

With regard to the Atlantic service, what we want to have is a service equal to the best

now in existence in the world; that requires no expert knowledge, but it is a question of policy, shall we or shall we not have it? If we want to have it we must pay for it.

Yet in 1896 my right hon. friend wanted expert testimony when we proposed to vote $500,000 as a subsidy for a fast Atlantic service. Then he comes to the Pacific part of the project and he says:

Here again there is no necessity for experts; it is a question of policy, shall you or shall you not have such a service?

He has to-day declared that when you approach the Pacific everything is uncertain and in the dark; yet he there required no experts, no examination for either the Atlantic part or the Pacific part of the scheme. Mr. Lloyd George said again:

I have said something about experts in my observations, but that is not my proposal. My proposal is really described in the words used by Mr. Deakin in his resolution last week. I used the words 'concerted inquiry,' and he put 'systematic.' I do not think it matters. We really cannot pledge ourselves now as to the best means of doing this thing. The resolution has not even been placed on the paper. I do not think it really fair. If it be regarded as a matter of immense practical moment—I think it is—I think it would have been fair to the imperial government, at any rate, to let us have a copy of the resolution. We have had copies of all the resolutions about fiscal reform, but never a copy of this one practical proposal, which we could have examined. It ought to come before the cabinet. But we saw this resolution for the first time this morning, and it is really rushing us unfairly, I must say, to ask us to pledge ourselves, not to the general proposition that it is desirable or that we will look into the matter, but to pledge ourselves to the actual route, to a 20-knot service here, a 24-knot service there, and an 18-knot service in another place. Surely that is a thing that ought to be inquired into. The difference in cost between an 18 and a 20-knot service, I am told, is simply prodigious. The figures given to me were almost prohibitive. Possibly when we look into it, it may simply have been that a shipowner was trying to frighten us off it; I cannot say, but the figures were very alarming. To ask us to pledge ourselves to the very smallest detail (because that is what this means) without the slightest further talk amongst ourselves as to the best plan of doing this thing, I really do not think is quite fair to us.

Lord Elgin, the chairman, voiced the same objection, and in the end my right hon. friend, though he fought stoutly for his proposition, gave way, and the amendment, in the form in which it is to-day on our Order Paper, was adopted. So much with reference to that.

Now, when my right hon. friend comes down and asks this House to-day to pledge itself to this scheme, where is he as compared with where he was in 1907 at the time of the conference?

At that time he would have a 24-knot service and nothing less on the Atlantic and a 22-knot service and nothing less on the Pacific. With a 22-knot service on the Pacific Sir Joseph Ward would be willing to guarantee the £100,000 subsidy. To-day he is willing to make it a 20-knot service between Great Britain and Canada and an 18-knot service or less on the Pacific. Will my hon. friend think for a moment of what has taken place since 1896? To-day we have the time made of six days and less between a British port and our own Canadian ports by most excellent steamers of a most excellent type, and all of this has been brought about by the operation, gradual and yet in a certain sense rapid, of commercial development and general improvements in this country. I suppose that to-day he could get that twenty knot service in contradistinction to the existing eighteen knot service with the promise of a certain amount. How much is he proposing to pay? The hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) says it would cost us one and a half million dollars yearly. We pay $680,000 now, he says, for mail subsidy on both oceans, so that the increase of subsidy will amount to about $1,000,000 per year. My right hon. friend put it at from $1,000,000 to $1,300,000 per year. That question is a practical one. At this period, under our present circumstances, are we in a position to pay or to pledge this country to pay $1,000,000 more or $1,500,000 per year for ten years for the sake of getting an improvement in the service of perhaps one day, certainly not more than one day. It is a practical question. What I complain of is that my right hon. friend proposes to put this through the House without giving us any commercial or other information, except those general and indefinite statements of his. He does not tell us whether he is going to insist on a twenty knot service or a twenty-four knot service. He does not tell us whether the service will be obtained at a minimum of cost of $1,000,000 or a maximum cost of $1,500,000. All he asks for is power, after having this scheme approved by this House, to enter into negotiations. That is where, if my hon. friend will pardon me, the position is a little suspicious. Will you remember, Mr. Speaker, what occurred in 1903 when the Grand Trunk Pacific scheme was being put through? Then my right hon. friend was in a hurry, he did not want experts, he did not want information. No engineer had laid a line on that great stretch of the Grand Trunk Pacific from Moncton to Winnipeg, no traveller had ever footed it. My hon. friend declared that time would not wait and could not wait and he could not wait; no matter about expert opinion, no matter about information, no matter about the cost, circumstances are ripe for it and I want it put through and put through at once. What a parallel to the events of the

conference of 1907. The Prime Minister said: Without experts, without the information required for the establishment of the service, he would pledge Canada to take her share even up to a million and a half a year. We have information by actual experience of what the country has spent and is likely to spend by reason of taking my hon. friend at his own estimation in 1903. He estimated that the total money cost to this country of the National Transcontinental Railway would be $13,000,000. The Minister of Customs followed in his wake and used the argument throughout Ontario. The Minister of Finance made a carefully revised statement of the cost and placed it at $52,000,000. The Minister of Railways comes down to-day and leaving out terminals and interest and a lot of other things, he tells us it will cost at least $114,000,000. My friend to my right (Mr. R. L. Borden) by a most temperate and I think careful statement, placed the cost of that completed road from Moncton up to the city of Winnipeg at $170,000,000 or $180,000,000. Leaving out of account $11,000,000 which he has calculated for, which might be disputed by some, although I do not think it is at all liable to any dispute, and basing the figures on government records and information, that line of railway will cost us from $160,000,000 up to $170,000,000. We are therefore suspicious and we would not like to and do not propose to vote for any scheme that my right hon. friend brings down in this eight month of the session involving the laying of a possible $15,000,000 additional burden upon the people without making sure that no contract will be signed in the recess, and that when we meet next year we may not have the Prime Minister present to us, as he has done in the Yukon and other cases, a hard and fast contract and say to his followers: We are pledged to that, pledged to Australia, pledged to New Zealand, pledged to Great Britain, you are to see us through—and his obedient following would see him through as they have done heretofore. The financial conditions of this country are such that it is necessary to scan with the very greatest particularity any scheme by which it is proposed to place on the shoulders of an already overburdened people an additional possible tax of $15,000,000 during the next 10 years. The Finance Minister knows something of the condition of the London money market. He boasted the other day that we got our money but he was not very particular in explaining that we got it because the promoters had to put up the money, and now to hold 50 per cent of the whole subscription. Although we got our money from the underwriters, then, does he think that he has made it easier for us to go on the London market and ask for another loan of four, six or eight millions as he will have to in the course of this and the early part of next year? To-day the revenues of Canada are falling off by over a million dollars a month; to-day the taxes are rising at the rate of 16 per cent in ten years and other obligations in addition to what we already have are promised to be loaded upon the people sometime during the few remaining days of this session, some of them may be necessary, some of them I am bound to say not at all necessary. With all this in prospect we do not propose as an opposition to pin ourselves down to a position where we will be met with an added obligation of $10,000,000 or $15,000,000 facing us when the next parliament assembles at Ottawa.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ontario). The unusually late date at which this motion has been brought down, when it is anticipated that parliament shall prorogue on a week from Saturday next, is an indication that the government do not expect any very lengthy or adequate discussion of so grave and important a proposal. However, if the Prime Minister had followed the exact analogy of his course at the Imperial Conference of last year, he would have brought it down on the very last day of the session. So, I think, we may be thankful that it has not been postponed until a still later date.

There is not the slightest doubt as to the absolute importance of better means of intercommunication between the different parts of the empire. That has been an article of Conservative faith and Conservative policy for many years. I need not go over the ground already traversed by my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), who has pointed out that what is now known as the 'All-Red route' in Canada is practically that which for many years had borne the same name in Australia and New Zealand, and is but the ordinary development of ideas and proposals that were debated in this House long before the right hon. gentleman came into power in 1896. I do not desire to detain the House at any length, but let me point out that since 1896 conditions have changed a great deal in this country. What were essential and necessary features of any policy in 1896 may not be so essential and so important to-day. The Conservative government of this country in 1895 looked forward to a 20-knot service on the Atlantic. Since 1896, the service on the Atlantic has advanced from 14 or 15 knots to 18 knots. We have to-day on the Pacific, as well, a 14-knot service. My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) in speaking on this question a few years ago in Montreal used some language which is singularly like that what the Prime Minister used to-day, but singularly different from the attitude taken by the right hon. gentleman at the imperial conference and from the view expressed

in very forcible and eloquent terms by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) when he addressed this House on this subject during the budget debate. The Prime Minister's proposal at the imperial conference was for a 24 or 25 knot service; and I think the hon. member for Brandon put the case for a service of that kind as strongly as it could be put when he addressed the House during the debate to which I have just alluded. My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture, speaking on this subject not long ago, in Montreal on the occasion of a banquet to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, then Minister of Justice, said:

Personally, as far as the fast line is concerned, I would like to see a line of ships built to steam 18 or 20 knots, carrying 10,000 or 12,000 tons of freight, and accommodating about 250 passengers with comfort. That type of boat is both profitable and comfortable. I would rather travel across the Atlantic in a steady commodious boat than in the speedy ones. The record breakers made good time, but there is more ease and comfort in crossing on the cargo boat. I think these boats could touch at some coast port for the convenience of passengers who were travelling in haste, after which the journey could be continued to an inland port. It is easy enough to get a fast line, but it costs a lot of money, and I do not see why we should be held by the nose for such a service. At present, there is an inclination on the part of some Canadians to plunge into any expense, and this must not be allowed to go too far.

That would seem to have been a rather severe stroke in advance at the statements of the right hon. Prime Minister at the imperial conference, and at the same time a somewhat forcible retort to the argument put forward by the hon. member for Brandon during the present session.

I should pause to mention the great interest which the High Commissioner for Canada has taken in this project of better communication between parts of the empire; and whether we accept or do not accept all the views which have been put forward by Lord Strathcona with regard to the rate of speed which is practically attainable under present conditions between Canada and the mother country, we must all acknowledge with gratitude and appreciation the great services which that gentleman has rendered to the empire in this and many respects, and the deep interest he at all times has shown in everything that tends to the welfare of this great country and of the empire as a whole.

My hon. friend the member for Brandon, in debating this matter during the present session, and the right hon. Prime Minister in his speech to-day, have touched this question solely from the standpoint of passenger and mail service, except in one respect to which I will allude for a moment, in which my hon. friend from Brandon did mention the subject of freight. I regard that as a rather serious omission. I am not inclined for one moment to minimize the importance of the best service for passengers and mails that can reasonably be attained, within the resources of this country, between Great Britain, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. I appreciate to the full what has been said in support of that view, especially what has been said by the hon. member for Brandon. There is a great deal of force in all that he has urged upon our attention on that subject. As a matter of sentiment, as a matter of bringing together citizens from different parts of the empire, as a means of enabling them to discover the enormous resources of this country, and, in that way, to promote the development of these resources—for all these considerations and many others that time does not permit me to dwell upon, I acknowledge the importance of that aspect of this great question. But let us remember—and it seems to me that this point has been entirely overlooked—that, after all, the transmission of passengers and mails does not constitute what is really commerce between Canada and Great Britain or Canada and the other parts of the empire. When you analyse what is meant by the promotion of trade and commerce between the different parts of the empire, you must acknowledge that, in the end, it depends upon the free interchange of commodities and upon our being able to transmit to their market in the mother country and in Europe the rapidly increasing, and already very great, natural products and manufactures of this country. It is in this that trade and commerce consists. And, without for one moment minimizing the other considerations that have been urged, I venture to regret that those who have at heart this great project do not seem to have taken that aspect of the subject sufficiently into consideration.

If you put aside sentimental considerations and the possibilities of attracting capital to this country to which I have just now alluded, what do we find to be the chief benefit that can be derived by the people of this country from better communication between different parts of the empire? How many farmers and producers of this country have occasion to cross the Atlantic in any year? But how many farmers and producers are there who are not vitally interested every year in the transmission, by the cheapest and most expeditious modes of transportation of their products to the mother country? Seventy-five per cent to eighty per cent and perhaps eighty-five per cent to ninety per cent of our people are vitally interested in that question; and any proposal which neglects to give due and proper consideration to that particular problem ought not to command the assent of parliament or the approval of the people. We know that, under modern conditions, we are obliged to compete in the market of the mother country, not only with the farmers

and producers of the United States, but also with the farmers and producers of Europe as well as those of New Zealand and Australia. It will be impossible for us to compete with them unless we have a modern and efficient cold storage system, and that system can never be thoroughly efficient so long as there is a single broken link in the chain of connection from the point of production to the markets in the old country. Therefore these essential features, more favourable freight rates, better means of transporting freights, and a system of cold storage seem to me to have been entirely overlooked by this government.

There is another consideration, and my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has dwelt on it. It cannot be denied that the very prosperous times through which Canada in common with the rest of the world, has been passing until within a year ago, have led this government to indulge in enormous expenditures and obligations, the true measure of which is only beginning to be realized. When we find an expenditure of from $175,000,000 to $200,000,000 facing us in respect of the construction of the Transcontinental Railway alone, when we see the enormous demands made upon the public treasury from all parts of the country and the somewhat prodigal promises of gentlemen on the treasury benches, when we realize that up to the present we have not developed in their true sense our national ports and that we are only on the threshold of the real development of our inland waterways; when we consider the thousand and one demands for purposes of real national development which must be met within the next few years, we begin to realize that the resources of Canada, great as they are, may be strained, and strained unduly, in the immediate future if we are not careful how far we commit the country to increased expenditure. Look at the estimates of the present year. The government have already brought down estimates amounting to $127,412,724, and if rumour be true we are yet to be confronted with an enormous amount of Supplementary Estimates and perhaps a still more enormous amount for railway subsidies. We are also face to face with this huge expenditure not only on the National Transcontinental, but in almost every department we must be careful how far we commit ourselves in advance. Look for a moment at the terms of this resolution :

That at the Imperial Conference lately held in the city of London, England, the following resolution was unanimously passed:—

That in the opinion of this conference the interests of the empire demand that in so far as practicable, its different portions should be connected by the best possible means of mail communications, travel and transportation; and that to this end it is advisable that Great Britain should be connected with Canada and through Canada with Australia and New Zealand, by the best service available within reasonable cost; that for the purpose of carrying the above project into effect, such financial support as may be necessary should be contributed by Great Britain, Canada, Australia and New Zealand in equitable proportions.

I do not believe that there is any hon. gentleman in this House who does not heartily sympathize with the object aimed at. So far as the terms of the resolution are concerned therefore, we need not have any special concern at the moment because our liability is guarded by the expression 'within reasonable cost' and the whole matter is thus left open. The right hon. gentleman did not mention what he would regard as a reasonable amount this country should contribute. He did not give us any information as to the amount to which he would be prepared to pledge the credit of the country for the purpose of obtaining a twenty or twenty-one knot service. But even if he did, perhaps we could not place much dependence on it, for if we apply our experience in connection with his estimate of the cost of the Transcontinental, we would be obliged to multiply by fifteen any estimate he would offer. However, the resolution proceeds as follows :

That it is desirable that steps should be taken with all convenient speed to achieve the results aimed at in the said resolution.

That particular paragraph seems to be entirely unnecessary because it simply states what is proposed in more definite form in the concluding paragraph. The next paragraph is as follows :

That this House doth hereby endorse the terms of the said resolution, affirming that Canada is prepared to assume her fair share of the necessary financial obligations.

I would have been fairly well satisfied with that paragraph except for the circumstances I have already mentioned, namely, that the Prime Minister and the able advocate of this proposal, my hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Sifton), have carefully omitted any reference whatever to improvement in the transportation of freight. True, my hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Sifton), in the concluding part of his speech this session, said this :

So far as Canada is concerned, what may be said to be the argument in favour of it from a commercial standpoint. You can put it in two or three words. At the present time, mail, passenger and freight service of the best and quickest character from here to Great Britain goes through the United States, and from Australia and New Zealand goes across the continent of Europe. It does not go by our own ports or our own territory. In other words, so far as travel and transportation are concerned Canada is on the side street instead of on the main thoroughfare.

He did make allusion to the transportation of freight, but the difficulty I find with his

proposal is that throughout his speech he strenuously advocates the expenditure of an enormous sum for the improvement of the passenger and mail service but says not one word as to the appropriation of any expenditure whatever for the improvement of the freight service or the establishment of any system of cold storage.

This paragraph of the resolution pledges Canada to assume her fair share of the necessary financial obligations. I see no particular advantage in our pledging ourselves to obligations, the exact nature and extent of which we do not know at present. It has all to come before parliament again in so far as I understand. Even the Prime Minister, in so far as I have been able to comprehend his remarks, did not propose to enter into any definite engagement or to commit Canada to any definite proposal until the project—the plan, as it is called in the last paragraph of the resolution—shall have been submitted to the imperial and colonial parliaments. Of what advantage is it that the country should pledge itself to an absolutely indefinite and unknown obligation which, if the last paragraph of the resolution means anything, must be submitted to parliament before it can be entered into. There may be some sentimental purpose aimed at in the paragraph to which I have alluded, but in so far as any practical object is concerned, it seems to me that the resolution might with advantage be modified by omitting it.

At one o'clock, House took recess.

House resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Mr. Speaker, before the House rose I had been considering the individual paragraphs of the proposed resolution. I had pointed out that the second paragraph seems to serve no purpose which is not equally fulfilled by the last paragraph. The second paragraph declares:

That it is desirable that steps should be taken with all convenient speed to achieve the results aimed at in the said resolution.

The last paragraph declares that it is desirable that the several governments should with as little delay as possible agree upon a definite plan for that purpose. This paragraph, therefore, is superfluous.

So far as the third paragraph is concerned, I have pointed out that it is a pledge of financial support to an indefinite expenditure, and is entirely useless unless it is intended to justify the government in committing the country in advance. For that reason I would think that no good purpose would be served by the third paragraph. If everything is to be open to the consideration of parliament when the proposal is eventually submitted, of what value is it to say in this paragraph that Canada is prepared to assume her fair share of the necessary financial obligations? The necessary financial obligations are to be within reasonable cost; therefore the whole matter, I would suppose, is to be left entirely to the discretion and judgment of parliament when the proposal comes to be submitted. Therefore of what value is it to say in advance that Canada is prepared to assume her fair share of the necessary financial obligations unless the government is now prepared to inform parliament what they consider to be Canada's fair share or the reasonable cost?

I will quote the fourth paragraph:

That in the opinion of this House it is desirable that the governments of Australia, Canada and New Zealand should, with as little delay as possible, agree upon a definite plan for carrying into effect the terms of the resolution of the Imperial Conference, the same to be submitted for the consideration of the imperial and colonial parliaments.

I have no objections to the terms of that paragraph, provided a rider, to which I will refer in a moment, is added which will make it absolutely clear and certain, beyond peradventure, that the government will not take the course of committing the country to some huge expenditure before it comes to this parliament for the purpose of procuring its ratification of that which has been done in advance. The wording of this paragraph leads me to consider for a moment just what the plan may be which the government will eventually propose. I have already pointed out the extreme importance, from my point of view, of fair consideration to lower freight rates and to a system of cold storage, and I am glad to observe that, at the recent Imperial Conference, Mr. Lloyd George apparently took the same view. At page 568 of the report of the Conference I find this:

Mr. DEAKIN. May I add that at present our connection with this country is by the alternative routes round the cape or through the Suez canal? These are our principal routes and must always remain our great cargo routes, because there is no transhipment.

Mr. LLOYD GEORGE. And, from the point of view of developing trade, they are much more important.

These words indicate his view, of which I was not aware when I spoke on this subject about a year ago. He emphasizes his opinion that one important, perhaps the most important, consideration is the development of trade by the carriage of commodities from one part of the empire to another. Again, at page 577 of the same report, I find Mr. Lloyd George using the following language:

We cannot examine it apart from the question of the carriage of goods too. We must take that into account. It is not only a matter of a fast mail service, but also a question of the cheaper transport of goods and materials from the colonies. I consider that to be a very important item, so far as we are concerned.

Speaking for myself, I consider it to be a very important item indeed, so far as Canada is concerned. Our chief market for our agricultural products is the British market, and is likely to remain the British market for many years to come. To save a cent a bushel on the transportation of 100,000,000 bushels of wheat is to put $1,000,000 into the pockets of the farmers of this country. If by a system of cold storage you enable our perishable products to reach the British market in perfect condition, you confer a corresponding advantage on the producers of these products.

In this connection might I be permitted to make another observation? It is apparently intended to negotiate for only a 20 or 21 knot service on the Atlantic. As the hon. member for North Toronto has pointed out, the government are only proposing now what their predecessors actually accomplished twelve years ago before they went out of office; and the proposal of the Prime Minister is subject to this further observation, that if unassisted private enterprise has so improved the service on the Atlantic that instead of a 14 or 15 knot service we now have an 18-knot service, might we not reasonably rely upon the same unassisted private enterprise to bring about in the immediate or early future a 20 or 21-knot service? I will not take up the time of the House further in discussing this subject, but I will conclude by moving the following amendment to the resolution proposed by the Prime Minister:

That the said resolution be amended by striking out the second and third paragraphs and substituting the following:—

'That this House in expressing its strong sympathy with the object of the said resolution desires to record its opinion that more favourable freight rates and a thoroughly efficient system of cold storage are essential features of any such transportation project.'

And by adding the following paragraph at the end of the said resolution:—

'That, having regard to the very heavy expenditures and obligations in which the present administration has involved the country, the government should not commit Canada to any such plan, or to any contract or expenditure for such purpose until after the same shall have been submitted to and approved by the parliament of Canada.'

Hon. CLIFFORD SIFTON (Brandon). Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words upon the resolution which has been proposed by the right hon. the Prime Minister. I wish in the first place to express my pleasure at seeing the resolution on the paper. Personally I would have been pleased if the resolution had appeared sooner in the session, for reasons which I will refer to later on; but I am pleased that the government has been able to see its way clear to make the proposal which the Prime Minister has made. I am not especially concerned in the historical retrospect of my hon. friend the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster); at least, in so far as it dealt in criticism of the past action of members of the present government party. In matters of this kind we can at least afford to leave to one side what happened twenty or twenty-five years ago. Conditions have so changed that he would be a strange man indeed whose views in regard to some of these things had not altered with the altering circumstances. I am quite willing to admit that my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) did one service to the resolution when he proved—his remarks were conclusive upon the subject as were also the remarks of the leader of the opposition—that it has been the traditional policy of the Conservative party to favour better means of communication between the different parts of the British empire. That unquestionably has been a part of the policy of the Conservative party, and I trust it is a part of the policy of the party which is now in power. I am satisfied that if this resolution is adopted by this House and if due and legitimate and proper diligence is shown that in the course of time we shall be able to meet the desires of those loyal British subjects and loyal Canadians who are anxious to see such a project carried into full and effective fruition. I think, however, that our friends on the opposite side of the House in pursuance of the traditional policy of their party should give us a little more enthusiastic support than they are giving us upon the present occasion, because while the leader of the opposition may very properly say that there is much in favour of his amendment, yet that amendment can be taken as meaning nothing else than, for the present at least, a negative to the resolution which has been moved by the right hon. the Prime Minister. After all, the position we are in to-day is this: That the Prime Minister and his colleagues having attended the imperial conference, and the representatives of all the colonies having passed a certain resolution in regard to improving the transportation system between the different portions of the empire mentioned in the resolution, the question now before the parliament of Canada is: Will the parliament of Canada endorse the action of the imperial conference or will it not? That is the definite question we have to settle. I am inclined to think that it will be seen upon full consideration that the whole subject is so surrounded with difficulties that it is not possible for the government at the present stage to go into such matters of detail as those to which the leader of the oppositon refers in the first portion of his amendment—the second portion of his amendment, of course, has to do with an entirely different phase of the question. It will been seen that the effective factors of the problem are such that it is not

possible for the government to come before parliament in regard to a scheme of this kind in the same way as if it were a scheme relating to the internal development of Canada and which was solely and entirely within the jurisdiction of the government and parliament of Canada. We have before us a proposition which has to do with various portions of the empire : Great Britain, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. You have first to get some kind of a statement of views, some kind of a general proposition to which the parties will agree. The general proposition we have in the resolution of the imperial conference, but then the parties have to find out what can be done ; they have to find out how much it will cost, they have to discuss the question, they have to settle details and arrive at a scheme which each government will be prepared to recommend to its parliament. All that has to be done before you can get any further with the project than it is at present..

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Might I point out that my amendment does not touch that part of the resolution.

Mr. SIFTON. But my hon. friend will see that in the first part of the amendment he refers to making provision for freight and cold storage in connection with the service, and that is essentially a matter of detail which must be worked out at a later stage of the proceedings. It cannot certainly be worked out now by one of the parties before the general arrangement is at all perfected.

I hope I may be excused for a personal word or two. There has been some misunderstanding with regard to me and to my position in connection with the matter, and think it but right that I should say a word in explanation. I have not had, and I have never expected to have any interest in this project other than that which any member of this House has or ought to have in any great project affecting the well-being of Canada. I never expect to have any financial interest in it, and the part I have taken in it was simply intended to promote a favourable view amongst that portion of the public of Great Britain with whom I had an opportunity of coming into contact. My interest in it is simply that of any other patriotic Canadian and I have only done what others would have done under the same circumstances. I say this because I do not desire to be in the position of advocating in this House that in which I had or intended to have at some future stage a financial interest. I may add that I do not think any one who may interest himself in promoting the project can sensibly look forward to deriving any financial benefit from it. It is one of those things which will have to be first of all promoted, pushed forward, and carried on by those who are willing to devote time and attention to it for the purpose of promoting the general welfare of the British countries concerned.

After the imperial conference passed the resolution the members of the conference separated and no opportunity was given to them afterwards to deal further with the subject or to get more information. It was suggested to me when I was in England that I might profitably devote some time to getting information upon the subject and pursuing inquiry in a direction that might ultimately be useful. The result of my inquiries, in conjunction with Lord Strathcona, our High Commissioner, was, that such a service as is contemplated—and which I think was fairly in the minds of the representatives at the imperial conference at the time, or which would be agreeable to their views now,—the result of our inquiry was that such a service would probably cost in the neighbourhood of £1,000,000 of subsidy from the various governments concerned. My hon. friend from North Toronto seemed to question the definite nature of the service that was proposed and certain extracts from the proceedings of the imperial conference would indicate that at the time the proposition was first made all the members of the imperial conference did not have exactly the same idea of what should be done. I submit with confidence to the House that that is exactly what might have been expected. The right hon. the Prime Minister of Canada brought his resolution in and each man had at the moment his own idea as to what ought to be done and as to the method in which the plan should be carried out. These ideas necessarily will be somewhat modified by further discussion and by further information. I think I am perfectly safe in saying that so far as Australia and New Zealand are concerned, at the present time they would be satisfied with a service of ships making a speed of twenty-four knots upon the Atlantic and twenty knots upon the Pacific from Vancouver to Auckland and thence to Australia. A twenty knot service on the Pacific and a twenty-four knot service on the Atlantic would I believe be acceptable to the different members of the empire who are concerned in the project and would satisfy them as a carrying out of the resolution passed by the imperial conference. Roughly speaking, that would give us a service under which mails and passengers would go from Great Britain to a Canadian port in less than five days, to Vancouver in nine days, and to New Zealand in not more than twenty-five days. At the present time the service is about seven days to a Canadian port, twelve days to Vancouver and thirty-eight to New Zealand, so that New Zealand would make a saving of something like thirteen days on mail and passenger service. At present the mail and passenger service from New Zealand is extremely poor.

The position therefore is altered to a considerable extent since the time of the Imperial Confernce. Discussions have taken place and information has been disseminated. It has come to the knowledge of all parties concerned that in all probability such a service as I have described is a practicable service which could be made and would be the best service that could be obtained for any reasonable expenditure.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Would such a service include the transportation of any of the products of Canada ?

Mr. SIFTON. Freight, yes. The ships on which the estimates were made provided for a capacity of 1,000 tons freight for the Atlantic boats and 3,000 tons for the Pacific boats. I may say that experience shows that a larger capacity than 1,000 tons upon fast Atlantic boats would not be of much service, because taking the year around, the probability is that that is about as much of the class of freight they would take as they could succeed in contracting for. As a matter of fact the very fast boats running from New York do not take anything like 1,000 tons on the average. The Canadian Pacific Railway boats running from Quebec and St. John do somewhat better. Therefore the conference resolution having been passed, as much information as can be gathered has been gathered upon the subject, and if we are able to infer anything as to the attitude of Great Britain, it is that if the colonies are desirous that this plan should be carried out, the colonies should get together, settle upon a definite plan and present it to the imperial government for their acceptance. That obviously is a reasonable position for the British government to take, and therefore it becomes essential that somebody should take the initiative and obviously from Canada's position in relation to the whole scheme and her great interest in successfully carrying it out, it is the logical position that Canada should become the chief promoter in carrying this into effect. Thus what the Prime Minister is asking is that, the resolution having been passed, the general features of the scheme having been accepted in so far as they can be before a definite business proposition is arrived at, the government of Canada should be authorized to take the matter up with Australia and New Zealand, arrive at a definite proposition and then go to the imperial government, get them to agree to the scheme and carry it into definite effect. I cannot see myself that any other plan could be practically proposed or would give any probability of arriving at a successful conclusion.

At the risk of repeating what I have said in this House I shall discuss briefly the cost. Expert shipping men in London were employed for the purpose of arriving at as close an estimate as possible of the cost of such a service upon the Atlantic and upon the Pacific, the probable revenue that could be safely counted upon and the probable deficit for all purposes between the revenue and the expenditure. It was computed that a subsidy of something in the neighbourhood of £1,000,000 sterling would be necessary and it was thought, and I do not think that this is regarded as being an unfair allocation of the liability, that the British government ought to be asked to bear one half of that expense, that New Zealand would be willing to bear the expense to the extent of £100,000, that Australian would probably give £75,000 and Canada would give £325,000 of annual subsidy. At the present time Canada, judging by the results of the last fiscal year's operation, is giving $679,000 for the Atlantic and Canadian-Australian services, so that if the idea prevails outside of this House that Canada is getting its present service by private enterprise alone, it is a mistaken idea. We would therefore be required to add to our present subsidy something like $950,000 or $1,000,000 per year and, shortly, what this House has to consider is whether the advantages to be derived by Canada from the institution of the services asked for is worth that amount of money. That is the question in a nutshell, that is what we have to decide.

At the present time the short rapid and in one sense, the direct service for passengers, mail and express from Canada to Great Britain is through the United States. That which it is desired to send quickly must go through the United States and I think I am safe in saying that it is a rule the world over that where you desire to have the best facilities for doing business you should have the best facilities for passenger, mail and express business. These facilities go with other business. One builds up the other, one is necessary for the other and I think it only necessary to state the proposition to have the House admit that if you are going to have the best possible development of the country's business of all kinds between Great Britain and Canada you must have all three classes of traffic, passenger mail and freight, on as good a basis as it is from any other country. Freight will follow the easiest and best line of trade.

My hon. friend speaks of freight. I do not minimize what he says. Unquestionably one of the most important things today in Canada is the carrying out and the full development of a thorough system of cold storage to get our produce, fruit produces especially, to England in the best possible form. The institution of the fast service on the Atlantic, a weekly service which can be counted upon with a capacity of 1,000 tons a week of freight, with cold storage, is the necessary complement of any scheme of the kind. These are the ships that would have the capacity and the equipment for carrying the freight that

has to go by rapid boats and to go frequently during the year, not being able to wait for the ordinary freight accommodation. Then upon the general question of freight my view is, and I submit it to the House and to the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) as being in accordance with the development of business in past times in this and other countries, that the best way to bring about the full and effective development of a freight route is to make that route absolutely safe, to make it well known, so that every sea captain will be willing to make use of it. We have had great disadvantages in connection with the St. Lawrence route. Every patriotic Canadian has regretted the accidents which have taken place on that route, and we all desire to see the route improved to the greatest possible extent. I am sure that every hon. member of this House must have been gratified to see from the newspaper reports that the city of Montreal is at last coming to her own in connection with the freight business, and that American ports are waking up to the fact that freight is coming to the port of Montreal in greater volume than before. That is due to the steady improvement of the St. Lawrence route. That improvement has been slow, but it has been sure. It has gone on as rapidly as the conditions of the country would allow. And, even though you had any amount of money, these improvements take time. I am satisfied that the time is coming when every stigma that has rested upon the St. Lawrence route in past years will be removed. And when that time comes, when you are landing passengers from fast boats on the Atlantic ocean at the city of Halifax in winter, and Quebec in summer, if that should be selected, and the St. Lawrence route has become known as a safe and reliable route, you will have no difficulty whatever about the freight service. The freight boats will come. The rate of insurance will be lowered, and every disadvantage that freight vessels have laboured under in this route will be removed, and we shall have as great freight advantages at Montreal, perhaps greater, than they have at New York or any other American port. So I submit that the true view is that in order to get a freight service developed, the best way is to make the route a good route and a safe route, and one that everybody knows to be good and safe; and the best proof that you have such a route is that the fast steamers make use of the route. As an illustration of what the institution of such a service does for freight, consider for a moment the case of Germany. Any one would have thought, when Germany started out to build fast passenger boats, that it was the sheerest nonsense for her to pursue the policy she did. She was doing a fairly large business with the United States, but she deliberately went to work to build the most expensive and fastest passenger boats on the sea. What for? For no other purpose than as an advertisement to show what Germans could do. And the growth of trade on the part of Germany as the result of her enterprise and success in connection with the maritime matters, particularly with reference to her development of these fast passenger boats, has been enormous. Every man who studies the subject of European and American exchanges is aware of the enormous trade that has come to Germany by reason of the improvement of her passenger service. Now, if that has followed in the case of Germany running passenger ships to the United States, an alien country, a country alien in language, alien in sentiment, and with a strong protective tariff —if that result has followed such action on the part of Germany as between Germany and the United States, what may we not expect to follow if such a policy is adopted as between Canada, Great Britain and Australia, countries that are not alien in language or sentiment, but friendly and anxious to do all the trade they can with one another.

I do no desire to speak at length; these are considerations that occurred to me while listening to my hon. friend from North Toronto and the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). There is, of course, the question of finance which is a serious and important question. There is the question as to what is Canada's immediate duty. The question of time is a serious and important question in connection with matters of this kind. For my part, I do not share the view—which is held, I hope, not by many members of this House, yet the view which seems at times to obtain—that there is much to deplore in connection with the past history of Canada and her work in improving her means of transportation. My belief is that no country in the world has ever accomplished so much in the way of overcoming natural obstacles to transportation, in the same length of time, as the few million people in Canada have done. I give full credit to every one who has had anything to do with that development, whether his sympathies were with the other side of the House or with this. It should be a source of national pride that we have overcome these obstacles. When we see one Transcontinental Railway in full operation, another reaching completion, and the Canadian Northern, which will probably before long be a transcontinental line, three direct lines to Canadian outlets; when we think of the great sacrifices that have been made to develop our transportation system; surely we can have the necessary complement, that which follows as the day the night, we can add to that general system an ocean service which shall put us on the same footing in respect to this, as that upon which we stand in the general business of the country. Sir,

what answer can we make when we are told that, while Canada is developing very rapidly, while she is improving her internal transportation system tremendously, she is still satisfied to remain on a side street, still satisfied to remain dependent for the ordinary interests of business upon the courtesy and good will of our neighbours to the south? It ought not to be so. It seems to me the time has come when Canada can afford what is, in this respect, a necessity for her national growth and development.

And it should be done now. Mr. Speaker, even if you allow that everything will be done that can be done, and done with all reasonable speed, it will be impossible to bring this service about inside of four years, probably five years. You have to get the several governments together; there are the interminable discussions between the members of the several governments; the British government has been brought in; the four parliaments have to be consulted. In view of all that is to be done, it is not to be expected that this can be brought into effect inside of four or five years. Then if we are going to do it for this generation, the time has arrived when we ought to make a beginning. Temporary financial difficulties which afflict us at the present time, will not, we hope, remain to trouble us four or five years from now. This temporary financial depression will pass away; it was a natural thing; a necessary thing; a good thing. For, it is as necessary in connection with the business corpus that it should have periods of recuperation as it is in connection with our physical bodies. We cannot keep going at full speed all the time. This necessary lull in business had to come. It has come. It has not hurt Canada seriously. In a year or two we shall have emerged from it, and I think that, if we have then been afraid to begin the steps necessary to bring this great project into effect, every one will feel that we have made a very serious mistake. I do not desire to be understood as advocating a reckless financial policy. I am not on my feet for the purpose of critising the financial policy of the government; but I am free to say that if, at the end of four or five years, in consequence of arrangements made in pursuance of this resolution, we shall be called upon to pay the subsidy for the purpose of securing this service, I think that some of the expenditures which this parliament is authorizing might well be cut out for the purposes of furnishing the means for this subsidy. Under any circumstances, many of the things we are called upon to do now, we shall not be called on to do then. We are accomplishing great works, they are passing into the region of things accomplished, and what we have to do is look to the future. For my part I am satisfied that my hon. friends opposite can hardly expect the House to take the position that after the representatives of Canada have gone to the imperial conference and become parties to the resolution adopted by that conference, the House should decline to endorse the position they took. And I am convinced my right hon. friend, the First Minister, can confidently ask the House to stand by the position he took at the conference.

Mr. W. COCKSHUTT (Brantford). As an ardent advocate of all things tending to the unity of the empire, I take particular interest in this discussion. The first part of the resolution is one that commends itself to all parties in the House. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition expressed his agreement in that part, submitted to us as the result of the conference held in London a little over a year ago. I am not so much concerned regarding how the right hon. the First Minister arrived at his present opinions as I am glad to know he has made some advance along broad lines and is advocating the policy he formerly opposed and which we on this side have been advocatng for many years. The question of intercommunication between Great Britain and the various constituents of the empire is one that should have the earnest attention and consideration of every citizen of the empire; and it is, as a citizen of the empire and a Canadian that I desire to make a very few observations on the question before the House. I have listened with much attention and interest to the remarks of my hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Sifton), and I have read over the speech he made during the budget debate and noticed particularly the figures he presented on page 5355. In that speech he said, speaking of the expense:

It has been suggested that a reasonable allocation of the proportions of that million pounds sterling to the various contracting parties would be:

Australia	£ 75,000
New Zealand	100,000
Canada	325,000
Great Britain	500,000

These are very large figures, but I can quite understand that we might receive full value in return if the money were wisely expended. But there is one thing I cannot understand in the policy propounded by the First Minister and the hon. member for Brandon, and that is why South Africa is left entirely out in the cold. South Africa is one of the most important colonies of the empire, almost directly on the route to New Zealand and Australia, and it would not be a very difficult proposition for the steam service to touch at some port in South Africa as well as New Zealand and Australia. If South Africa were brought in, the advantages might be greater and the expenses to the other constituents of the empire somewhat less, as no doubt British South Africa would be ready to

contribute a fair share, as well as the other colonies, for the service proposed.

There is one feature I have not yet heard touched upon and which to me appears to be the key-not of the situation. Since the Prime Minister has taken strong grounds upon the question of transportation, I do not see why he should have overlooked the question of a mutual preference between Great Britain and her colonies. On looking over the report of the colonial conference, I find that the First Minister took a less advanced position with regard to mutual preferential trade than with regard to mutual transportation facilities. The starting point should be the effecting of a mutual preference arrangement between Great Britain and her various colonies. Have we made any advance in that line? No doubt the First Minister will say that Canada has already held out the olive branch and given Great Britain considerable concessions. But that is a jug-handled policy which gives little or no advantage to the Canadian people. We consequently sacrificed a large part of the duties we might have collected on these goods and have had no return and are not in as good a position as we were in a few years ago. We have surrendered a large part of our market to Great Britain and in return have not received a penny of preference to recoup us. A few years ago Canadian cattle were admitted to the British market free. They could be landed alive and were considered the best supply of meat that went into the British market. That meant an immense revenue to the farmers of our country. In the province of Ontario, immense herds of cattle were daily on our markets where they were herded together and shipped to Great Britain, and the average price of our cattle has considerably diminished since our cattle have been scheduled in such a way as not to be allowed to land alive in the old country. That is one question the government should take up with the view of opening up trade for our ships to carry. Australia submitted certain financial propositions a year ago, but I have not heard that any response has been made by this government with the view of developing the trade that should be carried on these ships. It is all very well to put ships on the ocean but you have to supply them with cargoes, and I want to fill them with cargoes profitable alike to the buyer and the seller, the consumer and the producer. But the government are providing transportation without saying where the cargo is to come from. A business proposition would be to establish a mutual preferential trade between Great Britain, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. Why not follow the course this government lately did with regard to France? They gave us the treaty first—which treaty, I believe, has since miscarried—and then allowed a subsidy to the line which would carry the products resulting from that treaty. Why not do the same thing here? Negotiate your treaties, produce your trade which is going to utilize the fleet of ships, and that being done the success of the steamship lines will be assured. But nothing of the kind has been done. No advance was made by the Prime Minister and his assistants in London with reference to the great question of preferential trade with Great Britain. The possibilities of the trade between Canada and her sister colonies and Great Britain are greater, more valuable and would be more profitable than all the treaties that can be negotiated by this government with all other foreign powers combined. The markets are there and the people, and all we have to do is produce the goods and we are producing them and will produce them in greater quantities in the near future. What we want is matured arrangements between Great Britain and her various colonies which would place Canada in a position she has never yet occupied.

We cannot lend our attention to that question too soon. I regret that this question has been brought to the House at this very late stage when we can scarcely give any time to its consideration. But, as has been shown very clearly by my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), this proposition of establishing a fast steamship service between Canada and Great Britain is not new. It is an old proposition that has been before the House on many occasions. It is a proposition that has been endorsed by the business men not only of Canada but of the empire, and, for the purpose of laying before the House, the views of the business men of the empire as assembled in Montreal in 1903 and as reported in the 'Report of the Fifth Congress of the Chambers of Commerce of the Empire' held in Montreal, Canada, on the 17th, 18th, 19th, 20th and 21st of August, 1903.' I desire to read a resolution which was submitted at that meeting by one of Montreal's leading citizens. It reads as follows:

> Moved by Mr. Robert Reford, that this congress considers it of the utmost importance to the interests of the empire that the United Kingdom and her colonies should adopt a policy under which lines of steamships will be secured and retained for (1) the provision of fast mail service on the several routes; and (2) the development and control of trade between the mother country and her possessions, and between the colonies themselves.

That resolution was discussed by 500 chosen delegates representing every principal town and city throughout the British empire and was carried by an almost unanimous vote. In 1906 the Sixth Congress, comprising the same Chambers of Commerce of the empire, met in London, England, and almost the same resolution was passed as follows:

Moved by Mr. R. Wilson-Smith, Montreal—Resolved, that this congress hereby reaffirms the following resolution, adopted at the last congress held in Montreal, in August, 1903: 'That this congress considers it of the utmost importance, to the interests of the empire, that the United Kingdom and her colonies should adopt a policy under which lines of steamships will be secured and retained for—

1. The provision of fast mail services on the several routes; and

2. The development and control of trade between the mother country and her possessions, and between the colonies themselves.

These resolutions were passed almost unanimously in these meetings of commercial men assembled from all parts of the empire. So that the proposition which the government brings down is not a new one. It is true that it is a somewhat advanced position for this government to take. It is to be regretted that this is not a very opportune time to talk of devoting large sums to be taken out of the public treasury to any enterprises at all. I could only wish that a fraction of the amount that is being sunk, for the present, at all events in the Grand Trunk Pacific, could have been withheld in order that we might have a subsidized line of steamships to carry the products of Canada to different parts of the British empire. That is a project that is worthy of the greatest consideration, and as a citizen of Canada and of the empire I desire to discuss this question entirely free from all party prejudice as I believe that this side of the House has always held the banner in regard to being the imperialistic party, if there is such in Canada, and that it has always desired to improve the relations between the mother country and the colonies. That being the case, we could not oppose the spirit of the resolution as brought down and which embodies the view of the late Colonial Conference. The amendment moved by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) I think does not change the resolution in any particular. It is not a negative at all, as the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) has stated, but it is simply saying that in any such arrangement as is contemplated we must have full regard to the possibilities of the carrying trade with reference to products of all kinds to and from the various parts of the empire, that they must be carried in cold storage where necessary and that all possible consideration must be given to the development of the trade of the country rather than to the carrying of passengers upon either the Atlantic or Pacific. Very few of our own citizens who go across the ocean want to go in very fast ships, but the proper transportation of the products which are daily going out of Canada means dollars and cents in the pocket of every farmer in Canada. So that the first consideration should be given to the transportation of our products in a cheap, efficient and safe way, in a way that will preserve them in the best condition so that when they arrive on the British market, or on any of the colonial markets, it will be found that they will bring the highest prices. Therefore, I think the rider that has been proposed by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition is one that we might well adopt. I trust that the right hon. leader of the government will see his way to join with my hon. friend the leader of the opposition in this and that we may have a united House on what is really an imperial question. Let this resolution, as amended by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition be the unanimous voice of this House. I think it would have a great effect throughout the empire. It would be doing something to consolidate the empire and in my opinion it would be a great step in advance for the commercial interests of Canada and of the empire as a whole. It is my intention to support the resolution as amended by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition. I trust that the right hon. leader of the House will see his way to incorporate these few words in the resolution so that it may go out to the world, to Great Britain and the colonies, that we are on this empire matter comparatively a unit in this country and that when it comes to discussing these broad imperial questions in a business way we do not allow small-minded politics to creep in, but are prepared to do our utmost to further the object which we all have so much at heart—the unification, consolidation and development of the greatest empire that the world has ever seen. If it is the desire of this House to contribute to that end I hope that the resolution, as amended by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, will be adopted, and I trust that the same spirit that has been displayed in the discussion so far may characterize it up to the finish and that we may present a united front upon this question. I have spoken of the chambers of commerce of the empire. They held their fifth meeting in Montreal and their sixth in London. Only yesterday I saw heralded in the press that the seventh has been called and where has it been called? Away out in the Antipodes, in Australia. The next meeting of the chambers of commerce of the empire will be held in Australia. The limelight will then be turned on the transportation facilities of the empire. Business men from all over the world, from all parts of the empire, will be going to Australia to take part in that great congress and the very question that is before this House to-day will be one that will be agitating every business man, every board of trade, every chamber of commerce throughout the empire because they have all to get there. They will want to get there in the best possible way, they will want to get there expeditiously, safely and in comfort. But I say that we should not sacrifice the con-

sideration of material advantage to that of speed. It is all very well to travel in very fast ships, but it is a great deal better to travel in comfort and safety. The interests of the navy of Great Britain cannot be any more advanced than by the extension of the mercantile marine to all the seas that couple the various parts of the empire, placing upon them a class of ships that will carry safely and expeditiously both the passengers and trade of the great British empire. It is well known that in times of war the mercantile marine is the first adjunct of the navy and that fact should not be lost sight of in the consideration of a question of this kind. It is a matter that presents itself to the advanced man as one of importance. Every ship that you place upon the ocean not only carries mails, passengers and cargo from one part of the empire to another but is also a source of strength and help in time of stress and danger because it affords safe transport for troops, a means of getting supplies to any part of the earth in a short time, and it is one of the most valuable adjuncts that can be given a nation for its safety, prosperity and welfare. When the vote is taken on this resolution I trust it will be found that both sides of the House with united voice will give their support to what I conceive to be one of the greatest factors for the advancement and consolidation of the British empire in its various constituent parts.

Mr. WM. ROCHE (Halifax). I agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Cockshutt) that we should have unanimity on this resolution, for this certainly is a question which is not controversial. The people of Canada are not so much interested in the contest as to who applied the epithet 'All-Red' to this project, or as to who were the best friends of this enterprise in the past, as they are in the question: Who are the best friends of the enterprise now? He who will demonstrate that fact in this House and in the country will do more to enlist the gratitude of Canadians than one who, for the sake of political controversy, endeavours to make out that one political party was more interested in the project than was the other. I regret that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) imparted a political tinge to this debate. It may be that his combative energies have been so exercised lately that unconsciously polemic controversy comes upwards in his mind—anyhow, the leader of the opposition dispelled the idea that we were to have entire unanimity. I looked to him for moderate counsel so that the House might be united on the question in the manner prayed for by my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt), but instead of coalescence the leader of the opposition introduced an amendment which practically will have the effect of making this a party question, although in its opening paragraph the amendment does speak of acquiescence in the principle, but not in practical details or in the operation of it as a practical measure. There has been throughout the country—there certainly has been in the maritime ports, where the subject was originally of more interest than it was in the interior of the country—a difference of opinion as to whether a comparatively slow service of 16 or 17 knots would not better serve the exigencies of the country than a more rapid service of 20 knots or over. That controversy waged in parliament. However, the discussion on that point as a practical issue has almost passed, because of the fact that a 17-knot service has been tried and has been successfully established along commercial lines. Such a service does not require so much of government aid in the way of subsidy, and it may be fairly left to achieve its own part in the commerce of the country. That controversy was not confined to politicians in the Canadian parliament or to opposing views in our commercial centres, but it was taken up by the steamboat companies themselves, and some of these companies which are esteemed to be the most highly advanced and most in touch with the freight and passenger traffic of the Atlantic have rather retrograded from the very fast service of 20, 22 and 23 knots to a service of 16 and 17 knots. The controversy existed between the directors of leading steamship lines who had experience in both directions. The White Star line, which has the largest ships in the Atlantic service, have gone back from the 'Oceanic' of 20 or 21 knots to the 'Republic' of 16 or 17 knots, and they are building monster ships which are not intended to attain a very high speed. The Hamburg-American line, which was the first to produce a fast ship, have also retrograded and they have built four enormous boats which make a speed of 17 or 18 knots. The 'Kaiserin Augusta,' 25,000 tons and accommodation for 3,000 passengers, is an 18-knot boat, and the 'Amerika,' the 'President Grant' and the 'President Lincoln' are of similar speed. Some of the White Star boats now run to Southampton instead of to Liverpool; they have enormous capacity with moderate speed and large passenger accommodation fitted up with all the adjuncts to luxury which modern travel requires. I may say that the experience of this present year has to a large extent justified those who build large ships of great capacity and comparatively slow, because the reflux of passenger traffic in the immense number of continental Europeans who have gone from the United States back to their native land has, on the return voyages filled all the space that was previously occupied by light cargo, and great difficulty has been found even on those enor-

mous boats in providing accommodation for the middle class and steerage passengers. In the minds of a number of gentlemen in this House, and in the mind of the public generally, the 'Mauretania' and the 'Lusitania' have set up the standard of what a fast Atlantic ship should be. The British government furnished the Cunard Company with a large amount of money at a low rate of interest, and also gave them a large subsidy, so that they might obtain the prestige of having the fastest ships on the Atlantic, the German builders having wrested from the British builders the reputation for constructing the fastest, best appointed and most luxuriously fitted passenger ships. But it was not only sentiment that prompted the British people to the desire to have the fastest ships, nor was it altogether that these fast ships would be a powerful adjunct in war. There was the further inducement that the prestige of building the very fastest ships was of immense advantage to the British shipbuilders, whose trade was waning and who, in consequence of regaining their reputation, would have the advantage of securing orders from foreign owners who wanted vessels of that class. The competition was between the British and German builders as to the cost of production as well as to the turning out of the fastest and most economical ships. The 'Mauretania' and the 'Lusitania' are of great size, of great speed, of luxurious furnishing, but they are very costly. Many who would otherwise advocate a fast Canadian line have been deterred from this advocacy through the belief that vessels equal to the 'Lusitania' and the 'Mauretania' would be necessary for the Canadian trade. It is a fallacy to suppose that we need vessels of that extremely costly type. The Cunard Company have, in addition to these steamers, vessels of less speed and power and cost, but of greater capacity for the carriage of freight. I believe the great lines usually run cargo boats in conjunction with their fast boats. The North German Lloyds has been spoken of. They were the pioneers in using very fast steamers. They have on the Atlantic to-day four steamers of 23 knots, which are fitted equal to the Cunard steamers, have all the modern appliances for comfort, and make the trip from Cherbourg to New York in six days. They are interchangeable with regard to berths and accommodation, the one with the other, which gives them an immense advantage. They have lately put on the New York route a steamer called the 'Kronprintzessin Cecile,' about 700 feet in length by about 70 feet broad. A ship with a little more horse-power, say 5,000, would make the passage from Halifax to a port on the western coast of England in four days, summer and winter, and there is no other port in America from which a service of that kind could be maintained. Four steamers of that size and power would be sufficient to maintain such a service continuously summer and winter, because at Halifax they would not be delayed by the tides, but could proceed at any time to the ocean. Therefore this question is not one of vague cost, as was intimated by my hon. friend from North Toronto, but is confined within narrow limits of cost. The success of these large ships is very largely governed by the amount of subsidy that will be available.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. About how much would these boats cost ?

Mr. WM. ROCHE (Halifax). About $3,000,000 each. The New York lines obtain from the southern and western states a large passenger list of wealthy people who pay for suites of rooms and other special accommodation. It will not be necessary to incur such large expense on our boats; nor will it be necessary to furnish them so luxuriously as the New York boats. An immense advantage will accrue from diverting to the Canadian line British passengers who now go for the sake of speed to New York. Passing through Canada, they will become acquainted with the resources and possibilities of our country. And this is not a remote thing that is to be catered for 25 years hence, or even 10 years hence; but it is something to be catered for now, when public opinion is formative, when people are making their calculations, when business men are making their connections, and studying how and where they can best extend their business. I do not need to go in greater detail into a comparison of boats and routes. We know that both New York and Liverpool are bar harbours. New York dominates Liverpool. If I were asked for advice, I would say, go to a port on the west coast of England in direct communication with London and the contient. Where speed is the prime factor, there is no route between Halifax and a southern port on the west coast of England. A remark made by the hon. leader of the opposition has been enlarged upon—that these boats could not carry perishable freight. I think that is the substance of the hon. gentleman's amendment.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN If the hon gentleman will pardon me, I was not speaking of ships of any particular kind. I was merely desiring to emphasize the point, which the hon. gentleman has already remarked upon, that there should be facilities for carrying freight.

Mr. WM. ROCHE. I listened attentively to my hon friend the leader of the opposition, and although he did not expressly state it, the whole course of his remarks, and also of his amendment, tended to the position that this is a comparative question, not an absolute one, and therefore it would

be better to do something else than to do immediately what is proposed by the government. And one of the stated reasons was that the farmers might have the advantage of shipping their ordinary agricultural products, and also their perishable goods. Now, there is nothing to prevent cold storage accommodation being provided on these ships. If that were done, fancy products, such as fruit and other things, could be carried in these ships much better than by any line of freight steamers that could be subsidized or invented; because the great element would be speed. A great many products that could not be sent by an ordinary freight line, even with cold storage, could be sent by a fast line. Merchants and others passing over the line would see opportunities for increasing business, and the English market for our products would be very much extended, because they could be carried by this fast line to the best market in the world, which they have not hitherto been able to reach because of the want of rapid transit. With regard to the remark of the premier of New Zealand, that he stipulated that freight should be carried on the Pacific steamers, I am not going to speak in regard to the Pacific end of this project, as some of our friends from British Columbia are going to deal with that feature of the subject. I will merely say that if a fast line were maintained for so long a voyage as from Vancouver to Australia, it would be impossible for it to carry any great burden of freight. The amount of coal that would be necessary to maintain a vessel at a speed of 18 or 20 knots on the Pacific, would exclude any amount of heavy freight, and only a small space could be reserved for the more valuable and compact goods. Therefore for the future heavy freight would have to be carried by another kind of ship.

The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) this afternoon expressed anxiety for our fellow citizens of the empire in South Africa. It is a good way out of the line of travel from Vancouver to Australia, but it shows his cosmopolitan regard for sentiment and his love for the old flag; but I can assure him that the British public have well provided for the trade of South Africa and onwards from there to Australia; they have steamers of very large size, with good passenger accommodation and that is a trade which they intend to build to its utmost capacity. There is in that country a very strong English sentiment, a sentiment to deal with the mother country. That has been well provided for and the lines well established. I think my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) and I can afford to leave our co-citizens of the empire in South Africa to the kindness of the people of England and to the care of those companies which are at present engaged in the South African trade.

It was hoped that the introduction of the turbine engine would solve a great many questions, but unfortunately the turbine engine is not more economical in the consumption of coal than the old style of engine. It is only on vessels of very high power that there is economy in the turbine and therefore the anticipation that the turbines would permit of longer voyages with the same supply of coal has not been fulfilled. Various companies have been experimenting; the German companies have adhered to the old reciprocating type, some of the British lines have adopted the turbine and the British government has been experimenting with oil fuel. But these experiments are not yet completed and it is not possible to state any results. Many interested people thought that the turbine engine would solve the problem of coal carrying capacity but as yet that has not been accomplished.

Great Britain has a great interest in this project. The leader of the opposition and the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) called that a sentimental interest. I cannot say where the bounds between sentiment and material interest lie, but it is surely true that the amount of advantage to Great Britain will determine the amount which Great Britain will contribute to this joint project. It is not merely a question of distance but it is also a question of safety. Great Britain is looking constantly to securing fast merchant ships to supplement the navy, as was well remarked by my hon. friend from Brantford, and this line will afford useful ships for this purpose when required. It is also of great advantage to the British government to have a safe and rapid line of communication available in time of exigency, away from Europe, which would not be menaced by the navy of hostile powers. There is great rivalry as to which shall be the predominant naval power and the further the line of communication is carried away from Europe and the passage of the Suez canal, the safer are the British possessions in the east and the wide stretching British commerce to be found in every sea. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) have perhaps not looked up the statistics of the immense damage inflicted on British commerce in the short war of independence with the United States and the war with the United States in 1812, when American privateers pushed right up to the British channel and captured whole fleets of merchantmen owing to their speed. I recommend my friends to study these subjects at their leisure and give their views at some later stage because they tend to show the immense importance of this subject to the British empire, and also that a liberal participation in this plan is essential to the efficient government and holding of British

colonial possessions. We are not looking for war. The leader of the oppposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) said it was extremely necessary that the farmers should have cheap and rapid accommodation on ships equipped with cold storage and lower rates of freight for their products. The rates of freight from Canada to Great Britain to-day are extremely low on heavy goods. My friends will remember that there are hundreds of thousands of tons of shipping laid up in England at the present time because the vessels are not able to obtain remunerative rates of freights. This government also has subsidized lines of steamers to carry freight with some regularity to compete with freight carried on the great lines from the United States. The government has been liberal in providing for this service, and there has been no complaint, by the leader of the opposition or anybody else, on the ground of excessive freights from Canada to the old country. I would like to see our shipments to Great Britain increase, I would like to see every facility afforded to the farmers, I would like to see cold storages established at every point where it would be of advantage. But the government has not protected that particular interest. I would also like to see the farmers of Ontario make more frequent passages to the old country and establish agencies under their own control for the distribution of their products there so that they would reap the whole advantage from their sale. I had remarked that this project must be dealt with comparatively. Well, we know the cost of this somewhat definitely; also there are limitations under which it will be necessary for Canada to assent to any proposals that are not fair or adequate. Only the other day, we passed a measure to extend a railway to Hudson bay, involving an expenditure of about a hundred millions. I did not hear any of these eloquent voices on the other side raised against that. We had the project of the Georgian bay canal involving a sum, we are told, of a hundred millions.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not hear about that.

Mr. WM. ROCHE (Halifax). Did not the hon. gentleman hear it stated that it would cost a hundred millions for the Georgian Bay canal?

Mr. FOSTER. I did not hear the Minister of Railways say it was going through.

Mr. WM. ROCHE (Halifax). Perhaps the hon. gentleman was out. But I am only speaking in round numbers. I have understood that the Hudson Bay proposal would cost something like a hundred millions.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, my no! I did not hear that.

Mr. WM. ROCHE.

Mr. WM. ROCHE (Halifax). I heard no objection to the building of the Hudson Bay Railway.

Mr. FOSTER. I was in favour of it for my part.

Mr. WM. ROCHE (Halifax). Very well, then the hon. gentleman is committed to it whatever it may cost. And it was supposed to cost a large amount of money. And there was no opposition to that proposal. But here is a proposal within extremely small limitations. Formerly it was supposed to involve an expenditure of $500,000 to $700,000 annually. This proposal as stated by my hon. friend will not involve more than $1,000,000. This affects the interests of eastern Canada, it affects the interests of all the continent through which this line of communication passes; it affects the interests of the people on the western ocean; all are interested in this proposal, and nobody, up to the present time, has shown that any disadvantages are to accrue from it. When the expenditure is so limited, why should we have an amendment declaring that this is injudicious or inexpedient at the present time, especially when we have embarked upon proposals that will cost a large amount of money, and more especially when one of the routes to be provided, that by Hudson bay, is open it is said by some, for two months in the year, and by some for four. Here is a route that is opened the whole year round. It opens possibilities greater than any body has been able to prophesy. If we consider the possibilities of the development of Canada we shall give to a project which helps in the realization of those possibilities the hearty and unanimous assent of this House, backed by the enthusiasm of a growing and progressive people.

Mr. A. E. KEMP (East Toronto). I do not intend to go into this subject in great detail, as we are trying to end this debate and close the session with as little delay as possible. Nor do I intend to go into the historical phase of the question of the fast Atlantic service. It is pretty well known to the people of Canada that during the past twelve or fifteen years, or perhaps more, this question has been fully discussed. I shall discuss the question from the standpoint of to-day, and consider it in the light of conditions as they exist. The hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) says he is sorry that the government is not receiving the enthusiastic support in this measure which he would expect it to receive. Well, it did not occur to me, while the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was addressing the House upon this project, that that right hon. gentleman was over-enthusiastic with regard to it himself. If ever I saw the Prime Minister handle a question with a pair of tongs I saw him do so to-day. The

hon. member for Brandon, I notice, differed with the Prime Minister with respect to the speed of these vessels upon the Atlantic. If I understood the Prime Minister correctly, that right hon. gentleman advocated a 20-knot service. But the hon. member for Brandon still insists that this service should be by vessels of 24 knots an hour. This is a difference of opinion between the Prime Minister and member for Brandon with regard to one of the most important things in this scheme. It seems to me also that the hon. member (Mr. Sifton) has not been able to convert certain other members of the cabinet. The leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) read an extract from a speech made on this subject by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher). And I have every reason to believe that the Minister of Agriculture entertains the same view with regard to this service as he did when he made that speech. So, the hon. member for Brandon need not complain about the attitude of the opposition when he has not been able to win even members of the cabinet to his own view upon this project which lies so near his heart. I said that I did not intend to go into the historical aspect of this question. But it is necessary that I should refer briefly to the fact that the sum of $750,000 was voted, I believe, by the former administration to aid this fast Atlantic service. At that time, the service on the Atlantic was very poor. The time occupied between Liverpool and Canada was about double the time taken by the steamers of to-day. During these years, private enterprise, with the improvement of conditions, has given us pretty nearly what was laid out in the terms and conditions of the contract it was then desired to enter into. But, more than that, I would point out that this government, as stated by the hon. member for Brandon, is paying out pretty nearly the amount which the former administration proposed to provide for the fast Atlantic service. According to the figures given by the hon. gentleman, this government is paying $680,000 per annum to carry the mails, and, I suppose, subsidize the steamship service upon the Atlantic, which is pretty nearly as much as the amount voted under the former administration. I am glad that through the enterprise of two corporations, we have to-day an efficient service on the Atlantic without the expenditure of an enormous sum. That could hardly have been expected at the time the contract I referred to, as made by a former administation, was voted upon in this House.

This question we are discussing not only embodies a fast Atlantic service on the Atlantic, which is the most important from our standpoint, but it also embodies the putting of faster trains on the railways crossing the continent—that would apply to the Canadian Pacific Railway—and a better steamship service on the Pacific ocean between Vancouver, New Zealand and Australia. We have to look at this matter entirely from the standpoint of carrying mails and passengers, and cannot expect that vessels, such as we intend to put on the Atlantic, which have a speed of 24 knots an hour, will be of the slightest advantage to the people as far as freights are concerned.

I shall not take up the time of this House referring at any length to the sentimental aspect of the question. I wish to endorse the words uttered by Premier Deakin, of Australia, and telegraphed to this country via London by the Associated Press a day or two ago :

London, July 7.—A despatch from Melbourne says that Premier Deakin, commenting on Sir Wilfrid Laurier's request for Australia's co-operation as to the All-Red route, says the Commonwealth must have a definite financial proposal before he can advise action. The whole question had now narrowed down to cost, as the sentimental benefits were admitted long ago.

That is the position I take. The sentimental benefits which would arise from the bringing closer together the various parts of the empire are admitted. And while I am prepared to criticise the resolution submitted to this House, I do not want to be considered any the less a loyal subject of the empire ; I do not think I will be, and, in fact, I do not care whether I am so considered or not. So far as the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) is concerned, what he proposes is a different scheme from what the Prime Minister brings down. The hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) thinks that $1,000,000 is a very small thing with which to charge the country for all time to come. Well, considering all the heavy expenditure to which the government has committed us, in view of the excellent service we have on the Atlantic at present, I think this proposed extra expenditure of $1,000,000 per year is a very serious one. Capitalize that amount of interest at 3½ per cent and you have a capital expenditure of $30,000,000, besides the subsidy we are now paying of $680,000 per year. If this government is going into a project which will involve the borrowing of $30,000,000, I think the project is one not to be at all likely lightly considered.

The hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) referred to the great development in Germany, which he attributed to their enterprise in subsidizing fast steamships. My own view is that the great development of Germany is not due to her fast Atlantic steamships, although that service may have been a factor to some small extent. But the fact is that some years ago, when the craze was on, each country was competing with the other as to which should have the

fastest Atlantic service. The 'Lucania' and the 'Campania' were built by the Cunard line and were the fastest steamers afloat. Then the Germans came on with faster steamers. A few years ago the great financier, Mr. Pierpont Morgan, appeared on the scene and attempted to consolidate certain British and American lines. That caused a sort of spasm in Great Britain, and for fear that the competition created by this great amalgamation would drive British passenger vessels of the fastest type from the Atlantic, and under the influence of that alarm, the British government subsidized two steamers built by the Cunard line, the 'Mauretania' and 'Lusitania,' but that these vessels have been an unqualified success is questioned. While we have the 'Campania' and 'Lucania' on the Atlantic it has been demonstrated that a great many people prefer to travel by slower vessels. From what I have been able to learn, this fast Atlantic travel is more of a fad than anything else. Where two vessels, such as the 'Mauretania' and 'Lusitania,' have been built, there have been twenty-five or thirty others built, more commodious and comfortable vessels, which run seventeen or eighteen knots an hour, and these have taken the business. The Cunard line, many years after they had the 'Campania' and 'Lucania' on the Atlantic, built two steamers, the 'Caronia' and 'Carmania,' which are always crowded with passengers. To suppose that every one who travels on the Atlantic wants to save half a day or a day is simply a fad. While some may think the saving of a day of great importance, a great number of the traveling public do not. I have said what the Cunard line have done; other lines have done the same. The Hamburg-American owns the 'Deutschland,' built for the New York to Liverpool business. She has been put on the New York and Mediterranian service during the winter time. Then the company have built and worked successfully vessels of great capacity which make slower time, such as the 'President Lincoln,' 'President Grant' and 'Amerika.' Probably the 'Amerika' is the most popular, and of the White Star line the 'Cedric' and 'Baltic' and 'Arabic' are among the most popular. Other companies have not pinned their faith to the extreme type of fast Atlantic vessels. Comfort and security count for something with certain people who travel on the Atlantic.

My right hon. friend the First Minister figured out that a 20-knot service would make the trip in five days across the Atlantic. Well, steamships plying to Great Britain at present take five and a-half days from Liverpool to Rimouski and six to Montreal. Are we going to pay this extra $1,000,000 for the purpose of saving half a day or a day? In my opinion, the scheme is not practicable. There is no demand for it. The time is not opportune for considering it. Twelve years ago the conditions were entirely different. Since then we have been able to secure, on a commercial basis, a service, furnished voluntarily by people well posted in the trade, which is certainly as good as the desired service in many respects.

The hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) said it would take time, after passing the resolution, to bring all the parties together and decide on a joint agreement, and that it would be five years before we can have the ships on the ocean. I believe that in three years, or in four years at any rate, we will have a 20-knot service on the Atlantic. We have at the present time an all-red route, so called. I will not quarrel with the premier or any one else who wishes to have the credit of having invented that name. It is a matter of very little importance to me what you call it, but we have an all-red line from Great Britain to Canada and from Canada to Australia and New Zealand. Only to-day I saw a gentleman who had recently come from Australia on the steamers which are plying on the Pacific which service is being improved. He came across in a ship of 7,000 tons, he had a pleasant voyage and the passengers were well satisfied with the treatment they received and the accommodation they had on that vessel. I endorse what has been said by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) regarding the importance of freight traffic. If we have this amount of money to spend and if we feel that we ought to spend it in this way we would be doing something which would be of far greater service to this country if we did something in the direction of obtaining better freight rates for the products of Canada and of extending the cold storage facilities in a way that will make them of greater benefit to producers than they are at the present time. I do not want to be stampeded into endorsing the vague plan suggested by this resolution. I do not understand how the premier expected this resolution to go through the House unanimously. The time has come when we should stop this sort of thing. The time has come when we should get estimates accompanied by a little more information with respect to matters of this kind. The hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) states that some steps ought to be taken but I would like to ask that hon. gentleman as I would like to ask the premier what steps have been taken by the government of Great Britain, New Zealand and Australia. I do not know why we should be expected to take the initiative any more than these other governments. I think that the advantage it would be to save a day or possibly only half a day in the voyage across the ocean has been very much over-estimated. Viewing it from the standpoint that these vessels will be entirely

for the purpose of carrying passengers, that a very small portion of the people travel by the Atlantic or travel at all, and that a great many people prefer such vessels as are on the Atlantic at the present time, I think we should encourage the people who have had the enterprise to do what has been done upon the Atlantic, who have given such a splendid service, rather than create competition by government aid which would discourage men from going on in the future and continuing the splendid work which they have done in the past. I believe that if we are just a little cautious in regard to this matter, a little more sensible, we will have, in the next five years, upon the Atlantic, a far better service than we will have by the voting of $1,000,000, as is proposed by the hon. member for Brandon. Therefore, I will have great pleasure in supporting the amendment of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Mr. Speaker, if there be some possible difference of opinion on this side of the House on details of this question, as suggested, it is quite evident that there must be larger and greater differences of opinion among hon. gentlemen opposite. I take it that the speech of the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) was made in support of this fast line scheme, possibly with some modification of the words, the changing of the phraseology here and there, the dotting of the i's or the crossing of the t's, but the hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. Kemp) has given us his reasons for voting against the whole scheme. Therefore, we must assume, if he is going to vote with the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) on this question, that they have a common ground and that they are really placing themselves in opposition to this whole scheme. If that is not the meaning of the proposition of my hon. friends opposite I must confess that I am unable to see what their purpose is by the amendment which they have presented to the House, because a certain portion of the amendment distinctly declares that you must do nothing immediately. You must not commit yourself to anything, you must come back and tell the House what you have in your mind before you agree to anything. Let us suppose that delegates from this government go to meet the government of New Zealand or of Australia and that they do as my hon. friend the leader of the opposition suggests; they would go there with instructions that they could agree to nothing, commit the government to nothing, bind Canada to nothing, and that would mean the absolute obstruction of this whole scheme. If the whole scheme is a dream and a bad one that position is justifiable, but I do not think that my hon. friends would like to take that position, and certainly that was not the line of action taken by hon. gentlemen opposite——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Was it the intention of the resolution as proposed that the country should be committed to a definite plan and to an expenditure without coming back to parliament ?

Mr. FIELDING. No, what was intended to be accomplished was that this House should first declare its approval of the principle of the fast line service forming part of the All-Red line between England and Australia and New Zealand. My hon. friends opposite say that there is a difference of opinion on this side as to whether that should be a 24 knot or a 20 knot service. I do not see any difficulty on that score. Every one of us, I am sure, would be glad to get a 24-knot service if we could get it at a price which would be reasonably within our ability to pay, but if we cannot get a 24-knot service without paying a price that would seem to us to be excessive then I suppose we would all be very pleased to have, at a moderate price, a substantial improvement upon the service that we already have. Whether you have a 20-knot service, a 21, a 23, or a 24-knot service is a matter of detail and a question of price.

I do not see why there should be this division of opinion in the House to-day. My hon friend from Brantford expressed the view very strongly that we should be unanimous, that there should be no difference whatever. He wishes to be counted among the enthusiastic advocates of this All-Red scheme. I share his feeling that there is no good reason for a difference of opinion. If the principle generally that it is desirable to have a faster service on the Atlantic and a faster service on the Pacific is a principle which we all recognize to be a good one, then I see no reason for the amendment of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition.

We are told that this is not a new question. Very true; and if it is not a new question, if it be one that the House has considered again and again, there can be no reason for complaining that there is not ample time to consider it. If we had brought forward something that was entirely new there might be just cause for complaint on that score. This is not a case in which we are called upon to deal with details. Why should my hon. friend the leader of the opposition think it necessary or expedient to import into this discussion and into an amendment the question of cold storage or freight rates ? These are important questions, truly, but they are not necessarily part of the present side of the discussion; certainly, they are not necessary in the form of an amendment to a resolution which does not profess to deal with details but in which we are content to ask parliament to assert the general principle of the approval of this policy. So, I think

my hon. friend has made a mistake, from our point of view, in insisting that this matter shall be dealt with now as one of detail. As far as the question of a freight service is concerned no one disputes for a moment that the transportation question, in relation to the products of the country, is more important than the question of a passenger service. My hon. friend's amendment would imply that no attention had been given to the question of the freight business of the country. On the contrary, everybody knows that this government has liberally supported the establishment of lines for the development of the freight business of the country. A number of steamship lines are to-day engaged in that very line of business under grants in aid given by this government with the approval of parliament.

The question of freight has been considered, the question of freight will continue to be considered and therefore it is not necessary to assume, when we ask that the principle of a fast line should be affirmed, that we are ignoring or neglecting or not considering the development of the freight business of the country. There has been great progress made on Canadian railways in the separation of passenger and freight traffic and we can see similar development in our ocean carrying trade. It is not many years since the very best railways in the country ran mixed trains where you would have a passenger car and a cattle car following the same engine, but to-day the cattle car is to be found on a cattle train, the lumber and the coarser freight is carried on a train specially intended for that purpose, and the passenger train is operated as a passenger train absolutely distinct from the freight business. A further development is that on many trains there are only first-class cars, and although we have not yet come to it to any extent in Canada it is a quite common thing in the United States to see passenger trains made up entirely of pullmans. I have seen a cattle steamer leaving the port of Halifax which carried His Excellency the Governor General of the day.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Nothing wrong in that.

Mr. FIELDING. Nothing wrong at all except to point to the fact that the passenger steamer of to-day does not as a rule carry cattle. It was the only ship His Excellency could avail of in these days, and like a sensible man he took it and no doubt he would do so to-day under similar conditions. But the point I am making is that owing to the development in the steamship service these conditions do not now exist. The passenger business is being separated from the coarser freight business, and even in what might be called moderately fast steamers comparatively small quantities of freight are carried. I remember crossing on the 'Campania' which was then the crack boat of the Cunard fleet, and the commander told me he did not want more than 1,500 tons of freight, because anything more interfered with his coal capacity for attaining high speed, and the comfort of his passengers. And so on these fast ships will not carry low grade freight at all, although of course cold storage accommodation will be necessary because that is a specialized freight which can stand a higher rate. It is possible to combine cold storage freight with a fast steamship service, but it is not possible to combine with a fast service the carriage of low grade and bulky commodities. There is a tendency to-day, as we know, for many passengers to take what might be called moderately fast steamers.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Large ships.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes. There is no doubt that a great many transatlantic passengers prefer boats like the 'Baltic,' the 'Carmania,' and the 'Caronia, which are of moderate speed and which while carrying passengers with a high degree of comfort also carry a considerable quantity of freight. But the steamship line which will have its 'Carmania,' 'Caronia' and 'Baltic' will have also other very fast boats and without which the line could hardly keep up its reputation. My hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Sifton) said that these very fast boats act as an advertisement, and from that point of view it is desirable that we should have them on the Canadian service. A nation, no less than an individual engaged in business, must attend to its advertising, and if we have steamers of not less than 20 knots, or possibly of 22 knots or 23 or 24 knots if we can get them, I feel satisfied that by bringing through Canada a large stream of first-class passengers who now go to New York, it will have the effect of advertising Canada amongst the people whom we desire should know the vast resources of our country. My hon. friends who are in business advertise in newspapers and spend their money freely, but they seldom can associate a given customer with a given advertisement although they do know that business comes and that if they cease to advertise business will also cease. I believe that even from the point of view of the advertisement it would be well for Canada to have a few of these moderately fast steamers, as fast as we can get. I feel interested in the matter naturally from the point of view of the lower provinces. I sympathize most heartily with my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Roche) in his remarks about the great advantages of the port of Halifax. I have always felt that in all probability, if some day we are to have one port all the year, that port would be Halifax. I have felt that if in the meantime we are to have a winter port probably Halifax would be found the most advantageous, and that the

summer port would undoubtedly have to be Quebec if the ships are of too great draft to permit of them going to Montreal. But while I warmly advocate the claims of Halifax I recognize frankly that this is a question which we must leave to be considered from a broad national point of view. I would be perfectly content, speaking for myself, that if a company should be found to take up this enterprise they should settle for themselves on commercial lines the point of departure in Europe and the point at which their steamers should arrive in Canada. If as a result these steamers should come to my own home in Halifax, well and good, but if, because of the application of sound commercial principles to the enterprise, the ships will go to some other port, then we shall have to be content.

I shall not detain the House further, but naturally feeling a great deal of interest in the question, I thought I might say a few words. I believe that the time is not ripe for this parliament to deal with it as a question of detail, and that all that remains for us to do at the present time is to reaffirm the resolution of the imperial conference. I am sorry my hon. friend the leader of the opposition feels it necessary to introduce that amendment. It seems to me to be unnecessary and I would hope that he could see his way to withdraw it.

As to the financial side of the question, I regret that hon. gentlemen opposite have taken such a pessimistic view. Either they want this service or they do not, and if they do want it is is a pity they should seek to alarm financiers by the story that this is a gross extravagance and that Canada cannot afford it. Canada undoubtedly has many obligations; we have great works in hand, and we have other great works which have claims upon us. This is a time for Canada to exercise all due caution, but it is not a time for timidity. It is a time for Canada to have faith in herself, and while we should hesitate to spend any money wastefully on services which are not calculated to advance the best interests of the country, let us say to ourselves and to the people abroad: we have faith in Canada, we believe she is going to pass quickly through this little temporary depression, which is less here than in any other part of the civilized world; we believe that Canada is able to undertake the various responsibilities which her condition calls for, and that the credit of Canada in the future will be upheld as it has been in the past.

Mr. J. W. DANIEL (St. John, N.B.). It is gratifying to be able in this parliament to speak to a question which cannot in any sense of the term be called a party question. We have already heard of the inception of what is called the All-Red route, which was conceived and tried to be started many years ago; and we all know that even at the present time we have an all-red route from England to Australia and Hong Kong through this country. I listened very carefully to-day to the speech of the right hon. the Prime Minister. I have also read very carefully the resolution which he proposed at the imperial conference and the remarks which he made in support of that resolution. As it gives in a short space and rather definitely the scheme which he urged, I will read it:

> That in the opinion of this conference the interests of the empire demand that in so far as possible its different portions should be connected by the best possible means of mail communication, travel and transportation; that to this end steps should immediately be taken to establish a fast service from Great Britain to Canada, and through Canada to Australia and New Zealand, and also to China and Japan; that such service on the Atlantic ocean should be carried on by means of steamships, equal in speed and character to the best now in existence, and upon the Pacific ocean by steamships of a speed of not less than 18 knots, and in other respects as nearly equal to the Atlantic ships as circumstances will permit; that for the purpose of carrying the above project into effect, such financial support as may be necessary should be contributed by Great Britain, Canada, Australia and New Zealand in equitable proportions.

This resolution, which, with slight modifications, was endorsed and carried by that imperial conference, was not for a service of twenty or twenty-one knots across the Atlantic. It was for a service equal to the best on the Atlantic at the present time. Therefore, I was very much puzzled when I heard the right hon. the Prime Minister in introducing these resolutions to-day, speak, not of a twenty-four or twenty-five knot service across the Atlantic, but of a twenty or twenty-one knot service, and I asked myself why we should go through all this formality for a twenty or a twenty-one knot service? Already we have an eighteen knot service on the Atlantic, and in a very few years we shall probably have a twenty knot service at the hands of the same companies who now give us an eighteen knot service, and at very little if any extra cost to this country. So that it appears to me that if we are looking forward to a twenty knot service on the Atlantic ocean, the members of that imperial conference who endorsed the resolution introduced by our Prime Minister, when they come to read the statement of the Prime Minister in this House to-day that he is only seeking to promote a twenty knot service across the Atlantic, must come to the conclusion that we as a parliament are not keeping faith with the other members of that conference, who voted not for a twenty knot service, but for a twenty-four knot service across the Atlantic ocean. The eighteen knot service applied wholly to the Pacific ocean. Therefore it seems

to me that the Prime Minister has put us rather in a quandary.

Speaking personally, I am quite in accord with the resolution which was passed at the imperial conference, and which is brought before us to-day ; and, for the reasons which have already been given, we can only tell by experiment whether such a service on the Atlantic would be justified or not. We all know that such a service cannot be commercially successful. It is not commercially successful at the present time, even with the steamships running to the port of New York and having the 80,000,000 people of the United States to draw upon. But if we are going to carry out the resolution of the imperial conference, we have to put on the Atlantic ocean a service equal to the best at present plying on that ocean anywhere. That means a twenty-four knot service, or all our work will be of no effect, and we cannot be considered as carrying out in good faith the undertaking of our representative. Then comes the question of freight. We all know that so far as this country is concerned, the freight business is more important than the passenger business ; and I may say in passing that the greatest usefulness of speed in crossing the Atlantic is neither for freight nor passengers, but for the mails, and there is no doubt that it is of very great advantage to have a quick mail service. Except with regard to certain classes of freight, like express freight and perishable goods, the matter of speed need not be taken into consideration in connection with freight ; it is not a matter of importance. I am speaking, of course, in a comparative sense ; therefore when we speak of bringing into force a twenty-four knot service, we cannot consider freight at all, but only mails and passengers. I would like to call the attention of the House to a remark made by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) when referring to this matter. He says that we already pay about $600,000, and we have our service on the Atlantic and on the Pacific, and that to pay $1,000,000 or a little more for a twenty-four knot service would simply mean the addition of say $400,000 a year. Well, Sir, I entirely dissent from that view of the matter. I say that if you pass a vote for a twenty-four knot service, which it is said will be likely to cost this country a million or a million and a half, you will have to keep up your freight service independently of this service; for that is the most important service for the business of the country, while the other is more in the nature of an advertisement or a pleasant thing for the people of this country to say that we have coming from England to Canada the fastest steamers on the Atlantic ocean. That is a pleasant thing to say, but it is not entirely business. The freight matter is business which must be looked after whether we have this fast line or not. I entirely dissent from the view expressed by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) that it would be adding only about $400,000 to the present expense of the country in regard to steamship subsidies as you have to maintain the freight service in as good a condition as at present, so that the fast service will be entirely additional.

Personally, I would be very glad indeed to see a 24-knot service across the Atlantic. I was a little amused at the argument of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. W. Roche) with regard to ways and means. He referred to our heavy obligations for the National Transcontinental Railway and the probable expense of improving the Welland canal, possibly building the Georgian Bay canal and constructing a line of railway to Hudson bay. Then he said, naturally, what difference does a million or two more make under those circumstances? Perhaps that is excusable, but at the same time I think, whether it costs only a million or a million and a half, we should consider thoroughly as to whether the fun of having this service would pay us, although personally I believe in having a fast line to this country, the fastest we can get. In saying that I cannot be accused of speaking from a personal interest in the matter, because the Minister of Finance has just stated that Halifax would be very sure to be the port of call on the Atlantic. As a resident of St. John, I will be quite content to leave the choice of ports to any company that undertakes the service, to those who are particularly interested in the business. The present scheme, as introduced by the Prime Minister, is most indefinite. No one in the House or out of it knows when we vote for this resolution what we are voting for or what it will entail. The Prime Minister should have been a little more definite in his statement and have taken parliament and the country a little more clearly and thoroughly into his confidence ; he should have told us what it is intended to do, so that we can vote intelligently.

Mr. R. G. MACPHERSON (Vancouver). Mr. Speaker, I do not think there can be two opinions in the province of British Columbia, where we have seen some fairly rapid strides made in navigation, as to the advantage of this project to the western part of Canada and our own Pacific province. We have to-day operating from British Columbia ports to Australia, New Zealand, Yokohama and Hong Kong a number of lines, and the question of a much better Pacific service is one of great importance. The line of demarcation between the speeches of hon. gentlemen on this side and hon. gentlemen opposite on this question is well drawn. The resolution of the Prime Minister means action immediately upon a question which is of

importance to all parts of Canada, while our hon. friends opposite say to wait, or if not to wait, that a cold storage route is the proper route. The difference between the two propositions is that one is all red, which means fast, and the other is an ice cream route, which means anything going slow. Our hon. friends opposite are prepared to accept the cold storage route, but that is not the route which is wanted at present in Canada. From British Columbia we ship all kinds of produce to Australian and Asiatic ports, but we carry very few passengers indeed. I believe that Canada is shipping from her ports less than 6 per cent of the passengers carried from North America to European ports and to Australian and Asiatic ports. At present we have the Union Steamship Company from Vancouver and Victoria to Sydney and we have the Australian service from Vancouver and Victoria to Auckland, both very poor services, with the result that very few people travel by that line. Last summer I saw with my own eyes many people who were not able to secure transportation on the boats leaving Vancouver for Australia; they had either to go via San Francisco or wait for another boat. I talk with people arriving from Australia by every boat and ask them about the Union Steamship Company, the present line between Australia and British Columbia, and they are all of one mind in saying that it is as poor a service as is operated on salt water to-day. In face of the fact that it is a very poor service the boats are usually full, both first-class and second-class, and they are carrying a considerable line of freight. I trust that the All-Red route will consist also of a line of steamers from British Columbia ports to Yokohama, Nagasaki, Manilla or wherever it may be on the Asiatic side. We have at present the Canadian Pacific Railway 'Empress' line, which has done very good work indeed. There is also the Pacific Mail Steamship line. There never was a time in the history of any country in matters of transportation when it was so urgent that a first-class line of steamers should be established. We should have them from Canada to all ports on the Pacific coast. There is not a good up-to-date line of steamers operating there to-day. The Canadian Pacific Railway have beautiful boats, but they are not doing the trade there they should do. They should have much larger and faster boats, and any Canadian Pacific Railway official operating out of Vancouver will say as I do, that we cannot afford to wait, as the member for East Toronto suggested, if we are to hold our supremacy on the sea. Now is the time to act, and now is the time for this resolution to be carried into effect. What does the resolution of the leader of the opposition mean? That nothing can be done, not even a telegram can be sent, not an emissary can be sent to Australia, New Zealand or Great Britain to work up this All-Red route plan until parliament sanctions it.

Now, we are sanctioning the principle of it, and I trust we shall go so far as to not only sanction the principle—for that principle is accepted and admitted by all—but shall take practical steps which, in a short time, will result in a better service on the Pacific; concerning the Atlantic I do not speak. What does it mean, this carrying of passengers from British ports to Canada, across Canada and from our Pacific ports to Australia and New Zealand? It means that thousands of people will come into our country and will have the opportunity of seeing for themselves the possibilities of our country. It means that these people coming into our country will spend thousands and millions of dollars. There is no better trade in the world than the tourist trade of the world. We have demonstrated that conclusively in Vancouver, where our tourist trade has been the means of very considerable advancement for our city. So, I say, we cannot afford to take the position laid down by the leader of the opposition when he says: You should not consider this question until you have further data——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not say anything of the kind, nor does the amendment say anything of the kind.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I do not wish to misrepresent the case or to do the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) a particle of injustice. If I have read the amendment wrong——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You certainly have.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I understood the hon. gentleman's amendment to declare that Canada must not do anything further, that the country must not be committed to anything at the present time, which, I take it, means that nothing shall be done.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The amendment leaves untouched the words of the resolution proposed by the Prime Minister:

That in the opinion of this House it is desirable that the governments of Australia, Canada and New Zealand should, with as little delay as possible, agree upon a definite plan for carrying into effect the terms of the said resolution of the Imperial Conference, the same to be submitted for the consideration of the imperial and colonial parliaments.

That is left untouched by my amendment.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I have the amendment here. It reads:

That having regard to the very heavy expenditures and obligations in which the present administration has involved the country,

the government should not commit Canada to any such plan——

I think that is plain English.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Go on.

Mr. MACPHERSON. (Reading):

—or to a contract or expenditure for such purpose until after the same shall have been submitted to and approved by the parliament of Canada.

If I understand anything about business, in the first place we must negotiate.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Certainly.

Mr. MACPHERSON. If we are to accomplish anything we must take the first step. Now, the first step means entering into arrangements with Australia, New Zealand and the mother country. There must be some considerable expenditure in order even to accomplish that. My hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) says that nothing shall be done for the present. If he says he is prepared to accept fully and without qualification the resolution brought in by the Prime Minister, well and good. But he qualifies that. And the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Kemp) says, 'Time enough'; the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Daniel) says, 'Time enough'; the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) says, 'Time enough'; nothing can be done; take what you have for the present, and do nothing for the future.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not mean to say that, and I do not think I said anything that could be construed in that way.

Mr. MACPHERSON. We have a searching of hearts now; and my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) says he does not mean that. Then, what does he mean?

Mr. FOSTER. I go further; I say I did not say that.

Mr. MACPHERSON. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has a way of so clothing his ideas in words that almost any suggestion can be taken from them. He is very clever at that. He must take either one course or the other—either he is prepared to go on with this fast Atlantic trans-Canada Pacific route or he is not.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me one question? Will he ask his own leader whether he proposes, under this resolution, to enter into any contract or agreement involving financial obligation with these countries without first coming to parliament to gets its authority and approval?

Mr. MACPHERSON. Let me read the resolution. I think I understand it,—I am over twenty-one years of age and understand English fairly well. The resolution says:

That it is desirable that steps shall be taken with all convenient speed——

I do not need to ask my leader what it means. There it is, 'It is desirable.' Will my hon. friend (Mr Foster) say it is not desirable? Well, he strikes that out, that is, hon gentlemen opposite have taken the position that it is not desirable at the present time to do anything further than to allow us to drift. The people of Canada will not allow its government to drift. If the government is to be found worthy of its place, it must be in advance of public opinion. The people of Canada are no longer going to do business on a back street. Whether it is transportation by land or transportation by water, Canada must be on one of the main thoroughfares of the world's trade. The people of Canada have an opportunity, at the expenditure of very little money, to greatly advance their own interest. And, after all, dollars and cents do not count so much when it is a question of the advancement of our country. We are doing a much bigger trade than we used to do, and with better facilities our trade will grow still greater. I declare my belief that the people expect the government to take advantage of every opportunity to make broader and deeper the channels of our country's trade.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). I would not have spoken on this subject at all considering the stage of the session, had it not been for one remark made by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) which has been so conspicuously accentuated and illustrated by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mcpherson) who has just taken his seat. In voting on this motion and amendment, I occupy this position: I have the honour to represent a constituency which, I venture to say, is as strongly imperialistic in its opinions and ideas as any constituency in the Dominion of Canada; I feel very strongly that, no matter what else I may do in this House, if in any way by any action or vote of mine I should show want of confidence that this union would continue, or any unwillingness on my part to do all in my power to continue to perpetuate and strengthen this union, it would be utterly futile for me to appear again before my constituents. Therefore, it is that, when such a motion is before the House, and when such an amendment is moved by the leader of the opposition, and when the hon. member for Brandon, who has been supposed throughout the country to be the father of this scheme —though it appears most unjustly supposed, because, as shown by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) the scheme is older than its reputed father, but at any rate he must be admitted to be a father-in-law of the scheme—when that hon. gentleman was careful to define the position occupied by the government on this scheme,

I think it necessary to give the reason why I cannot vote for the motion and why I am compelled to support the amendment. In my humble judgment, the whole question is in a nutshell. Both sides of this House are in thorough accord as to the propriety, the necessity and duty of doing everything we can to bind the empire together. One side of the House say it is to be done in one way and the other side says another way. I believe the government is entirely wrong. I shall give my vote simply on the ground that hon. gentlemen opposite are entirely mistaken in their choice of the way to bind the empire together and that the mode they have adopted is exactly the one which an enemy of the empire, one desiring to see it dismembered, would prefer.

The resolution submitted by the leader of the government is ambiguous. It may be read one way or the other. But the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) has kindly instructed this House as to the true meaning of that motion, and it is solely on the speech of that hon. gentleman that I feel compelled to vote against the original resolution. Discussing the various advantages which the proposed line would give the empire, the hon. gentleman was good enough to tell us that the freight and cold storage service was a mere matter of detail to be looked after later on. To my mind the freight and storage service is the crucial point of the whole case, and there is nothing more to be said in favour of the resolution after this expression of opinion from the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton).

If we are to spend one and a half million dollars, we should get something in return, and when the hon. member for Brandon says that freight and cold storage are simply matters of detail, we must conclude that the expenditure of $1,500,000 a year is for a fast passenger service.

My hon. friend the leader of the opposition, on the other hand, says that whatever we are to give should have for its primary object the best means of bringing the products of the empire to the markets of the empire. Incidentally the passenger question must of course arise, and in the ships which primarily are to bring our products to the markets of the empire, we will do the best we can for the passengers. But the hon. member for Brandon ignores freight and cold storage altogether as the primary object of the resolution. The $1,500,000 per year is to secure a fast passenger service. Incidentally he will do the best he can to secure freight; and if the rosiest dreams of the hon. friend should be realized, we will be able to carry 1,000 tons of freight on each of these mammoth steamers. Canada at the present time, with all the obligations she has to bear, is to be asked to pay $1,500,000 per year for its fast steamship service for passenger traffic. Well as an imperialist, I am not going to pay that for a passenger service. I am prepared to do whatever is necessary to bring the empire closer together by facilitating a better interchange of products, but I am not going to pay that amount simply for a faster passenger service.

My hon. friend from Brandon pointed out that we are at present paying $679,000 a year for the service we have. I presume the greater part is paid under the guise of postal subsidies, and therefore, he says, all we are asked to pay is $1,000,000 additional per year. But if we are to subtract the $679,000 on the one hand, we must subtract whatever advantage and service we are getting for that on the other hand, because it is not to be presumed that we are paying that $679,000 per year for nothing. I have always understood that the mail subsidies were practically subsidies to enable the steamship lines to give us a fast service which they could not do without such assistance. No one will pretend that we are paying all this money merely for the carriage of our mail bags. If we are, we are paying a great deal too much and are being robbed. What we are paying for is not merely the carriage of the mails but indirectly to subsidize these steamship lines which have improved so much in the last ten or fifteen years. If we were to stop the payment of that $679,000 a year, does any one suppose we would have the same efficient steamship service? It is not to be supposed that we are going to withdraw our present subsidies from those lines which have done so much to promote trade between this country and the motherland. We are asked now by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton)—and that is his interpretation of the resolution submitted to the House—to pay annually $1,500,000 to some company, without knowing to what company or of whom it will be composed or what service it will give. All we know is that $1,500,000 per year we shall pay for passenger service, and incidentally a little freight, and the maximum freight which the hon. member for Brandon can suggest is 1,000 tons to each ship.

Then what kind of a steam service are we to have? The First Minister and the hon. member for Brandon are contradictory in their views. The one says that 20 knots per hour will do, but the other insists on 25 knots per hour; and should we vote this resolution, we will not know whether this annual subsidy of $1,500,000 is to be for a 20-knot or a 25-knot service. If a 20-knot service, that will not suit my hon. friend from Brandon. If a 25-knot service, that is beyond anything the First Minister dreams of. When these gentlemen differ so much, we are justified in asking that the government should decide what it wants and adjust its domestic differences before asking the House to vote. But suppose the scheme should be estab-

lished and suppose we are given the best steamships that can be got, running at 25 knots an hour across the Atlantic and Pacific, what do we get in return for our $1,500,000 annual subsidy? How many Canadians are going to travel on these fast steamers? Is it not a fact that the faster the steamer the higher the rates? The majority of the people who will pay the particularly high rates will come from the neighbouring republic; and the practical result will be that we will be paying $1,500,000 a year in order that our neighbours to the south may have an opportunity of travelling through the beautiful route down the St. Lawrence to reach the old country by a class of steamers which the people of Canada cannot afford to patronize. In my constituency, you will get very few men who can afford to travel on these expensive boats. I find there are very few of my constituents who will ever be able to send any of their products to the old country by these boats which are limited, as a maximum, to 1,000 tons a trip. Therefore, as representing one constituency, I feel that I am bound to ask what the people of that constituency are going to get in consideration of this grant of a million and a half to which every one who is the head of a family must contribute his share. I am as anxious as any one to support anything that will tend to bind the empire together, but I want some common sense basis for an expenditure of $1,500,000. If any man is an enemy to the maintenance of the empire, if any man wishes to see this empire dismembered, if any man wishes to create a feeling throughout this Dominion of Canada, into which people are pouring from all corners of the earth, that will cause Canadians, including this conglomerate population, to become dissatisfied with the present conditions, he will bring resolutions before this House that will compel the people to pay large sums of money for considerations the value of which we do not know.

Mr. TALBOT. The resolution says that it shall be a fair sum.

Mr. NORTHRUP. A fair sum which has been illuminated by the evidence given as £325,000 a year. The amount has been fixed practically by the conference. We have been told on the floor of the House this afternoon what the amount is to be. I say as an imperialist that with our constantly increasing population coming from all the corners of the earth, coming from countries with flags different from the flag under which we have lived, seeking to find a better and truer form of government than that which they have left, coming to this country without the feeling that we, who have been born here, possess, that there should be some material advantage in the connection between Canada and the motherland being called upon to pay £325,000 a year that our neighbours to the south of us may be able to travel a little more swiftly across the Atlantic in ships, owned by some one we know not whom, and bonused by the empire to the tune of $1,000,000 a year, and this object lesson being presented to these new-comers, it will not have a tendency to make them any more loyal or any more desirous of maintaining the connection between the mother country and our own land. Feeling that it would be in the interest of the empire that the people of this country and of the various colonies should have a better, a cheaper and a faster way of carrying their products to one another and to the markets of the world than they have at the present time, and that the resolution is not in the true interest of imperialism, I, as an imperialist, am compelled to oppose it and to vote for the amendment proposed by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. HANCE J. LOGAN (Cumberland). Mr. Speaker. It is a matter of regret that the resolution now before the House and which was moved by the right hon. the First Minister; a resolution of extreme importance to all Canada, should meet with the opposition of our friends on the other side of the House. The 'All-Red route' so called, important though it is to every part of the British empire is surely of special importance to our Dominion. Were I an Australian I do not know that I would be so enthusiastic over a proposal to give a large subvention for this steamship service, but as a Canadian living in Canada which is so to speak the half-way house of the empire, I feel that interests vital to our country are wrapt up in the successful accomplishment of the policy enunciated by the right hon. gentleman. It is a matter of common knowledge and I may add a matter of general disappointment to Canadians that travellers to the American continent from the motherland do not patronize to any great extent the existing Canadian seamship lines. I venture to say that not three per cent of all the travelling Englishmen, Irishmen, and Scotchmen who come to Canada enter the Dominion by a Canadian port. They reach us by the gateway of New York; they first see a great city; their eyes first rest on a foreign land teeming with millions of people, and finally they get to Canada by a side door. It is a good deal like viewing a small chapel when one has seen the vast cathedral of St. Peters at Rome. One reason therefore why I support this project so cordially is, that it will be an advertisement for Canada and that it may exert an educative influence upon the people of the old land to

help them to a correct understanding of the actual conditions of our country, and in some degree to a knowledge of our people and our aspirations as British subjects. Ask nine Englishmen out of ten if the Halifax route or the St. Lawrence route is as safe as the New York route, and their answers will be that our ports are set in dense fog banks, that the ice coming down from the Arctic fields constitutes a danger to navigation, and that the River St. Lawrence is full of hazards. And yet, the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) proved conclusively by the facts which he gave us in the budget debate that the Canadian route is far safer than any other and that so far as absence of danger to navigation is concerned it is incomparatively the best.

Mr. TALBOT. We have not had a single accident on the St. Lawrence route for three years.

Mr. LOGAN. As my hon. friend remarks there has not been an accident on the St. Lawrence route for three years and the same remark is true of the Halifas route. Speaking on a former occasion in this House, I cited as an illustration of the inexcusable ignorance of people on the other side of the Atlantic with regard to Canadian ports, that a merchant in this city who had ordered goods in England to be sent to him by the Canadian Pacific Railway steamers for his Christmas trade, received word from the British manufacturers that they were sending the goods via New York as the Canadian ports were all frozen up. I regret that this is not an isolated instance and that it merely expresses the general opinion to be found on the other side. Such has been my experience when travelling in England and such has been the experience of others. The people of the old land seem to think that while we have a magnificent country in the summer, and while we have great seaports in Halifax, St. John, Montreal and elsewhere, yet in winter these ports are frozen and inaccessible from the ocean. Hence it is that had we this 'All-Red' route with great vessels plying on the Atlantic subsidized by the imperial government, by the Canadian government, and by the Australian and New Zealand governments, it would be the best advertisement in the world that Canada is not a land of ice and snow, and that even in winter there are Canadian ports to which these magnificent steamers can ply successfully. I quite appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that this late hour of the session is not a time for long speeches, and so I shall be brief. I have already expressed my regret that the members of the great Conservative party in this House did not rise to the occasion, and pledge to the government the assurance of their support in the carrying out of this imperial project. It will be difficult enough to secure the All-Red route and to get subventions from the different governments even if we had unanimity here, but how much more difficult will it be to bring the scheme to successful fruition when it is proclaimed to the other governments of the great colonies that His Majesty's opposition in Canada have moved in opposition to this scheme. I am honoured Sir, to be the successor in the representation of Cumberland, of Sir Charles Tupper, one of Canada's greatest sons, and the thought occurs to me to-night that were Sir Charles Tupper at this moment leading the opposition, the attitude of his followers on this great imperial question would be far different from what it is. When the present government came to power in 1896, Sir Charles Tupper wrote to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Prime Minister, that, if he as Prime Minister of Canada would strive for the fast Atlantic service which had been initiated by the Conservative government then he might count on cordial assistance from the Conservative party. In 1897, when this government completed a contract for a fast steamship service with Peterson, Tate & Co., the first man who spoke from the opposition benches was Sir Charles Tupper, and although he expressed himself as not agreeing with the contract in all its details he declared that he did not want to have it understood for a moment that he was opposing this scheme which he had so much at heart.

Mr. SPROULE. He should have waited for three years and then presented his congratulations.

Mr. LOGAN. Sir Charles Tupper was too big a man and too patriotic a Canadian not to congratulate his political opponents when he thought they deserved congratulation and hence he did not wait for three years. Sir Charles Tupper had his heart and soul in this project of a fast Atlantic service and when he introduced his scheme to the parliament of Canada there was no question raised as to his presenting it in all its detail. I read in the debates of 1896, some interesting remarks made by my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster). Let me hark back to his words of that date to contrast them with his words of this afternoon. He was criticising Mr. Dobell, then a minister of the Crown, in connection with this very subject, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) said :

> He is opposed to the fast line because it is costly and it cannot be given to the government cheap. Yet the hon. gentleman himself and thousands of Canadians almost every year go down to New York and take the best berths in the fast steamers from that port to Liverpool, and they do not get them cheap.

I would commend these words to my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) in the light of his statement this afternoon that Canadians travel by the existing Canadian routes. The statement was made this afternoon, and it has not been contradicted, that only 6 per cent of the travel between Liverpool and Canada

is on Canadian ships. Is not that a lamentable state of affairs? My hon. friend the member for North Toronto, contending that they knew a good thing and wanted it and were prepared to pay for it, said:

They know a good thing, they want it, and they are prepared to pay for it. Would they not be willing to pay an equal price, if they sailed by a fast steamer from Quebec as by New York? But the hon. gentleman is opposed to a 20-knot service, chiefly because the people would not be able to get a $75 passage.

Let me quote some further words of the hon. member. A question had been raised in reference to the carrying of freight, and the hon. member spoke as follows:

The hon. gentleman, as a result of his investigations, will not be able to avoid the extreme difficulty of providing ample freight capacity and a rapid service in the same vessel. The more closely the hon. gentleman inquires into the matter, the more he will be satisfied that the government have only a limited range of choice as to the quantity of freight that can be carried, if the main idea of having a fast service is maintained.

And further on:

I think he will find out that unless he is prepared to very nearly double the tonnage of the vessels as compared with the tonnage of tenders for which we called, he will not be able to accomplish any very much larger scope of freight combined with the speed that is necessary for making it in reality a fast service. So much with reference to that. But 1,500 tons or 2,000 tons per vessel is still a very respectable quantity of freight of the kind that this will be.

The hon. gentleman went on to speak on the same lines on which the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) spoke this afternoon, saying that if we established this fast service for passengers and for certain kinds of freight and for mails, it would not be long before the freight service would follow the passenger service. What he said was this:

But, I think what takes place is this, and what takes place under these peculiar conditions where these tenders are now, is that fast freight vessels follow in the wake of a fast line such as we are contemplating to put on.

The hon. gentleman at that time was arguing without having the present resolution before him, and it seems to me that his words are a condemnation of the amendment which has been moved by the hon. leader of the opposition, and which I presume he will be called on to vote for. Let us take this amendment, Mr. Speaker, I am bound to say that it is a little confusing. It reads thus:

Mr. Borden moves in amendment that the said resolution be amended by striking out the second and third paragraphs.

Mr. LOGAN.

Now, the second and third paragraphs of the resolution are as follows:

That it is desirable that steps be taken with all convenient speed to achieve the results aimed at in the said resolution.

That this House doth hereby endorse the terms of the said resolution, affirming that Canada is prepared to assume her fair share of the necessary financial obligations.

These are the two paragraphs which go to the root of the matter, and which the hon. leader of the opposition wishes by his amendment to eliminate. Then he proposes to substitute for them the following:

That this House, in expressing its strong sympathy with the object of the said resolution, desires to record its opinion that more favourable freight rates and a thoroughly efficient system of cold storage are essential features of any such transportation project.

Yet we find that the hon. member for North Toronto ten years ago argued that these two things could not be successfully combined. Then the hon. leader of the opposition, by his amendment, would say further, what to my mind is unnecessary:

That, having regard to the very heavy expenditures and obligations in which the present administration has involved the country, the government should not commit Canada to any such plan, or to any contract or expenditure for such purpose, until after the same shall have been submitted to and approved by the parliament of Canada.

That is practically what is set out in the resolution of the right hon. the First Minister, which says:

That in the opinion of this House it is desirable that the governments of Australia, Canada and New Zealand should, with as little delay as possible, agree upon a definite plan for carrying into effect the terms of the said resolution of the Imperial Conference, the same to be submitted for the consideration of the imperial and colonial parliaments.

So that, to my mind, the main part of the amendment of the hon. leader of the opposition is that we shall inquire into the question of obtaining 'more favourable freight rates and a thoroughly effective system of cold storage.' These are details of the question. What we are asked to do here to-night is to endorse the position taken by the right hon. the First Minister at the Imperial Conference in favour of an All-Red route throughout the empire.

I have before me an interview given to the 'Canadian Gazette' by the distinguished statesman, Sir Charles Tupper, immediately after the First Minister placed his resolution before the Imperial Conference. Did Sir Charles Tupper greet it with captious criticism? Did he say: We must have a certain amount of room for freight and a certain amount of room for cold storage? No. As a big Canadian, he expressed himself as very strongly in favour of the

scheme. It was a matter in which he had always taken the greatest possible interest, as he naturally would, having been a pioneer in the movement. He said that the All-Red route as now put forward was simply completing the carrying out of an arrangement that was made by his government when he was Premier of Canada; but the contract then made with the Allan line was prevented from coming into operation by the refusal of the Earl of Aberdeen, then Governor General of Canada, to authorize the signature to the contract. The contract was made by a government of which the hon. member for North Toronto was a member—actually made to be signed by the Governor General without submission to parliament, and Sir Charles Tupper said Lord Aberdeen refused to ratify it.

The hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Kemp) is very frank in this matter. He is against this scheme absolutely, without any qualification. He seems to think that fast travel is a fad, saying that the fast steamers of the German lines were put on at a time when everybody had a fad for fast travelling. I will undertake to say that he could not book a berth on any of those steamers within three months. Everybody knows that they are the most popular steamers that cross the Atlantic to-day. He says the time will come when people will go back to the slower vessels. He might as well talk of abandoning fast trains and going back to slow freight trains or stage coaches. The tendency of the age is for faster travel, whether on land or sea, and my hon. friend must know that. I know that he knows it, because before taking his seat he said: Our present service is an 18-knot service; leave it alone, and in three or four years the companies will give us a 21-knot service. If that is going out of style, if this fast travel is only a fad, if people are going back to the old slow travel, why are the Canadian companies going to put on 21-knot steamers inside of four years?

This scheme appeals to us in many ways. As a great imperial proposition, it brings the different parts of the empire closer together. I do not agree with those gentleman who say that we can do greater service to the empire by being able to sell our products to the different parts of the empire; we can become greater imperialists by coming in closer touch with the rest of the people in the empire. This All-Red route will put Canada upon the main postroad of empire. Thousands of people travelling from England away to the east, or from the east to the motherland will pass through this magnificent country, will see the great harbours on the Pacific, the unequalled scenery of the Rockies, the oceans of wheat growing on the prairies of the west, will see the great provinces of Ontario and Quebec; in summer they will pass down the magnificent St. Lawrence river and in winter will go through the maritime provinces with their magnificent resources and potentialities and will sail out of a harbour unequalled in the world. This will be an advertisement for our country to our friends at home, and not only will it bring us nearer the man in London, but it will bring us nearer to the man who lives in Sydney or in Melbourne or in Auckland. To-day almost 99 per cent of those who travel between New Zealand or Australia and England go by the way of the Suez canal, and not via the Canadian route. If this line is established in such a way as we hope, it will mean that not only will we become better acquainted with people in the motherland but we will become better acquainted with our brothers in the more distant parts of the empire.

I regret very much that the proposition is not definite enough to establish Halifax, or St. John if you like, as the Canadian port for use all the year around. Then people would not wonder when travelling whether they were going to Quebec or Halifax or to St. John, they would know that they would go to one port all the year around. It would be: All aboard for Halifax or all aboard for St. John at Liverpool at all seasons of the year. It may not be possible to do this but it will at any rate mean that during a great portion of the year this magnificent service will be through the maritime provinces. The maritime provinces will no longer be reached by a switchback railway, they will be on the main line from the old land to the far east. We will be able to show travellers when they enter Halifax the great harbour which is the pride of our province. They will be able to see the little province of Nova Scotia of which we, its sons, are so justly proud. They will be able to see the great province of New Brunswick and to realize that away down east of the great provinces in which we are to-day, there are provinces well worthy the admiration of every true friend of the empire.

We spend $680,000 a year in subsidies. I am not here to say that that money is thrown away. I think a considerable portion of it is well spent. Some of it, I am afraid, is not, but is it not better to spend a million and a half and get a sure benefit than to spend $680,000 for doubtful benefit? We are sure that if this All-Red route is established it will be a great benefit to every province of Canada. There will, no doubt, be accommodation for certain lines of freight but we cannot, as shown by the hon. member for Toronto ten years ago, make it a freight and passenger service at the same time, although we may provide for some classes of fast freight, express parcels and mails. For these reasons I am very heartily in favour of the resolution

which has been moved by the First Minister.

Our friends opposite are the most shrieking imperialists that have ever been known to live until they have to pay for it. When it comes down to giving a preference on British goods entering Canada they take it with a wry face and in private and on public platforms in some parts of the country, they deprecate giving that preference. They are immense imperialists, but when it comes to giving a million and a half dollars out of the taxes to establish an All-Red route to bring all parts of the empire closer together, to cement the heart and the outlying limbs of the empire, these gentlemen throw in resolutions about cheaper freight, cold storage and one thing and another, all for the one purpose, to defeat the resolution introduced by the First Minister.

I congratulate the First Minister on the scheme which he had the honour of introducing at the imperial conference. It matters not whether he is the author of the name 'All-Red route,' or the author of the scheme, he moved the resolution before the imperial conference of this empire and to him should be given that credit. I can only say in conclusion that if our hon. friends opposite had met this resolution as Sir Charles Tupper would have met it, as the big men who were at the head of that party twenty or twenty-five years ago would have received it, they would have strengthened the hands of the government of Canada, they would have strengthened the hands of the imperial government, and their action would have been a great inducements to the governments of New Zealand and Australia to grant their subventions towards this scheme which means so much not only to Great Britain but to all parts of the empire.

Mr. E. B. DEVLIN (Wright). Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution of the right hon. the Prime Minister because I believe it to be commercially important to the Dominion of Canada. The subject-matter of the resolution has been treated under different phases, along different lines. Some have viewed it as an imperial question and others as a commercial proposition. I take it that it is solely in the interests of the different parts of the empire and that it will mean a great deal in the building up of the Dominion. The time has come when water routes are to be given their proper place in the consideration of the great national questions. I have already in this House declared myself strongly in favour of the improvement of the water routes of Canada. I believe that the construction of the Georgian Bay canal is a very live question for the parliament and people of Canada and I trust that before many months, or years at most have elapsed, we will have some definite announcement with reference to the construction of water routes in this Diminion. It is also of vital interest to the Dominion of Canada that we should improve in the best possible way the transportation facilities between Europe and the Dominion.

In connection with this resolution,I would add a word in favour of a project that is receiving the attention of the British parliament, that is to include a port in Ireland as one of the features in the All-Red route. I do this not simply because I am proud to say a word on behalf of Ireland, not only as an Irish Canadian, but because I believe the project can not be successfully carried out without a thorough, studied consideration of the advantages of a port in Ireland as a means of shortening the Atlantic passage. Therefore, I have double pleasure in suporting this motion, because ultimately Ireland will receive a great measure of justice in the consideration of this question. I am opposed to the amendment because I believe that its main object is to defeat the motion before the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the vote is taken, I wish to claim the attention of the House for a short time; and I do it because of certain things that have transpired since the right hon. gentleman introduced the resolution this morning, and also because of certain differences of opinion as to the meaning of the resolution and the amendment. I listened with interest to the speech of my hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Sifton). But the House could not but ask: What scheme is it we are asked to endorse? My hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Logan) made a very strong appeal to the opposition to support the government scheme. The vital question with me is: What is, at the present moment, the government scheme? I know that the scheme was as proposed by the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) at the imperial conference. That was a scheme of 24-knot service on the Atlantic and 22-knot service on the Pacific. I know what the scheme was as proposed by my right hon. friend this morning—it was a scheme of 20 knots or 21 knots for the Atlantic and 18 knots, if it could be had, on the Pacific. But, when the master of ceremonies came upon the scene and gave the only authoritative pronouncement, and with greater, though limited, information, the scheme he outlined was one of 24 knots on the Atlantic and 22 knots on the Pacific. Now, when heated appeals are made to this side of the House to support the government scheme, I ask myself: Which is the government scheme? Who is the master of this craft? The hon. member for Brandon gave us what may be called a matured opinion. In the speech he delivered a few months ago in this House, he declared that he had been commissioned by the Prime Minister to take this matter up in England and gather

information. To-day, he told us that he had gathered that informaion. He knew exactly the scheme that was proposed. It was the scheme of 24 knots on the Atlantic and 22 knots on the Pacific: it involved a subsidy of $5,000,000 a year, and Canada's contribution to that subsidy was to be from $500,000 to $700,000 in round figures. He declared that he had gone over to the old country, and, as no one else seemed to be doing anything about it from the public point of view, he had set himself to make these inquiries; he had talked with members of the government, with financial men, with shipbuilding experts; he had had computations made of revenue, of cost, of deficit; and had arrived at the conclusion which he announced here to-day without an if or an an as the scheme which was known to everybody who was intimately connected with it. And yet, the Prime Minister this morning did not know of that. He had not taken counsel with the hon. member for Brandon, and made the mistake of coming down to a 20-knot service on the Atlantic and 18-knot service on the Pacific. Again I ask myself: Who is the authority and what is the scheme?

Now, why was there nobody to get information? If the thing was not to go absolutely by default why was it necessary that the hon. member for Brandon should go across the water and make these investigations? One of the schemes of the imperial conference of last year was the establishment of a secretariat, under Lord Elgin, whose duty it was to take up unfinished resolutions and unfinished proceedings, pursue the investigations and report the information to the different governments, so that these governments would have the duty of placing this information before their councils, and, if thought necessary, before their parliaments. That secretariat has been organized; I cannot but think that that secretariat has been at work. Is the hon. member for Brandon a member of that secretariat? Or is it that that part of the organization of the imperial conference of last year, heralded to us as having been established by Lord Elgin in connection with the colonial office, has done nothing in reference to this, the largest piece of unfinished business which was before the conference? I cannot but think that that secretariat has done its duty; that it has been making investigations; that it has been taking the opinion of experts, and that it is giving this information to the imperial government, for every once in a while we see intimations that the imperial government is considering the matter, is taking counsel with reference to it, and we are told, time and time again, that it is more favourably inclined to it on account of the information it has received. Now, the Prime Minister should have done what the hon. member for Brandon did, only more so. They have employed him, they have authorized him, and he—as shown by his own statement to-day—having made the inquiries, the Prime Minister should have placed the information before us and given us such facts and calculations of cost, revenue and expenditure, of such commercial avenues as would be opened up by this scheme, as have been gathered by the hon. gentleman into whose hands he committed the matter and the secretariat whose duty it was to follow out this unfinished business in the way I have described. And yet my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) did nothing of that kind when he came before us to-day.

Now, that is the first thing I wish to call the attention of the House to; and the second thing is this: We have had rather a remarkable change within the last few hours in the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite. In the 1907 conference, my right hon. friend never made a plea for freight, or cold storage, or reasonable freight rates. I have read his whole speech through—it does not take long to do it—and there is not a suggestion in favour of any consideration of these important points. He does not recognize their importance. He gives way to the statement made by Sir Joseph Ward that the 22-knot service on the Pacific is necessary in order to satisfy New Zealand's wants, and, by implication, cuts out the employment of the service for fruits and perishable commodities of any kind.

When he brought this matter before the House this morning, he never mentioned, he never thought of the immense importance to this country of the cheap transport of its products. He never seemed to have had sympathy with or to have thought of the matter until it was brought up by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). Then it certainly developed into a most important thing under the manipulation of the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) and of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). Then it became the word for every speaker on the other side that we must have regard to the moving of the products of the country, to the cheapening of rates and the furnishing of cold storage facilities. The resolution of my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) has done this much. It has wakened hon. gentleman opposite to a realization of the fact that there is a farmers and producers side to this question as well as the side of the nabob and millionaire who travel and pay large sums for every luxury and comfort on their passage.

But there is another strange difference of opinion. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) blurted it out and so did the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson). What was the plain statement made by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding)? Each of these gentlemen wanted—what? The

approval of this House to the resolution of the right hon. the First Minister, or, as they put it, the approval of the scheme of the government. It would take a Philadelphia lawyer to tell what is the scheme of the government. Who has the best of it? Is it the member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) or the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurer)? The one speaks as Prime Minister but the other speaks with a voice which sounds very much like a solid and supported authority. The Minister of Finance and the member for Vancouver say: Support the scheme of the government; give it your endorsation. For what purpose? As the Minister of Finance says, you could not bind Canada to anything unless parliament gave its sanction to this resolution. The member for Vancouver said: What is the use of going over there and talking to the delegates of Australia or New Zealand, you would not be liable to make any binding agreement with them. What these gentlemen believe is that if the resolution passes, the Prime Minister will have the authority to go to Australia and New Zealand and Great Britain and make hard and fast contracts and bring them down to this House—make these contracts with the authority of this parliament behind him and quoting the support of this parliament in his negotiations with these countries. But if I understood the Prime Minister at all rightly this morning, he declared in so many words that it was not a part of his resolution to make it possible for any contract to be agreed upon between Canada and the other parties, that all these things must be brought down to parliament, and be subject to the open and free discussion and approval of parliament. Did I understand my right hon. friend aright? He nods his assent. Then we may have been a little over cautious, as far as he is concerned, when we wanted to make it still more binding that we should not be bound to any financial responsibility and be prevented from obtaining the consent of the House before being bound. But my hon. friend the Minister of Finance has an absolutely different idea. He cried out with indignation: Unless you give your approval, we could not bind Canada to anything. Well it is the opinion of this side that we shall have to back up the First Minister in opposition to the Minister of Finance and his followers and help the First Minster to insist on the point that this parliament shall not be bound by any agreement or contract, that we shall be free, from the compulsion of a contract, and that the government shall not be in the position of coming down to this House and forcing its supporters to carry through the contract because this had authorized the government to make it and make it final. We are supporting the First Minister against the Minister of Finance and those who look upon the adoption of this resolution as necessary to bind Canada. I think that is a fair criticism. We must have things clear in our minds.

With reference to the resolution itself, my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson) was in a dense fog. No darkness ever encompassed the Pacific ocean, so dramatically alluded to by the hon. gentleman this morning, so dense as that which enveloped him when he was trying to grasp the meaning of the resolution introduced by the right hon. the First Minister. He seemed to be impressed with the idea that you could not speak to Australia at all, that you could not pay two cents for postage to carry a document to Australia, that no steps could be taken and no expenditures made unless this resolution of the First Minister, as he intepreted it, was passed. Why, the hon. gentleman surely can read English. What do you find? You find this expressly stated in the resolution of the First Minister:

> That in the opinion of this House it is desirable that the governments of Australia, Canada and New Zealand should, with as little delay as possible, agree upon a definite plan for carrying into effect the terms of the said resolution of the imperial conference, the same to be submitted for the consideration of the imperial and colonial parliaments.

That is to be found in the Prime Minister's resolution—this resolution, one-third of which is supported by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). Therefore the opposition and the First Minister, whatever the hon. member for Vancouver may say, are agreed entirely in saying that the government should not delay, that the government should negotiate with Australia, New Zealand and Great Britain, and as soon as possible agree upon a definite plan, and then bring it to this parliament and let us discuss it. But the member for Vancouver says: Ah, you you should show sympathy with this. You should be more enthusiastic, says the member for Brandon. What can we do more? The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) who has been making his eulogy, long past date, of that great Canadian Sir Charles Tupper, said that if Sir Charles Tupper were here, you would not find him talking this kind of politics. Well, Sir Charles Tupper would be supporting the Prime Minister against some of his recalcitrant followers who want to push him further than he says he is willing to go. Sir Charles Tupper expressed his strong agreement with the Prime Minister in the idea which the latter brought before the imperial conference. That is what Sir Charles Tupper, that large Canadian would do were he here. That is what he did in London by interview. But what does my hon. friend the leader of the opposition propose? He proposes:

That this House, in expressing its strong sympathy with the object of the said resolution——

Do you want anything more ? Even the big Canadian, Sir Charles Tupper, used almost the same words. He said , strong support.' My hon. friend says 'strong sympathy.' That is better than strong support. It takes in the heart and vital organs. It is sentiment as well as force, and it is therefore stronger than the other. Let the member for Vancouver possess his soul with patience, let the member for Cumberland do likewise—if the resolution passes as amended by my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden), you have a strong expression of sympathy with the resolution of my right hon. friend and you have the imperative command of this House not to delay negotiations, to make them as speedily as possible, to settle on a definite plan, to bring it as quickly as possible to this parliament, and we will take it into consideration. What the amendment of my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) does is this : It calls to mind, and it was a timely calling to mind, that in the midst of this lavish expenditure which has been, the lavish expenditure which is now going on and the lavish expenditure which is in contemplation it is well, if you propose to spend so many millions more, that you shall heed the great imperative necessity of this country which is to get the producer, within the smallest cost and at the greatest speed, to the market where he must sell his products. To do that you have to have cold storage, and you have to have reasonable freight rates and that is all that this amendment in that respect calls for. It does call for that and why you should not call for that ? To my mind it was not necessary for the right hon. gentleman to put that resolution before the House. He had just as much authority—he and his government—to go into the closest negotiations with the parties to this matter, to get a definite plan, to get all information, all results, all consequences, all the advantages from the plan so concerted between the contracting parties, as far as the plan was concerned then he had a perfect right to bring that to this parliament and then parliament would have something to devote its attention to instead of the airy and contraditory nothings which are banded about between the right hon. gentleman and some of his followers. I would not give a doit, or anything in the way of heavy expenditures, if we are not going to get something which was really excellent for the money. The Prime Minister seems to be willing to take a twenty knot service, or may be a little less than a 20-knot service or any old thing that he can get, and pay well for it. This is a very important crisis with reference to what I consider the greatest of all elements in the permanence and progress of the British empire. This is the first attempt at co-operation amongst the great members of the British family. What is involved ? Forty or fifty million dollars is involved. John Bull & Co., represented by the old country, by Canada, by Australia and by New Zealand, have in contemplation the putting of $50,000,000 of their good money into a certain scheme, I say it is of the utmost importance that all the strength of investigation, of business talents, of clean cut judgment and the most serious consideration should be given to the bases of the project into which John Bull and these parts of the company propose to put $50,000,000 of their good money. Rush into a scheme that shall be unfortunate, rush into a scheme that shall be unsuccessful and you damn for ever co-operation between John Bull & Co. It is of the utmost importance, therefore, that time for investigation, that the clearest expert opinion, the best commercial opinion and the best statesmanship should be lavished upon the foundations and building up of the plan upon which we propose to get into this new venture with $50,000,000 of our good money. It is because it is not in that position that I am opposed to having this country bound any more than it is to-day until we have these foundations and until we have this superstructure as well. The hon. Minister of Finance with jaunty courage as some men would call it, but which I would not designate as courage but rather as temerity, is willing to go into any expenditures at all and he piteously appeals to this side of the House and says that it would be a pity if we gave a black eye to the credit of this country. My hon. friend would have done better if he had thought of that every year in the last six years of his financial administration. He would have done well to have thought of that when, at first with reluctance, but afterwards with heels that clipped it as quickly as those of any of his supporters, he rushed into expenditures for all kinds of inexcusable things in order that patronage and political strength might be given to the party which he is trying to lead.

Mr. JOHNSTON. What are they ?

Mr. FOSTER. One of the most comical things I think I ever witnessed in parliament I witnessed this afternoon when this learned, responsible and accomplished expert in the line of expenditures and steamship building hardened his face like flint and shouted out: We will take the responsibility, when $40,000,000 or $50,000,000 was spoken of. It is courage like that, based upon strength and stability like that, that helps us over the steep and difficult places in parliament and keeps our abiding faith in our country still within our bosoms when oftentimes we would be discouraged. But let the Finance Minister not turn to this side of the House if he is so anxious not

to give to the credit of this country a black eye. He must think of his own misdeeds. He did preach economy in the days of his novitiate, he did, in the maritime provinces declare aganst the extreme extravagance of the party that he wished to dispose, but that hon. gentleman repudiated, the very moment he got into the saddle, the professions of his novitiate and entered upon a course of reckless public expenditure which has brought the credit of Canada close up to the breaking point. The Finance Minister, as the financial head of this country, for the time being in control, should have known his business better, should have had something to do with experts and something to do with foundation processes when he came, in 1903, before this parliament and pledged his faith as a minister, and pledged this country as the Finance Minister, that it would cost, for building the Transcontinental Railway from Winnipeg down to Moncton, the sum of $52,000,000. To-day he is face to face, with a market which is none too favourable, with an expenditure for that same line of railway of $160,000,000 or $170,000,000. That is something which gives Canadian credit not the best standing in the markets of London where moneys are to be raised, where financial men look keenly and carefully into the resources and into the prospectus and statements which are made by the government and especially by the financial head of the government in Canada. My hon. frind the Minister of Finance said he thought that we wanted to be solid against the scheme. We were once the imperialists ; where are we now ? Does he not know the obivious retort ? Once he was a repealer ; where is he now ? Once he advocated a commercial policy which opened the arms of Canada to the United States and which barred with all the power of a discriminative tariff Great Britain and every colony of Great Britain out of this country as far as trade privileges were concerned. That is the hon. gentleman who thinks it safe and prudent to raise a question as to the loyalty of this great Dominion ; to raise a question as to imperial preference and the imperial relations. I do not wish to take up the time of the House longer.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. I am very glad that hon. gentlemen opposite show by their applause that they would like me to continue, and on some other occasion and in cooler climatic conditions I will afford these gentlemen the pleasure they desire.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). It were comical, were it not so serious, to note the efforts of my hon. friends opposite to kill this project while they pretend to be in favour of it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. FOSTER. That's all the thanks we get for supporting you.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is perhaps not aware that in his verbose extravagance he does not weigh his own words, and probably he does not remember that not five minutes ago he used these very words : I am opposed to have this country saddled with this new burden.

Mr. FOSTER. I did say that, but I coupled with it the condition that I was opposed to having the country burdened with the financial responsibility contemplated unless we had the definite plans and the basis for it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Let my hon. friend have whatever comfort he can take from that. The hon. gentleman is opposed to this project unless we have a definite plan, but I had understood that hon. gentlemen opposite were in favour of the idea and that they were anxious to have it investigated, although now they say they are opposed to it.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you say we are opposed to investigation?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has all along shown that he does not want this scheme, but, if he will permit me to say so, he has not had the manliness to come forward and declare it boldly. The hon. gentleman wants to know what is the scheme before the House. Well, I spoke with perfect candour, and I stated that there were more ways than one to approach the subject, and that there was more than one kind of steamer afloat on the ocean. The hon. gentleman asks : Is this the scheme of the member for Brandon or is it the scheme of the Prime Minister, as if there was any difference whatever between the scheme of the member for Brandon and the scheme of the Prime Minister. My hon. friend knows the English language even better than I, and here are the words of the resolution :

That we are in favour of a steamship service by the best service available within reasonable cost.

Mark, with reasonable cost. If we can have a 24-knot service we are in favour of it if we can have it within reasonable cost ; if we can have a 25-knot service, or a 26-knot service, or a 27-knot service, or the best service on the ocean, we are in favour of it, provided we can get it at reasonable cost.

Mr. FOSTER. That's right.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I referred this afternoon to the 'Mauretania' and the 'Lusitania,' and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) spoke as if that was the type of steamer we had in mind at the conference.

The memory of the hon. gentleman is defective; he knows that the conference sat in May, 1907, and the 'Mauretania' and the 'Lusitania' were not then launched, so that we could not have had them before us for purposes of comparison. I stated to-day that if we could have steamers like the 'Mauretania' and the 'Lusitania' that is what we would desire, but I spoke honestly as to the difficulty, and I said that it had not yet been proven that these two great steamers were a commercial success. I pointed out that while steamers of this type were what we aimed at, we might not be able to have them if they could not be obtained within reasonable cost. There are none so blind as those who do not wish to see, and there is no one who can be so blind as my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) on occasion. No one will accuse him of being naturally dense, but when he does want to be dense he will not exercise his power of discernment, and he can be denser than anybody I know of. Let us judge the policy of the opposition by the amendment they have moved. There are two propositions in that amendment, the last of which means nothing, because the difference between it and the proposition of the government is merely the difference between tweedledum and tweedledee. But there is another idea in the amendment, and I will mention it as an example of how ridiculous sensible men can sometimes be. This All-Red route is acknowledged to be a splendid project, a project which excites the pride of all Canadians and of all British subjects. What does the opposition say with regard to it? They say: Stop here; do not go any further in this imperial project until you have made arrangements for cold storage. Never was there such a big beginning and such a small ending. Is it possible that these gentlemen opposite, who claim that their party has attained to dignified statesmanship, should came down to resolve that in a project so vast you must not undertake it until you have provided for cold storage? Why do they not ask us to provide that the steamers shall have funnels and boilers? Is there any well equipped steamer to-day that is not provided with cold storage facilities as well as with a rudder and a mast? Do these hon. gentlemen opposite really believe that when we were contemplating this imperial steamship service, which is calculated to bind the British empire together, we ever thought the steamers would not be equipped with cold storage? Has it come to this? Is not such an idea too small for grown up men? Let me comfort my hon. friends opposite by telling them that it certainly does mean cold storage, for does not the resolution say in so many words that it means the best service available? Is there any kind of first-class service afloat on the Atlantic which is not provided with cold storage? Why, cold storage accommodation is just as necessary as the boilers in the ships. But my hon. friend from North Toronto, and the hon. leader of the opposition as well, have let the cat out of the bag and have —given us the true intent which moved them to this amendment. The leader of the opposition told us in his speech that there was something in this project not very pleasant for the farmers of Ontario and of the country generally, who do not travel in these luxurious steamers, but who want cheap freight rates for their products.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I notice that the sentiment is responded to on the other side of the House. There are more ways than one of providing cheap freight for the producers of this country. It is not altogether a matter of affording cheap transportation rates. The farmers will realize that when we provide the steamship service we have in mind we will be doing something to benefit the farmers of Canada. And here let me say that if there is one thing men should be ashamed of it is to endeavour to introduce class prejudices into a question of this kind. Let me point out that when we have these great steamers afloat on the ocean, and when we are carrying people from all parts of the world to our shores, we will be doing a good deal for the farmers of Canada.

I do not always agree with my hon. friend from North Toronto, but I must give credit to whom credit is due. We must give credit even to some persons whom I will not name, though it is not due; therefore I give credit to my hon. friend from North Toronto. My hon. friend during the present session made use of an expression which at the time seemed to me a little audacious, but which on the whole was correct. He said that in Switzerland they exported scenery. The expression was audacious, but there is merit in it. It meant that the scenery of Switzerland attracted to that country every year thousands of tourists. This is what he calls exporting scenery, and this is what we want to do—export the scenery of Canada. We are going to export it to Europe; we are also going to export it to the Orient: and this is in accordance with the views of my hon. friend. My hon. friend this morning made it a reproach to me that I brought this resolution before the imperial conference on the last day of the sitting. I do not know that it matters very much, as to the merits of this resolution, whether it was brought on the first day or the last day of the conference. Does my hon. friend want to make that an argument against the resolution? Did it occur to my hon. friend that, because the matter was brought before the conference on the last day of its sitting, it took the conference by surprise? Who expressed any surprise that the matter was brought up?

Mr. FOSTER. Lloyd George.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Lloyd George did not express any surprise; he only complained that he had not seen the resolution. He did not say that the idea was new to him. Does anybody suppose that at a conference of that kind, when members were meeting each other day after day, this matter had not been discussed informally between them? Does anybody suppose that this matter was brought before the conference suddenly, without a word of discussion or explanation beforehand? If the matter had not already been discussed, the moment the resolution was brought before the conference, everybody would have said: This is new to us; we must have time to consider it. Mr. Lloyd George complained only that he had not seen the resolution; but neither he nor anybody else complained that they were taken by surprise. No, Sir; the resolution was presented at the right moment; and what we want now is to have the assurance of the Canadian parliament that it will do its share when called on. I do not pretend to say for one moment, if we are authorized by this parliament to ask Australia and New Zealand for their co-operation in this scheme, that we can bind the Canadian parliament to do this or that; but we want to go to Australia and New Zealand with the moral certainty, affirmed by the Canadian parliament, that we have behind us the whole Canadian people.

House divided on amendment of Mr. R. L. Borden.

YEAS :

Messieurs

Alcorn,
Armstrong,
Avery,
Barr,
Beattie,
Bennett,
Bergeron,
Blain,
Borden (Carleton),
Brabazon,
Bristol,
Broder,
Chisholm (Huron),
Christie,
Clare,
Cockshutt,
Crocket,
Daniel,
Elson,
Foster,
Ganong,
Henderson,
Herron,
Hughes (Victoria),
Jackson (Elgin),
Kemp,
Lake,
Lancaster,
Lennox,
Leonard,
Lewis,
MacLaren,
McCarthy (Calgary),
Martin (Queens, P.E.I.),
Northrup,
Perley,
Porter,
Reid (Grenville),
Schaffner,
Sproule,
Staples,
Taylor,
Walsh (Huntingdon),
White,
Wilmot,
Wilson (Lennox & Addington),
Worthington,
Wright (Muskoka)—48.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Archambault,
Aylesworth,
Beauparlant,
Lemieux,
Loggie,
Lovell,
Beland,
Black,
Borden (Sir Frederick),
Bourbonnais,
Boyer,
Brodeur,
Brown,
Burrows,
Caldwell,
Calvert,
Carney,
Carvell,
Cash,
Clarke,
Conmee,
Copp,
Crawford,
Cyr,
Delisle,
Demers,
Desjardins,
Devlin,
Dubeau,
Dugas,
Dyment,
Fielding,
Finlay,
Finlayson,
Fisher,
Fortier,
Gauvreau,
German,
Girard,
Gordon,
Graham,
Harty,
Hughes (Kings, P.E.I.),
Hunt,
Jackson (Selkirk),
Johnston,
Kennedy,
Knowles,
Lachance,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),
Lanctot (Richelieu),
Lapointe,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Laurier (L'Assomption),
Lavergne,
LeBlanc,
Macdonald,
Maclean (Lunenburg),
Macpherson,
McCarthy (Simcoe),
McCool,
McCraney,
McIntyre (Perth),
McKenzie,
McLean (Huron),
McLennan,
Major,
Marcile (Bagot),
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Martin (Montreal, St. Mary's),
Martin (Wellington),
Mayrand,
Michaud,
Miller,
Oliver,
Pardee,
Parmelee,
Paterson,
Pickup,
Power,
Proulx,
Pugsley,
Ratz,
Reid (Restigouche),
Rivet,
Roche (Halifax),
Ross (Cape Breton),
Ross (Rimouski),
Rousseau,
Savoie,
Schell (Oxford),
Sifton,
Sinclair,
Smith (Nanaimo),
Smith (Oxford),
Stewart,
Talbot,
Telford,
Templeman,
Tobin,
Tolmie,
Turcotte,
Turgeon,
Turriff,
Verville,
Watson,
Wright (Renfrew),
Zimmerman.—108.

PAIRS:

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Logan,	Lefurgey,
Parmelee,	Worthington,
Galliher,	Clements,
McColl,	Ward,
Lemieux,	Haggart,
Adamson,	Maclean (York, S.),
Caron,	Seagram,
Bureau,	Osler,
Emmerson,	Monk,
Grant,	Barker,
Hall,	Fowler,
Law,	Roche (Marquette),
Carrier,	Morin,
Ross (Yale-Cariboo),	McLean (Queens, P.E.I.),
Schell (Glengarry),	Pringle,

Sloan,
Walsh (Montreal, St. Anne),
Bickerdike,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Gervais,
Ethier,
Guthrie,
Greenway,
McIntyre (Strathcona),
Meigs,
McLean (York, C.),
Wilson (Russell).
Smith (Wentworth),
Marshall,
Lalor,
Forget,
Ames,
Paquet,
Boyce,
Tisdale,
Owen,
Stanfield,
Macdonell,
Thompson.

Amendment negatived.

House divided on motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

YEAS :

Messieurs

Archambault,
Aylesworth,
Beauparlant,
Beland,
Black,
Borden (Sir Frederick),
Bourbonnais,
Boyer,
Brodeur,
Brown,
Burrows,
Caldwell,
Calvert,
Carney,
Carvell,
Cash,
Clarke,
Conmee,
Copp,
Crawford,
Cyr,
Delisle,
Demers,
Desjardins,
Devlin,
Dubeau,
Dugas,
Dyment,
Fielding,
Finlay,
Finlayson,
Fisher,
Fortier,
Gauvreau,
German,
Girard,
Gordon,
Graham,
Harty,
Hughes (Kings, P.E.I.),
Hunt,
Jackson (Selkirk),
Johnston,
Kennedy,
Knowles,
Lachance,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),
Lanctot (Richelieu),
Lapointe,
Lemieux,
Loggie,
Lovell,
Macdonald,
Maclean (Lunenburg),
Macpherson,
McCarthy (Simcoe),
McCool,
McCraney,
McIntyre (Perth),
McKenzie,
McLean (Huron),
McLean (York, C.),
McLennan,
Major,
Marcile (Bagot),
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Martin (Montreal, St. Mary's),
Martin (Wellington),
Mayrand,
Michaud,
Miller,
Oliver,
Pardee,
Paterson,
Paquet,
Pickup,
Power,
Proulx,
Pugsley,
Ratz,
Reid (Restigouche),
Rivet,
Roche (Halifax),
Ross (Cape Breton),
Ross (Rimouski),
Rousseau,
Savoie,
Schell (Oxford),
Sifton,
Sinclair,
Smith (Nanaimo),
Smith (Oxford),
Stewart,
Talbot,
Telford,
Templeman,
Tobin,
Tolmie,
Turcotte,
Turriff,

Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Laurier (L'Assomption),
Lavergne
LeBlanc,
Verville,
Watson,
Wright (Renfrew),
Zimmerman.—109.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Alcorn,
Armstrong,
Avery,
Barr,
Beattie,
Bennett,
Bergeron,
Blain,
Borden (Carleton),
Brabazon,
Bristol,
Broder,
Chisholm (Huron),
Christie,
Clare,
Crocket,
Daniel,
Elson,
Foster,
Ganong,
Henderson,
Herron,
Hughes (Victoria),
Jackson (Elgin),
Kemp,
Lake,
Lancaster,
Lennox,
Leonard,
Lewis,
MacLaren,
McCarthy (Calgary),
Martin (Queens, P.E.I.),
Northrup,
Owen,
Perley,
Porter,
Reid (Grenville),
Schaffner,
Sproule,
Staples,
Taylor,
Walsh (Huntingdon),
White,
Wilmot,
Wilson (Lennox & Addington),
Wright (Muskoka)—47.

PAIRS:

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Adamson,	Ames,
Bickerdike,	Barker,
Bureau,	Boyce,
Caron,	Forget,
Chisholm (Antigonish),	Cockshutt,
Galliher,	Clements,
Emmerson,	Maclean (York, S.),
Ethier,	Morin,
Grant,	Fowler,
Greenway,	Tisdale,
Guthrie,	Haggart,
Hall,	Lalor,
Law,	Macdonell,
Logan,	Lefurgey,
McColl,	Ward,
McIntyre (Strathcona),	McLean (Queens, P.E.I.),
Walsh (Montreal, St. Anne),	Marshall,
Meigs,	Monk,
Ross (Yale-Cariboo),	Osler,
Parmelee,	Worthington,
Schell (Glengarry),	Pringle,
Sloan,	Roche (Marquette),
Gladu,	Seagram,
Bole,	Stanfield,
Carrier,	Thompson,
Gervais,	Smith (Wentworth).

Motion agreed to.

AUDITOR GENERAL.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into Com-

mittee of the Whole to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to provide that the Auditor General be paid a salary of five thousand dollars per annum.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General having been made acquainted with the subject matter of this resolution recommends it to the consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

PROHIBITION OF OPIUM.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Minister of Labour) moved that the House go into Committee of the Whole to-morrow to consider the following proposed rtsolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to prohibit the importation, manufacture and sale of opium for other than medicinal purposes.

Motion agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR GENERAL—SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) delivered a message from His Excellency the Governor General signed by his own hand.

Mr. SPEAKER read the message as follows:

GREY.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending March 31, 1909, and, in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act of 1867, the Governor General recommends these estimates to the House of Commons.

Government House,
Ottawa, July 9, 1908.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the message of His Excellency together with the Supplementary Estimates be referred to the Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the orders of the day are called, I desire to ask the Minister of Finance if the Supplementary Estimates that have just been brought down are all the supplementaries or whether there will be others?

Mr. FIELDING. At the present moment I have no reason to believe that there will be anything further; but if it should be found that any item has inadvertently been omitted, we shall feel free to bring it down.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But no others are contemplated?

Mr. FIELDING.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I desire to ask the Prime Minister when the railway subsidies which have been spoken of will be brought down?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am informed that they are ready for printing, and will probably be brought down to-morrow or the day after.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not remember whether or not all the legislation which has been spoken of by the right hon. leader of the House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is now before us. Is there anything else?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think there is nothing more, with the exception of a certain amendment to the criminal code, with regard to the railway men, which was foreshadowed some time ago.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There is to be a Bill for the transfer or sale of certain military properties at Toronto and at Montreal—simply to carry out the terms of arrangements made some time ago for which statutory authority is necessary.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When will that be brought down?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I believe the Bill is ready now.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is not contentious?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, it is non-contentious. It relates to matters which have been discussed before the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Whether it is contentious or non-contentious, everything should be brought before the House at the earliest possible moment with a view to facilitating the business. We have been here nearly seven months and a half, and any legislation necessary, it seems to me, should have been down long ago.

SUPPLY—OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). Before we go into Supply I would call the attention of the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to the fact that a report of the Debates Committee was brought before the House on April 23rd last, but no motion has been made to have that report adopted by the House. If I am well informed, it was delayed because of an expression of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), but it was to have been brought forward later on. Since then, a later report, made by the same com-

mittee, and involving exactly the same principle, has been brought before the House and adopted. I would now ask my right hon. friend if nothing can be done to have the pending report also adopted by the House. This is one of these reports of committees which are generally treated with respect by this House, and I think it is due to the Committee on Debates that this report should be brought before the House and acted upon. I imagine that the answer to my question will be that the chairman of the Debates Committee should bring the matter forward. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Gervais) is not here to-day. I do not know whether he will be here before the end of the session or not. I call the attention of my right hon. friend to the fact that it will seem like a slur on the Debates Committee if its report is not acted upon before the end of the session.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I must say, in justice to the chairman of the Debates Committee, that he has called my attention to this report more than once, but I have always understood that the matter was enngaging the attention of the Committee on Internal Economy.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). The matter is engaging the attention of the Committee on Internal Economy, and in one form or other it will be brought to the notice of the House, either by the report of the committee being called up or by some other proposition, at an early day. The session will not pass without the matter being dealt with.

Mr. BERGERON. I would remind my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that, as I have already stated, since this report was brought down, a later and analogous report from the very same committee has been adopted by the House.

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

Militia and Defence, chargeable to capital—for purchase of ordnance, arms, lands for military purposes, reserve stores of clothing, equipment, &c., and to pay for construction of new rifle ranges, $1,300,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has any printed statement of the Inspector General been distributed?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia). I am about to distribute it now. I could not do it before because it required a motion of the House, but I am going to read the document and shall ask permission of the committee to lay the report on the table and it will be immediately distributed.

I regret very much that I shall be obliged to detain the committee for some little time at such a late period of the session, but I think the committee will agree with me that I should not allow this session to close without making reference to the report of the Civil Service Commission, so far as it affects the Department of Militia, especially as my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) saw fit to give force to this report by reading very extensively from it those portions which refer to the Militia Department, thereby, I suppose, adopting the views therein expressed. I might have brought the matter up on the occasion when the report of that commission was under discussion ; but as I did not wish to discuss it generally, I thought it would be better that I should do so on the motion to go into supply upon the estimates for civil government. It so happened however that the estimates for civil government of my department were passed at a moment when, by agreement on both sides, there was no debate, when it was desirable to get the estimates through in order to facilitate the payment of the clerks in the service. Therefore I must ask, Mr. Chairman, your indulgence while I refer to that portion of the civil service report which deals with the Department of Militia. I believe it was understood that this item was reserved in order that any matter pertinent to the Militia Department should be open for discussion. I do not intend to go into a general discussion of the work of the Civil Service Commission, but I cannot help thinking that commission did not do its work in as workmanlike manner as was the work of the commission of 1892. I have carefully read the report and the evidence of the commission—the evidence taken by the commission of 1892 as well as that taken by the commission of 1907 and the report now under consideration. I observe that in 1892 the commission was very careful to prepare a list of the questions which were submitted to all the leading officials of the various departments some time before they were to be examined in order to give them every opportunity of being prepared to answer those questions. Perhaps I had better read a short extract from the report of the Civil Service Commission of 1892 because the idea is better expressed there than I can do it. It reads as follows :

> In order to fully carry out the duties entrusted to them, the first step which the commissioners took, after electing Mr. Hague chairman, was the preparation of a carefully considered schedule of questions on the above subject. A copy of these was transmitted to the deputy head or other responsible officer of each department with the request that answers shall be prepared and submitted when the officers in question shall be called on to give evidence before the commission. This method of procedure had the effect of obtaining accurate information in matters of detail and also of shortening to some extent the time occupied in the inquiry.

Nothing of this kind was done by the recent commission. On the contrary, it seems

to me, from reading the questions which were put, that there was frequently an evident intention to take the officers by surprise. At any rate no opportunity to prepare was given them. It seems to me that the questions were frequently leading and that there is every indication that the commissioners approached their task with their minds made up and not with the desire or expectation of learning anything from the evidence they were taking, which would enable them to reach a sound conclusion. It impresses me in that way, and in reading over the evidence taken in the different departments, I cannot but observe how differently the different departments were treated. I cannot help thinking that, perhaps without intention—we will hope without intention—the chairman of that commission was, let us say, unconsciously influenced by the fact that he had been an officer of the Dominion government for thirty or forty years and had been Deputy Finance Minister for something over thirty years and had thereby been brought in contact with the important officers in the different departments. This, one would have thought, would have given him possibly more special qualifications for judging the condition of the civil service, and undoubtedly it did. But, on the other hand, there were the jealousies and the difficulties which had arisen during those thirty years of office between him and other officials, and I presume that the chairman, being human, went into the work of chairmanship of this commission with a good many prejudices and possibly with some old grudges which have found vent in the report laid before the House in the manner of the questions put to the different witnesses.

I am not going to quote generally from the evidence, but I want to accentuate the observations which I have just made, by referring the committee to the evidence to be found in the first volume of the evidence, at pages 180, 183 and 184. I would suggest to any hon. gentleman who wishes to spend an amusing half hour that he read the evidence taken by the commission from the officers of the Department of Finance. It will not be forgotten, Mr. Chairman, that the chairman of this commission had been for thirty years Deputy Minister of Finance. I will give you two or three sample questions to show you how gently he treated his own department, the department in which he was formerly deputy minister. At page 180 I find this question put by the chairman to the present Deputy Minister of Finance, Mr. Boville :

Q. You worked your way up through every grade by promotion examination until you became deputy minister?—A. Yes.

Then, Mr. Fyshe says :

Q. Have you passed several promotion examinations?—A. One was all I had to take.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN

Then, at page 183, this question is asked by the chairman :

Q. As a rule your employees are all healthy?—A. Yes.

Q. And scarcely without exception they are of good character?—A. The employees of the Department of Finance are of the highest character.

By Mr. Fyshe:

Q. Are you more careful in your selection?—A. We are very careful in selection.

Q. And your political head does not give you any trouble?—A. None whatever. He is very reasonable and very careful to give us as good material as he possibly can obtain.

A little later on; the chairman—the ex-Deputy Minister of Finance—says :

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Who is being examined?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The present deputy minister, Mr. Boville, who had grown up in the department.

An hon. MEMBER. Who appointed the chairman?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Well, I did not, but I am responsible.

Q. In consequence of the training they received many former officials of the Finance Department have succeeded in outside life?—A. Yes.

Q. Mr. Ross left the department?—A. Yes, Mr. Chipman left the department.

Q. To become chief factor for the Hudson Bay Company?—A. Mr. Baker left the department in your time, Mr. Courtney.

The Chairman.—Yes. The Finance Department has trained up a lot of men.

The Witness.—Mr. Tabor is now a lawyer in Dawson.

A regular mutual admiration society. Here was Paul sitting at the feet of Gamaliel. I had a little curiosity to look up the length of time that these gentlemen had been in this wonderful department in which so many men have been trained for such important positions and this is what I found : Mr. Chipman was in the Finance Department from July 1, 1880, to February 7, 1881, and you will see what miracles were performed in that short time. I find that Mr. Ross, who was taken out of this department and given the position of general manager of a bank, was in the department exactly eighteen months, from July 1, 1901, to January 1, 1903. So you will observe that the department is able almost to perform miracles, that it is a wonderful training school. A man goes in, remains six months and is eligible for any position ! But there is one question from which probably a different meaning was intended to be taken from that which might be taken. The chairman says:

Q. And while men have constantly left the department you have had no applications from any who have retired to come back again?—A. No.

No, once having escaped they never want to return. However, I do not intend to deal with the matter in this way. I have simply given the committee this as a sample brick to indicate the method of investigation and the kind of frivolous questions with which these gentlemen occupied themselves in dealing with a serious question.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Were they as gentle with the Department of Militia and Defence?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Not quite, as I shall show you. The Militia Department can, I suppose, fairly be called a technical department. It is a department in which the expenditure of money is based upon the policy of the country. Parliament deliberately decides how large the militia shall be, what amount of money shall be expended upon it, and what shall be the policy with regard to the development and carrying out of the defence of this country. I have read over the orders in council by which this commission was appointed and I have looked in vain for any authority given by that order in council to these gentlemen to constitute themselves a committee to investigate and criticise the policy deliberately adopted by the parliament of this country. It is not their's. Therefore, I venture to think that these gentlemen have made a very grave mistake in arrogating to themselves the right to make such an investigation, particularly as they are notoriously, absolutely and utterly ignorant of the first principles which govern military matters. But, they rushed in and we have before us, in the report of the commission, portions of which have been read to this House, from the bottom of page 37 down to the middle of page 42, what might be fairly described, I think, as an indictment against the administration of the militia services, beginning with the criticism of the policy of parliament in increasing the vote from $3,500,000 to $6,500,000 between the years 1903-4 and the years 1907-8 and ending with the conclusion that the efficiency of the militia is less than it was ten or fifteen years ago. I propose, as briefly as may be, to deal with some of the matters referred to in this report.

As I shall quote to some extent from the memorandum of Major General Lake, Inspector General upon that portion of the report of the Civil Service Commission, 1908, which deals with the administration of the militia, I propose with the consent of the committee to lay this memorandum on the table, and I shall distribute copies to hon. gentlemen. I may say that when the report of the Civil Service Commissioners appeared, General Lake was very much surprised and he at once came to see me and he said he would be very glad indeed to prepare an answer which I gave him authority to do. Everybody knows who General Lake is, and everybody will agree with me that his opinion on the militia of Canada is worth more than perhaps that of any other living man. General Lake has served in Canada now about 9 years; he served as Quarter-Master General under the late government from 1893 until that government went out of power, and then on till 1898 under the present administration. Since 1904 he has been chief of the General Staff. He has served in India and he has served for a number of years in the war office. He was assistant quarter-master general at the war office during the whole of the South African war and he had under his control and was responsible for the transport of that great army which left the shores of Great Britain and which was safely landed, I believe, without the loss of a single man. I think I am correct in saying that his department of the War Office is the only one that has not been criticised in connection with the South African war. I think I may venture to put forward the memorandum of General Lake on a military matter as against the report of the Civil Service Commissioners. While the Civil Service Commission was sitting I called upon the chairman of the commission and suggested to him that as military work was somewhat technical perhaps he would like to examine some other officers—he had then examined General Lake and the present deputy minister who had only at that time been four months in office as deptuy although he had previously been in the department as director of medical service—and I said I would like very much if the commissioners would do me the favour of allowing me to see the questions and answers which they had received. I was received very pleasantly by Mr. Courtney and while he did not promise absolutely to do so he gave me to understand that he would. But a day or two afterwards I received from him the following letter:

Civil Service Commission,
October 24, 1907.

Dear Sir Frederick Borden,—Yesterday I talked over with my colleagues the purport of our interview of last Saturday, and, while we considered it very desirable to do all in our power to make our inquiries as complete and perfect as possible yet it was felt that to let the evidence get out before the production of the report would be unsatisfactory. But while we arrived at that conclusion we thought that every facility should be given to elucidate or supplement evidence either by witnesses or handing in statements to be added to the evidence—such being the case we shall be glad to see General Lake at any time that would be most convenient to himself to come before us, and anything he may wish to add will be appended to his evidence, if General Lake would kindly favour me with a call I am sure we could easily arrange a time. I have only to add that whatever course is settled upon that in view of the

early meeting of parliament action should be quickly taken.

Yours very truly,
(Sgd.) J. M. COURTNEY.

Hon. Sir Frederick Borden, K.C.M.G., &c.

General Lake has appended to his memorandum a letter which he himself wrote to Mr. Courtney. Mr. Courtney sent General Lake a copy of the evidence he had given and General Lake had an opportunity of correcting it, although as you will see as I proceed, not the slightest attention was paid by the commission to the direct evidence given either by General Lake or by my deputy minister. Possibly it was through an oversight, but in view of the character of the report it looks very much as if the evidence was wilfully omitted. This is the letter which was written by General Lake to Mr. Courtney and which I think is of importance:

Ottawa, November 25, 1907.

Dear Mr. Courtney,—I beg to return, herewith, amended and with certain notes, a copy of the evidence given by me before the Civil Service Commission, which evidence you were kind enough to return, in order that I might verify my answers upon those matters which are the concern rather of my colleagues of the militia council, and upon which I was not in a position to speak with authority. I shall be obliged if you will kindly cause any portion of my evidence which may be published to be corrected accordingly.

I venture, also, to submit, with the utmost respect, the following points for the consideration of your commission. At least three-fourths of my examination was devoted to questions regarding the military administration of the militia force as carried out by military officers, not by civil servants. Some questions were put which were founded upon newspaper paragraphs, generally inaccurate, often misleading. Others were asked—see more especially questions 171, 311-313 and 328-334—which appeared to suggest that the increase of expenditure since 1892 upon militia force had not been accompanied by a commensurate increase of efficiency.

It is not, perhaps, for me to advance the contrary proposition—though I hold it—but I must submit that no conclusion of that nature can fairly be grounded upon what could only be a superficial examination of the case. I, therefore, feel it my duty to urge upon the commission that no opinion, such as might be inferred from the tenor of the questions quoted—the accuracy of which is not always admitted—ought, in the interests of justice and of the public service, to be recorded, without far more searching inquiry and examination than the present commission has been able to give.

Believe me,
Yours sincerly,
(Sgd.) PERCY H. N. LAKE,
Major General, C.G.S.

J. M. Courtney, Esq., C.M.G., I.S.O.,
Chairman, Civil Service Commission.

It will be observed that General Lake had given the chairman of this commission fair warning so far back as November, 1907, and as General Lake says in his memorandum this letter was never acknowledged and the contents of it were absolutely disregarded. I find that insead of trying to get information from men who might be supposed to know something about military matters, these gentlemen based their questions very largely upon newspaper articles which appeared generally in newspapers hostile to the administration. I do not complain of that, if they were newspapers which knew anything of what they were talking about; but they were not. In one or two cases questions were based admittedly upon gossip of the street corner. There is altogether too much of the element of gossip running through the report of this commission from one end to the other. That part of it which refers to the Militia Department is all based upon imagination or upon gossip.

Now, I wish to summarize the misrepresentations—I cannot say deliberate misrepresentations—that have been made in this report as to the cause of the increased expenditure; as to the condition of the stores and the safeguards surrounding the care of the stores; as to the number of the headquarters staff, which is stated in one place to be forty, in another place to be fifty, and in another place, with the addition of some other officers, to be 220, while as a matter of fact it was twenty-three, and both the deputy minister and General Lake repeated that fact over and over again in their evidence; as to the accountant of the Militia Department, against whom the commission, or some member of it, seems to have a particular grudge; as to the functions of the Militia Council, as to which I shall be obliged to detain the committee for some little time; as to an article which was quoted, and which I contributed some time ago to the 'United Service Review;' as to efficiency, upon which there is absolute and utter misrepresentation, against the evidence and the only evidence, except gossip and newspaper clippings, which these gentlemen had before them.

The commission instituted a comparison between the expenditure of 1903-1904 and that of 1908-1909, as they say for 'specific reasons'; and they go on to point out that the Militia law was changed about 1904. An attempt is made to show that the change in the law resulted in placing the Militia Department absolutely under the control of the military branch and that therefore, in some way not fully explained, the expenditure ran up from three and a half millions in 1904 to six and a half millions. The commissioners say:

Your commissioners have made a comparison between these two years for specific reasons. In 1904 there was introduced into parliament an Act respecting the Militia and Defence of

Canada, which in many particulars was a new departure from the former Act. In the Act of 1904 by section 6 it is enacted:—

The Governor in Council may appoint a deputy of the minister and such other officers as are necessary for carrying on the business of the department, all of whom shall hold office during pleasure.

In all the Act which has over 140 sections, no other reference is made to the deputy, and it is a curious circumstance that while the appointments of certain officials are permissive certain others are mandatory.

You will expect, as a logical inference from this statement, that in the old law, the law which preceded that of 1904, elaborate references were made to the deputy minister, and you will be surprised when I produce the law of 1904 and the law of 1886, to find that the language in both is precisely the same. I am reading now from the statute of 1904, which is the present law, and in which section 6 says:

The Governor in Council may appoint a deputy of the minister and such other officers as are necessary for carrying on the business of the department, all of whom shall hold office during pleasure.

Now, let me read from the law of 1886. It is this:

The Governor in Council may appoint a deputy of the Minister of Militia and Defence, and such other officers as are necessary for carrying on the business of the department, all of whom shall hold office during pleasure.

The one is copied verbation from the other; and yet these gentlemen never took the trouble to look at the statute, because they were afraid, I suppose, that they might find that the very foundation of their theory did not exist. They go on to say that the creation of the militia council brought the military authority forward and substituted it for the civil; and they say that this is proved by the fact that the headings of the reports of the Militia Department have changed—that whereas in the old days, before this iniquitous law was enacted, the report was headed as follows: 'Department of Militia and Defence year ended so-and-so;' now the heading is only: 'Report of Militia Council for the Dominion of Canada for the year ending so-and-so;' and they say that this is a proof that 'the department has been swallowed up by the militia council.' Now, the report of 1904, the last report, is under two heads—first, part 1, that is, the report of the deputy minister; next, part 2, the report of the General Commanding. Under the head of the deputy minister comes the report as to the civil side of the department under the heading of the general officer commanding, all the district officers of the Dominion are included. It would be just as sensible to say that the department was swallowed up by the general officer commanding in the old days, and much more so, as to say that the department has lost its identity through the existence of the militia council. But these gentlemen venture upon somewhat dangerous ground for novices. They undertake to say that the militia council is more powerful and has assumed more authority in Canada than the army council in Great Britain. I shall read an extract from General Lake's memorandum on that point as it will be accepted as more authoritative than anything I could say. General Lake says:

It is rather a pity that the commissioners should have commented unfavourably upon the increased expenditure without thinking it necessary to make any reference to these reasons for that increase, which are matters of policy approved by parliament.

On the contrary, they seem to wish to attribute the whole of it to the assumption by the militia council of what they designate as the 'control' of the Militia Department. A parallel is drawn between the Army Council at the War Office in London and the Militia Council at Ottawa, in which it is argued with somewhat scant acquaintance with the organization of the War Office, that the Army Council is 'entirely distinct' from the War Office, whereas the Militia Council has 'swallowed up' the Militia Department. To any one who knows the War Office, the former statement is wide of the truth.

An attempt is also made to show that parliamentary control is more fully assured in England than in Canada. Parliament is supreme in both cases, and the weakness of the contention advanced by the commissioners will be recognized when it is remembered that the Militia Council is by law (para. 7, Militia Act) purely advisory to the minister, and cannot act without his direct assent (see order in council of December 7, 1904), whereas the letters patent of February 6, 1904, which created the Army Council, not only vested in the latter all the prerogative powers of the Crown previously exercised by the Secretary of State or the Commander in Chief, but gave to any three of its members authority to exercise its full powers.

That is literally true and yet this self-constituted military critic has the effrontry to say that the militia council has assumed control and absolutely possesses by Act of parliament greater control than does the army council itself. The militia council has no control whatever. The militia council, as the Act prescribes, is purely advisory, it is simply a convenient method by which the minister brings to his aid different members of the department, four officers and two members of the civil staff. The Militia Department is peculiar in this respect, it is different from such a great department, for instance, as that of the Interior, which has its geological branch, its Indian branch its land branch, and so on, all absolutely and entirely distinct. The Militia Department has its intelligence branch, with its chief of general staff, its adjutant general, looking after the troops, the training, &c., the quarter-master general, looking af-

ter the stores and supplies, and the Master General of Ordnance, and of course the deputy minister of the department as the other departments have. But these different departments or branches are inter-dependent, they are in a sense inseparable, and in order to have successful administration you must have those different departments in perfect accord and perfect touch. You must have continuity of purpose, you must have co-operation among the different branches of the service and you must have co-ordination or you will experience very great difficulty. That is the object for which the army council was conceived, but of course, the army council has received very much greater power. That is the object I had in copying the present plan on which the war office is administered, by introducing the idea of having in Canada a militia council. The system has worked admirably, better than I expected and I hope it will always be continued.

Why in the world did the commission go so far afield to invent a cause for the increase of expenditure when they had actually before them in the evidence of General Lake and in the evidence of the deputy minister, the reasons for the increase? The reasons are known to everybody who will stop to think. They are as follows: During the year 1903-4 this country assumed the responsibility of taking over and maintaining the garrisons of Halifax and Esquimalt. That meant an expenditure of one and a half to two million dollars. There is more than one-half of the total amount of the increase at once. The militia, under the new law, was paid nearly twice as much in the latter years as in the former years. That would account for from a quarter to half a million. The militia had been increased enormously in its numerical strength between 1903-4 and 1907-8. They might also have taken note of a charge of $200,000 on account of customs which is simply a cross entry. Between these different amounts you get the full three millions. I have a statement here which will give this exactly. The expenditures on account of the headquarter staff and district staff, the permanent force, exclusive of Halifax and Esquimalt, and their pay, provisions and supplies for the permanent force, clothing for the permanent force, transport of staff and permanent force, amounted in 1903-4, to $649,000, and in 1907-8 to $1,253,700. The strength of the permanent force, exclusive of Halifax and Esquimalt, has been increased from 853 to 1,656. Now, take the expenditure of the active militia, for training, clothing, grants, etc. In 1903-4 the total expenditure under this head was $1,077,000; in 1907-8 it was $1,562,000. The number of men of all ranks paid in 1903-4 was 33,751 and in 1907-8 42,612. On rifle ranges and camp grounds there was nearly $200,000 more spent in 1907-8 than in 1903-4—and I suppose no one will quarrel with that expenditure. On ordnance, field guns and rifles the expenditure in 1903-4 was $487,000 and in 1907-8 $718,000. On warlike stores the expenditures were much the same. On account of garrison at Halifax and Esquimalt there was no expenditure in 1903-4 except $109,987, which was the amount the Canadian government contributed to the British government for the maintenance of Esquimalt. As against this, you have an expenditure of $1,256,800 in 1907-8. On Royal Military College the expenditure in these two years is practically the same. The expenditure on the Dominion arsenal has increased from $224,911 to $416,000. The output has greatly increased. I have here an interesting statement showing that in 1895-6 the output of the cartridge factory was only 672,000 rounds, while in 1903-4 it was 6,352,000 rounds and in 1907-8 10,500,000 rounds, with a very large number of shells of the most expensive kind. These figures show an output in 1903-4 eight times greater than in 1895-6 and in 1907-8 fifteen times greater. In these items I have included the vote for customs, as I have already mentioned.

Now, one of the criticisms upon which this commission has rung the changes is that there is a very large—and I suppose the inference is, useless or, at any rate, unnecessary—staff. I find that the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), in his speech, made special reference to this subject, and drew a comparison between Canada and Switzerland unfavourable to Canada, the statement being that whereas the army of Switzerland was between 200,000 and 300,000 and the army of Canada only 50,000, the expenditure on headquarters staff was greater in Canada than in Switzerland. Now, as a matter of fact, the headquarters staff numbers 23—not 40 or 52, as stated in this report. And, as I have already said, that report was made in the face of the evidence given by General Lake and by Colonel Fiset—a deliberate misrepresentation, because the attention of the commission was thus called to the facts. It is stated by the leader of the opposition that the Canadian staff costs immensely more than the Swiss. I find that the Canadian staff cost $82,500, and the latest reports I have been able to get, those of 1906-7, show that the cost of the headquarters staff of Switzerland is $168,289—a little more than double. More than that, I find that the highest rate of pay in Switzerland is $1,800. If Canadian rates of pay where applied to the headquarters staff of Switzerland, the cost would be fully $330,000, or just four times the cost of the Canadian staff. Nobody expects that Canadians are going to attempt to live on the pay that the officers in Switzerland can live on; it would be impossible, and the

Canadian parliament does not expect it. So the statement is absolutely wide of the facts, no wilder statement was ever made than that the cost of the headquarters staff of Switzerland is below that of Canada. It is more than double, and, if the same rate of pay were applied, it would be exactly four times as much. Now, I would like to quote from General Lake's memo. I refer to appendix B, page 15:

A considerable amount of misconception, fostered by the ill-informed report of the Civil Service Commissioners, appears to exist on the subject of the number of staff officers now employed at headquarters and on the command and district staffs. I venture to think that it is desirable to place on record a clear statement of the case.

The commissioners have, while criticising the Militia Department and the Militia Council, assumed the truth of an allegation often heard, to the effect that the number of staff officers has, of late years, been considerably increased. They have failed, however, to make any inquiry as to the real extent and nature of whatever increase there has been, or the reasons for it.

It has more than once been advanced in the press, in criticism of the administration of the militia by successive general officers commanding, that each one has apt to differ from his predecessor's views and to introduce a new organization. While there may have been some ground for this criticism, it is remarkable that all general officers have been agreed on one point, at any rate, and that point was the necesssity for a reorganized and augmented staff.

And on page 16:

The contention implied in the report of the Civil Service Commission, that any large increase in the headquarters staff has been carried out as a consequence of the inauguration of the militia council, is, therefore, without foundation. The sole increase to the headquarters staff since 1903-4 has been the addition of three officers, viz: a chief of the general staff, a director of operations and staff duties, and a director of training.

A little further down:

The total of the district staff, when Lord Dundonald first took command in 1902, amounted to twenty-four. The command and district staff together now number twenty-nine. Though the commissioners talk of them as 'about 220,' the combined total of headquarters, command and district staffs at the present moment amounts to fifty-two officers. On January 1, 1893, the combined total of headquarters and district staffs was thirty-two. The establishment of the militia in that financial year amounted to 34,330 of all ranks. For 1908, the total establishments amount to 57,718. In 1892-3, there was no Army Service Corps, no Army Medical Corps, no Ordnance Corps, no Army Pay Corps, no Corps of Military Clerks, and no Signallers. The military force of that date could, therefore, not have taken the field—at least, not without many months previous organization of these services. As to the relative efficiency for war of the forces in 1902-3 and 1908, there can, therefore, be no question, although the increase of staff in the intervening period is almost exactly proportional to the increase in strength.

Another point usually forgotten by the opponents of any staff organization at all is the fact that, so long as the imperial troops were garrisoning the fortresses of Halifax and Esquimalt, not only was an unusually large staff (eight officers for about 2,000 men) maintained at the former place for the acknowledged purpose of assisting the militia force in organizing its staff duties in the event of war, but also that the considerable number of Imperial officers regimentally employed at that station furnished at all times a military reserve, upon which to draw for staff officers on emergency. With the assumption by Canada of the responsibility for the defence of these two places, the British troops have been replaced by Canadian troops and the supply of trained British officers formerly available for these important duties has ceased. Hence a considerable increase in the number of Canadian staff officers has been imperative.

The existing militia staff, if it be anything like sufficient for a force of 100,000 men, which is more than doubtful, can only be regarded as a bare minimum.

It may, perhaps, be of interest to note that the proportion of staff officers to men maintained in Canada and Great Britain, respectively, for 1907-8 works out roughly, at: In Canada 1 to 1,110, in Great Britain 1 to 1,030, of the forces provided for in peace. If the numbers of men which would be mobilized for war are considered, the Canadian proportion would be still smaller than the British proportion.

Because you have to add nearly 52 per cent to the number we actually train, as our whole system is conducted on the basis of 100,000 men in the event of struggle occurring, and we require to have sufficient officers and staff for that number.

It may also be noted as pertinent to the subject that the cost of the military side of the headquarters of the Swiss army is nearly double——

As I have pointed out:

—that of militia headquarters of Canada, and this in spite of the fact that the rates of pay, generally current in Switzerland are lower and that the economies possible under the system of universal service which there obtains tend to reduce expenditure considerably.

Now, Mr. Chairman, these military expert and critics seem to have discovered that we have staffs sufficient for 100,000 men! They state that in their report, not knowing—not caring to know, not desiring to know, shutting their eyes and ears lest they might know—that the whole scheme on which the Canadian militia is based is one of having an effective force of 100,000 men in case of necessity. How is that made up? We have over 50,000 enlisted, we have rifle associations and men who have gone through their annual training, on the reserve

list, who could be called on and are ready to enlist at a moment's notice, so that we could raise the number from 55,000 to 100,000 and put that force in the field at short notice. But it will not do to wait until trouble occurs to have officers ready. You can improvise your men, you can bring into the field men who have a certain amount of drill and have learned how to use their rifles, but you cannot improvise your officers in thirty or sixty days. You must have them carefully trained, you must have an effective staff, you must have every one of your departments which go to make up an army ready for action. And these men are in the meantime not idle. They are all occupied, and I venture to say, as General Lake has pointed out, that there is not a department in the whole service where more work is done than in the Militia Department, particularly in the military branch of that department.

We are told that there is less efficiency. These wiseacres say there is doubt as to whether the rural militia is as well trained as it used to be, and because somebody has said so on a street corner, they say that the city militia is much less efficient. In that connection I am going to bring an absolutely disinterested witness—a gentleman who has written a letter which I happened to see in one of the Montreal papers, a gentleman who occupies a very prominent position in the Conservative party in the city of Montreal and who has been an officer of the militia. My hon. friend from Sherbrooke (Mr. Worthington), I am sure, will know him very well. I refer to Lieutenant-Colonel Meighen who wrote this letter, certainly unsolicited by me:

Civil Service Commissioners as military critics.

Editor, 'Herald.'

Sir,—I do not suppose that in the moments of their wildest ambition, the members of the Civil Service Commission ever expected to be taken seriously as military critics. One may wonder, therefore, why they allowed themselves to say that they doubted if the city corps of the militia were as efficient now as formerly. I am sure I have the support of all city militia officers when I contradict this statement. The commission evidently do not know what they are talking about. I have been long enough actively connected with a city regiment, and in touch with many others, to know the conditions prevailing, and can say with confidence that the regiments in the chief centres of the Dominion are to-day very much more efficient than in the past.

I do not make this assertion without being able to give reasons for it, as is the case with the commissioners. The officers of the city corps are better qualified for their positions. The examinations which they have to pass are more numerous and more strict, and exact a higher standard than formerly, and the same thing applies in the non-commissioned officers.

To-day practical field work is called for, and is carried out by the different corps individually and in brigades, tactical manœuvres on a large scale being a feature of the annual training. Such things were never done fifteen years ago. Discipline has vastly improved, and finally and most important of all, the rifle shooting is very much better. Thanks to the ranges provided of recent years there are now many more men able to use their rifles effectively, and any one with the faintest idea of militia training knows that this is the most important feature of it. On this count alone, if on no other the commissioners report is utterly wrong.

I do not wish to belittle the excellent work of the officers and men of the militia in former years, but they had neither the material nor the opportunities to bring their corps up to the standard of those to-day.

It is to be hoped that the gentlemen composing the commission if they are called upon to make any further reports, will be more careful to ascertain the facts, and not imagine that the rashness of ignorance is knowledge. They have cast a slur upon a body of men who are giving up more of their time and money, and making greater sacrifices in the service of the country than any other class of Canadians.

F. S. MEIGHEN,
Lieutenant-Colonel, First Battalion Royal Highlanders of Canada.

Montreal, March 30.

He is not on the active list now, he has retired and I think he retired before that letter was written.

Another point referred to by the commission and quoted for my hon. friend the leader of the opposition is in reference to desertions. The statement is made that desertions are very numerous and reasons are given which are not correct. I will quote again from General Lake, because I do not wish to give my unsupported statement. I wish to give the evidence of a man above the suspicion of writing or saying what is not absolutely correct:

The commissioners refer to the prevalence of desertion in the permanent corps and attribute it mainly to a want of sympathy between officers of the permanent corps and the men. It may be remarked that the reasons given by Major General Lake——

In his evidence, mind you, which they would not take any notice of:

—were, the demand and high pay given for labour everywhere, the smallness of the establishments, poor barracks, no change of station and the occasional failure on the part of the government to keep faith with the men. While he admitted that, possibly, in some cases, officers might not be in full sympathy with the men, he expressly stated that he did not think it to be the case to any appreciable extent.

Yet, these commissioners rush into print to say that the desertions are entirely due to the fact that the officers are out of sympathy with the men when they have the evidence before them of the man best able to give evidence, General Lake himself, that such was not the fact.

He pointed out, also, that some of the barracks were wretchedly bad. Surely it would only have been fair to the officers of the permanent force for the commissioners to have mentioned some of these reasons.

They were not mentioning reasons. Again:

(f) That 'the desertions have been one in three.'

This statement was approximately true for 1905, but there has been much improvement since then. For 1906 the figures were one in six. For 1907 they were one in nine, and many of these men rejoin from desertion and reduce the proportion.

Yet, the commission insists upon saying that the desertions are one in three when they had the evidence before them, that of General Lake, that the proportion has been reduced to one in six, to one in nine and even less. Of course, there will be desertions in a country like this. I doubt if the proportion is any greater than in the United States. As General Lake has pointed out, the demand for labour is so great and men can get higher wages outside of the service. When they can get from $2 to $2.50 a day they are not going to remain in the service where they get from 50 to 75 cents a day. A man who goes into the service goes there simply for the love of soldiering and sometimes after he gets there he finds that he is not as fond of it as he thought he would be and he deserts. But, to put the responsibility of that upon the permanent force, officers and the department is absolutely unjust and, in view of the evidence which the commisioners had before them, simply outrageous.

These military experts and critics report that there is a useless officer in the department known as the inspector general. They say that in England there are good reasons for an inspector general and none in Canada, but they fail to tell us wherein the difference lies. Again, I shall have to trouble the committee with a short quotation from General Lake who, I fancy, is as good authority as there is on this subject:

The commissioners consider that the appointment of an inspector general is of but little benefit to the militia, and recommend that, when vacant, it be not filled. They state that, in Great Britain, the appointment was made for reasons which do not exist in Canada. They do not give those reasons, and it is, therefore, impossible to judge how far the commissioners' contention holds good.

But it may be remarked that the committee of 1904——

That is the English committee, the Esher committee as it is called,

—on whose report the present War Office organization was adopted, were very insistent upon the need for an inspector general; indeed, they said that effective inspection was 'absolutely imperative.' And the appointment is at present filled in England by one of the ablest soldiers in the army (General Sir John French).

An inspector general was appointed in Canada because the arguments used by the War Office Reorganization Committee (and detailed in their report) were concurred in, and it was considered essential to provide for inspection by a highly qualified officer, competent to speak with authority upon all military questions, who should insure, first, that the directions of the Militia Council were faithfully and uniformly carried out throughout the militia force (especially that the instruction given in the various military schools should be uniform) and, second, should report to the Militia Council upon the practical results of the measures adopted by it. Thorough and competent inspection is, at least, as necessary in the militia as in any business concern.

At this moment General Lake is the inspector general and he is engaged in making a most careful inspection of every branch of the militia from beginning to end, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, for the benefit of this country and so that this parliament at its next session will be able to see exactly what that able, experienced, competent, fearless officer thinks of our militia force. General Lake came out here in 1904 as chief of the general staff to assist in the reorganization of the militia, to inaugurate not a new policy, but improvements in the general plan of the militia, and I thought it was fitting that a man of his capability and experience should occupy the position of inspector general before he leaves this country for I regret to say his term of office will be up in a few months. I thought he should have an opportunity to see whether the system he inaugurated is effective and is being properly carried out so as to inform the minister as to what changes in it he would suggest. That is a duty that all inspectors general will have to perform. It would be extremely difficult to get as able a man as General Lake. I believe men can be got of sufficient ability and sufficient honesty to fill the position advantageously in the interest of the country, and of all the positions in the militia I believe this is one we can at least do without.

As to stores, there are insinuations—I do not know what other phrase to apply for they are scarcely direct statements—there are insinuations in this report which are said to be supported by evidence given by the Auditor General.

Mr. J. D. REID. Against the department?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Not against the department and not with reference to my department alone, but that the stores are not properly audited and that there is no means of preventing thefts.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is the Auditor General reliable?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I could read my hon. friend the evidence.

Mr. J. D. REID. Does the minister consider that the Auditor General is a reliable officer?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am not on the witness stand just now.

Mr. J. D. REID. You are finding fault with him.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, I am, and I must be allowed to do it in my own way, and when the hon. gentleman gets his opportunity he can criticise me. I do not consider the Auditor General reliable upon this point. I should judge from carefully reading the evidence of the Auditor General that it seemed to be almost a rehearsal; he said there was no means of checking the stores and that he had no authority to do so himself, which is perfectly true. But it is also true that over and over again the former Auditor General asked for permission to inspect the stores and received it. I have letters written by the former Auditor General to the department asking us to facilitate his making an examination of the stores and in every case that request was acceded to. The present Auditor General himself to my certain knowledge has inspected the stores at Quebec on more than one occasion; he made a thorough examination and took a thorough inventory of the Ross rifle factory a year ago, and the department has always been ready to facilitate any inspection or audit of that kind. As a matter of fact the very greatest care is taken with reference to the stores, and if the commission instead of jumping at conclusions and examining the Auditor General who admitted he knew nothing about it before he got through, had taken the trouble to have gone to the Quartermaster General and asked to inspect the great central store department at Ottawa they would have seen exactly how the stores are managed. I have here the following memorandum from the Quartermaster General on that point:

In looking over the evidence given by the Auditor General before the Civil Service Commission I think it right to draw your attention to the entirely inaccurate statements made by him, based no doubt upon his naturally limited knowledge and want of familiarity with the ordnance stores system of accounting for all stores in ordnance charge. As the bearing of all the questions and answers relates to accounting only I will not take them separately but treat the subject as a whole. Questions and answers will be found on pages 1304, 1316 and 1318, Vol. 2, Minutes of Evidence.

Both questions and answers are entirely misleading and not in the smallest way in accordance with the facts.

1. The duties of the Ordnance Corps are to receive, hold and issue clothing and equipment which has first been inspected and passed by the government inspectors.

2. It has nothing to do with the making of contracts or payment for stores under contract. This is all done by and under the director of contracts and the stores are delivered to ordnance charge after inspection.

3. A receipt is given by the senior ordnance officer to the director of contracts for all stores received by him. These stores are entered in a daily journal of receipts and from it transferred to the store ledger in which a complete list of every article in possession of the depot is contained.

4. There is also a daily journal in which all issues are entered and thence transferred to the general ledger, and the department is debited with the receipt and credited with the issues.

The general or store ledger consists of debit and credit pages and shows at the top of the debit page every article in store charge. At the end of each month the receipts for that month on the debit page are totalled up and added to the balance brought forward from the preceding month. Issues for the month are deducted and the result shows the balance in hand at the depot.

A monthly return from each depot is forwarded to headquarters showing all transactions, including each issue and receipt, accompanied by the authority for such issue or receipt. The checking clerk at headquarters sees that the balances on hand at the end of the preceding month are correctly carried forward to the current month and that the number of articles received or issued correspond with the authority for such receipts or issues.

Should any entry appear with no authority submitted it would be at once challenged. It will thus be seen how complete the system of checking and accounting is.

5. No issues are allowed to be made by any ordnance officer except on written authority, and such authority is governed by regulations as to clothing and all other equipment and the same authority is given for all receipts from inspection stores.

6. From the date of the organization of the stores department, many years ago an annual board of survey has been held. The board consisting of the district officer commanding of the district and two other officers.

The duties of this board were to count each and every article in store charge and then compare such count with the numbers given in the store ledger, noting either surpluses or shortages (if any) also noting such stores as were unfit for further service and such stores as could be repaired.

The board then prepared a list of all the above for submission to headquarters with its suggestions as to the disposal of all unserviceable and obsolete stores.

The quartermaster general has been over twenty years connected with the stores branch and in no case within his recollection have any of the boards found evidence of wrong-doing or dishonesty.

The quartermaster general is not in a position to say that there has been an audit of the military stores by an officer of the Auditor General's Department.

He can, however, state that on more than one occasion the late Auditor General wrote to the deputy Minister of Militia to say that an audit officer was making a tour of inspection and audit in connection with the stores branch and asking that instructions be given to the officers in military stores charge to afford such auditing official all necessary assistance in connection with his work, and in every instance

instructions were sent accordingly. As no report to the contrary was ever made to the department it is assumed that the audit made was found to be satisfactory.

In conclusion the quartermaster general desires to draw your attention particularly to the fact that the work of the commission was for many weeks carried on in Ottawa, during which time it would have been an easy matter to have visited the Headquarters Ordnance Stores (the largest of all the depots) for the purpose of examining on the spot, the hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of property held in charge, the method of caring for it and the working of the ordnance system of accounting.

It may be added that our ordnance system is much more strict than that followed in the imperial service.

D. A. MACDONALD,
Brigadier General.

Well the commission was too busy bringing out evidence about how many men had been graduated from the Finance Department for high positions outside, and too busy criticising the military policy of this country. They did not want information, and nothing is clearer from the beginning to the end of this report than the fact that they shut their eyes and their ears deliberately in order to make the damaging report which they have endeavored to make. Now, the people of Canada are interested in this phase of the question. They are paying millions of dollars for stores, and they want to know whether these stores are being properly taken care of or not. And so I am taking more time than I would otherwise take in order to bring these facts before the people and to show that the insinuation contained in this report is absolutely and utterly without the slightest foundation in fact. I have here a memorandum on this subject, prepared by the accountant at the request of the deputy minister, which I will read :

Procedure in purchasing stores, clothing, equipment, &c., and issuing them, and system of audit.

All such purchases are made by contract, and before being taken over, are thoroughly inspected and tested by departmental inspectors. If found according to contract they are passed into store, the ordnance officer in charge certifying receipt of the articles and also entering them at the same time in his store ledger, in which an account with each kind of stores or article in his charge, is kept.

Issues from stores are not made until the requisition has been approved by the officer commanding district. A receipt from the corps or person receiving the articles is always taken; this and the document containing the authority for issue are the vouchers which the officer in charge of stores has to submit in support of his monthly statement of stores issued.

Until quite recently these monthly statements were sent to the Quartermaster General for examination but a regular audit was some time ago undertaken by the accountant of the department and these returns now go to him.

The system of audit adopted is practically the same as that of the British War Office, viz.: first a thorough inventory of all stores, this was made a year ago last April. Then monthly returns of all receipts and issues together with an audit of the ledgers used by the officer in charge of stores. For this purpose two ledgers are kept in each store and are sent alternately every six months to the accountant for audit and verification. Lastly, an inventory at intervals to see that the articles, as shown in the ledger on the date the inventory is made, are there and in good order.

The audit is not confined to the stores in the charge of the district ordnance officer; it is also extended to the stores in the charge of the regimental officers throughout the country, so that all articles are kept track of from the time they are purchased and pass into store until they are condemned as unfit for further use.

Any gentleman who has anything to do with the militia knows that this statement is correct.

Now, these military experts and critics have something to say which one is scarcely able to understand the meaning of. In speaking of the general increase of the expenditure, which I have fully accounted for, and which they knew the reason for themselves, they say that there is no means by which they could appreciate whether amounts payable for sub-target guns or Ross rifles are proper and just. On that point I want to read the evidence of General Lake at page 756 of Volume I. There was an attempt made to lead General Lake, which was not eminently successful. The chairman asks :

Q. Is there not now rather an over inclination to lay in sub-target guns, Sutherland rifle sights and Ross rifles—to over do it rather than under do it?—A. I think it is necessary to have an up-to-date modern rifle, whether it be the Ross rifle or the Lee-Enfield. I think you must have a rifle which is, in the opinion of the general public at least, equal to the rifle with which your foe may be armed. I believe the expenditure on certain things, such as the sub-target gun, is justified by its results on the shooting of the militia.

That is General Lake's deliberate opinion in answer to a question which was evidently intended to lead him to say something else.

Q. Granted that it is desirable to have up-to-date methods, is there not an inclination, instead of ordering fifty sub-target guns, to order a thousand? Is there not an inclination to over do it?—A. Speaking for the Militia Council, I should say that we watch very closely not to order anything more than we positively need. We know the amount available for our purposes is limited, and we endeavour not to expend anything that we think could be avoided.

Q. Then the restraint lies in the amount of the vote?—A. Largely.

Q. If you could persuade parliament to increase the vote, the Militia Department would

gaily spend it?—A. I presume that we should say this: if parliament accepts the government policy and votes more money for military purposes, it presumably wants that money expended upon making its weapons of defence as strong and efficient as possible. At present we order artillery for exactly the number of militia we have available. If parliament told us, as it has done, that it thinks an army of double the strength should be legislated for, and gave us the money to fit out that army, we should do it. But as it is we try to expend the money that parliament approves, upon our estimates, without wasting any part of it at all.

Then there is another question:

Q. After the estimates have passed the government and been laid on the table, there, have been very few criticisms as to the amount granted for the militia?—A. I should say that parliament has always granted to the militia what the government of the day, representing the majority, has asked for.

I leave that question with General Lake's answer.

Then there is a further fling at the Militia Department in the statement, which is untrue, deliberately untrue, I think, in view of the fact that the evidence was opposed to the statement—that the Ross rifle contract was prepared by the counsel employed by the Ross Rifle Company. I made a statement upon that subject on a recent occasion, and I think it is desirable that I should repeat it. In this House, on March 27, I said:

Now, Mr. Speaker, another question which I would like to answer is: Was due care exercised in making the contract? Recently there has been a report, somewhat famous now, by a commission known as the Civil Service Commission, and in that report I find some more or less complimentary references to the Militia Department, which I hope to have an opportunity of dealing with some day before long. But incidentally, as a slight instalment of the good things given out to the Militia Department by that commission, it is stated that the contract was drafted by the contractor's solicitor. Now, in order to elicit information upon that point, the chairman of the commission, when he was examining the Deputy Minister of Justice, Mr. Newcombe, with reference to the conduct of the Department of Justice, put certain questions; and I would like to read what took place:

Q. You prepare all contracts entered into by the several departments which you are asked to put into legal form, I suppose?—A. We draft them all or revise the drafts prepared in the departments.

Q. We had before us this morning the Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence, and we were asking him some questions about the Ross rifle contract. Was that contract drafted in the Department of Justice?—A. I do not know where it was drafted, but we had a great many conferences over it. It was, I think, drafted preliminarily by Sir Charles Ross' solicitor.

This is all the reason apparently that the Royal Commission had to jump at that conclusion.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN

Q. Had he a solicitor acting for him?—A. Yes.

Q. In drafting these contracts, if it should appear they contained something that might be detrimental to the interests of Canada, would it be your duty to go on with the drafting or call the attention of the department to the matter?—A. I would call the attention of the minister, or the officer from whom I was taking instructions, to any situation of that sort and ask him what was intended. As to the substance of the contract, I would not interfere with the policy, but would endeavour to see that any deficiencies that suggested themselves to me or any supposed provisions that I thought would not work with adequate security to the government, were called to his attention. Then, that being considered, I would take the policy of the contract from him and give effect to his intentions.

Q. You have nothing to do with the policy of the government?—A. No, so far as concerns the business of the departments.

By Mr. Fysche:

Q. I suppose there is such a thing in the government service as cultivating a habit of doubt or suspicion about everything?—A. As far as I am concerned I have no suspicion. I point out to the government or the minister or the officer who is instructing me, what I suppose to be reasonable or what may work unreasonably, but the policy in regard to that is a matter for him to consider and settle.

Now I go on:

I think it is abundantly clear from this that the Deputy Minister of Justice would have considered himself in duty and in honour bound to call the attention of the minister to anything which he thought would not work well, but would work to the disadvantage of the country. He had nothing to do with the policy. Whether we should have a rifle factory or not was none of his business. But when a contract was to be made with Sir Charles Ross, the Deputy Minister of Justice stated that he felt it to be his duty to see that the government's interests were protected in every way. And yet in the face of that statement, we have the spectacle of a royal commission trying to stab and injure the department and the government by the casual statement, the unjustifiable statement, to which I have referred, that this contract was drafted by the contractor's solicitor. Now, I have a very definite recollection of what took place in connection with that contract. There were eight or ten or twelve different drafts, and time after time I took to council a draft to consult with my colleagues about; and in my room over and over again, there were present Sir Charles Ross, my deputy minister, the Deputy Minister of Justice, and on one or two occasions Sir Charles Ross had with him his solicitor. The idea was to get at a contract which would be fair; and I was determined, so far as I was concerned, to enter into no contract until I had the advice of the Department of Justice upon it. I got that advice, and I got it in the view expressed by the Deputy Minister of Justice that it was his duty to warn me if he saw anything in the contract which was unjust or improper.

That is the answer to that insinuation. I had intended to say something about our

contract system in the department, but I will only say that we have a director of contracts who supervises the business of making contracts. All requirements are sent in through the deputy minister from the different officers, the Quarter Master General and the Master General of Ordnance, whose departments are the ones principally requiring purchases. These are carefully considered. Advertisements are published, and the work is done by an experienced man who devotes his whole time and energy to informing himself as to the price and market value of goods which have to be purchased, and who has a staff to assist him in that work. We have, to aid our director of contracts, skilled inspectors who carefully examine all the goods which are delivered, and after all this has been done the goods are handed over to the Quarter Master General, and I have already read to the committee what takes place after that. So that every precaution is taken before purchase, after purchase and after the goods have been inspected and handed over to guard the public interest.

This report refers in very uncomplimentary terms, as I have already said, to the accountant and paymaster general of my department. They do not like his name;—I do not mean his patronymic, which happens to be Borden, but they do not like his official designation of accountant and paymaster general. They say that 'P.M.G.' might be mistaken for 'Postmaster General,' which does not occur to one as being a very powerful argument. Also they say that there is a member of the British government called the paymaster general. I do not think that that would cause very serious inconvenience, certainly not here; there is not the slightest danger of that distinguished member of the imperial government being mistaken for our Paymaster General or vice versa. As a matter of fact, his official designation is 'Accountant and Paymaster General' which exactly describes the duties he has to do. But what has outraged these commissioners almost beyond endurance is the belief that certain paymasters who existed some eight or ten years ago and whose services were dispensed with, have been resuscitated. Well, that is an entire mistake. When they say that the old paymasters have been restored in the districts, they say what is not correct. A pay corps was established for the purpose of better safeguarding the public interest; and I think I shall have to trouble the committee by reading further from General Lake's memorandum on this subject, I refer to page 8:

The commissioners take special exception to the existence of the 'Army Pay Corps,' which has recently been organized. In this respect, it need, perhaps, only be stated:—

1. That a trained pay corps is an absolute necessity for an army in the field. It would be too late to train it when war broke out. The enormous expenditure of the South African war is a good example of the wasteful results of maintaining too small a pay department in peace.

2. A trained pay corps is just as necessary to economy and efficiency in peace as on active service.

I would like special notice to be taken of that as against the statement of the expert critic of military affairs whose report I am venturing to criticise:

The assumption of the charge of the garrison of Halifax, has by itself made a pay corps of some sort a necessity. Col. Fiset, Deputy Minister, told the commissioners that the work of the Army Pay Corps saved to the public many times the amount of their salaries. No one who has any knowledge of pay arrangements at the annual camps and with the permanent corps during the year can have any doubt of this. Last year, at two of the smaller camps alone, over $3,400 of the unfounded claims were disallowed, which under previous conditions, would almost certainly have passed without question.

Now, the Auditor General was called upon by the commission to give his views as to the desirability or neecssity of a pay corps and he testified at almost what seemed to be like a rehearsal.

It may be noted, in this connection, that the Auditor General, in commenting upon overpayments of efficiency pay in 1905—before the Army Pay Corps existed—wrote: 'This office. . . . cannot check the pay-lists accurately in detail without the service rolls of the various corps and some local knowledge of the names thereon as well.' This local knowledge is what the officer of the pay corps supplies.

The commissioners appeared to think that all payments could be made to the militia by means of individual cheques from the Department of Militia and Defence. They can hardly have realized that this course would involve an attempt to prepare, sign and distribute on the last day of each camp, a cheque for each man, to the 25,000 or so troops in the annual camps. The impossibility of such an attempt will be understood when it is remembered that the amount due to each man depends on the efficiency pay earned and can only be computed towards the end of the camp.

Efficiency pay is dependent upon the good conduct of the soldier in camp. He is paid his 50 cents, and if his conduct is good and if he makes certain number of marks in rifle shooting he gets more, but that cannot be determined until the conclusion of the camp.

3. The commissioners assumed that the Army Pay Corps was merely a resuscitation of the old district paymasters, an entirely different body of men, not performing the same duties. The commissioners made what can only be termed superficial inquiries from Colonel Fiset and the Auditor General as to the system and duties of the pay corps, and had, apparently no knowledge of the audit side of the work.

As no officer of the pay corps was summoned before them, it is perhaps hardly to be wondered at that their report displays ignorance of the situation.

And that is a remarkable thing. They condemned the system of keeping the stores, but never took the trouble of going into a store or doing that branch the justice of calling upon one of its officers to explain the system. In the same way, they condemn the pay corps and the paymaster general, but never call him or one of his officers to come to them, nor did they go near him. That is the justice that is meted out to the Militia Department.

As regards the Auditor General's evidence, the following questions and answers, given at almost the end of his evidence on the subject are significant :—

I would like the committee to take note of this. The Auditor General was examined as to the pay corps and this is the grande finale of that examination :

Question by the Chairman.—I wanted the Auditor General to explain the system in order that the absurdity of it might be placed before us. Now, tell us another thing, Mr. Fraser, do you know anything about the working of the Army Pay Corps?

Answer.—No, not yet. I will know more about it a little later on.

And that is the evidence upon which the Militia Department and its officers are condemned, anything more grossly outrageous, I am sure, has never appeared in the annals of any parliament. Now, General Lake gives a full statement of the duties performed by the Army Pay Corps, but with this I need not trouble the committee. But on this point of the pay, there is something very refreshing with which I would like to enliven these proceedings. Mr. Fyshe, one of the commissioners, an ex-banker, put a series of questions. He was examining Mr. Boville, the Deputy Minister of Finance :

Q. Mr. Boville, you were not here when Mr. Fraser was giving us some evidence of the absurdity of the reintroduction of the paymaster's branch of the Militia Department, and this trouble, of course, has some bearing on it also.

They were referring to the forgery of some cheque mentioned in the previous evidence. I will not bother about that.

Would it not be a simplification of matters if the Finance Department made all payments for every department?

It was not merely that he would have no pay corps in the Militia Department, but he was going to abolish the paymasters in the whole service and have all the paying done through the office of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. I want to call attention to this evidence. The answer was :

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN.

Theoretically, yes, as an academic proposition, but as our business is so tremendous and is spread over such a wide area it is not practicable.

Then the chairman comes to the rescue. He asks 'How many of these cheques do you think they pay in a year? Mr. Fyshe said : 'I have no idea.' The chairman was evidently questioning his brother commissioner. The examination goes on:

The Chairman.—Somewhere about 700,000 of all grades. Your idea is that the Finance Department should be paymaster for the whole government.

Mr. Fyshe.—Should take charge of the whole thing, of every payment from five cents to five thousand dollars. Of course each department should look after its own expenditure and vouch for its payment, for the amount to be paid, but the Finance Department or the Auditor General's Department should make the payment, they have to go over this thing anyway.

The Chairman.—The theory governing the Finance Department is that it deals with the finances of the country.

Mr. Fyshe.—Yes, well let them make the payments.

The Chairman.—You must allow the other departments some latitude in the matter of small change. The Finance Department and the Auditor General's Office do make the big payments now, but if they were reqiured to make all the payments as you suggest it would probably require a staff of a thousand men to do it.

This is the way one of the commissioners was going to economize. His brother commissioner said if you do that you will require perhaps a staff of 1,000 men. Yet in the whole service I do not suppose there are more than 100 ment connected with the pay staffs. I continue reading from the report :

Mr. Fyshe.—You would simply concentrate the staff in one department instead of having it scattered around?—A. Apart from that, this credit system we have established facilities very materially the transaction of the government's business at distant points. Supposing all the payments were concentrated here in Ottawa, you would have constant growling at the delay in making payments.

Q. Not necessarily, if the pay-lists or accounts were properly vouched for and forwarded. It is only a question of drawing the cheque and sending it?—A. Which in the case of a payment in British Columbia would mean two weeks' delay.

Q. Well, you might make an exception in that case?—A. Then Prince Edward Island, it would mean a delay of nine days there.

By Mr. Bazin:

Q. And in winter what would the delay be? —A. In winter it would mean a delay of weeks sometimes.

Imagine anybody seriously suggesting that the whole business of paying out millions on account of the different departments should be done from the Finance Department. Is there anything more than that

necessary to show the unfitness of the man to deal with a big question of this kind ?

There is one thing more I would like to call attention to. In the course of the criticisms on the Militia Department, you will observe that the high pay of the officers is frequently referred to. It is rather singular that while the Militia Depatment is criticised for paying $2,800, $3,200 and sometimes $4,000 salary, the general civil service of the country is spoken of as being inadequately paid; and it is worthy of note that in the Civil Service Bill which has just been put through, the salaries are increased to something like the amount which the militia officers are being paid, so that after all we were not so very far astray. But it is singular that in one breath this commission should condemn the Militia Department for its high salaries and in the next condemn the government for not paying the civil service more.

Further than that the Militia Department is referred to as a department in which the officers are not only highly paid but whose officers and their wives and children receive pensions. That is one of the indictments brought against the Militia Department, yet at the conclusion of this report a Bill is submitted by which it is proposed that the whole civil service, including the wives and children, shall be given the benefit of a pension. In one breath the Militia Department is condemned for having a pension, and in the next the government generally is condemned because it has no Pension Act. Just here I would like to point out that every officer in the permanent force and on the staff contributes five per cent of his salary towards the creation and maintenance of a pension fund, while the Bill, which is suggested by these gentlemen for the benefit of the civil service, only recommends a tax of four per cent, so that the militia service is actually paying five per cent while they recommend four per cent for the civil service—a much more favourable arrangement.

I find that in the evidence the commission went out of its way to introduce something very foreign indeed to the inquiry and for no other purpose than to have a fling at the Militia Department. Questions were asked regarding the superannuation of an officer of the department, Mr. Aumond, who was superannuated a year or so ago on a retiring allowance of $1,321.25, who has that amount of money for the rest of his life and does nothing, and in the course of the questioning to get evidence on that particular transaction, the chairman asked :

Q. He had served for forty years?—A. Yes.
Q. This man had never had any bad habits?—A. Never.
Q. What was his name?—A. Aumond.
Q. Did his work very well?—A. Thoroughly well.

Q. He was a faithful officer?—A. He could not be better.
Q. And yet that man after more than forty years' service was turned out into a cold world.
Mr. Fyshe.—I call that brutal.

Well, turned out with nearly $1,350 a year in his pocket for the rest of his life and nothing to do ! What is the superannuation law for? What could I do? The man had been there forty years. We had talked about superannuating him for several years. He was of no use and it was better for the service that we should let him go. We let him go. Then, they go on to prove that he had to give up his house. I do not know about that but I made some inquiry—it is an outrageous thing to put such a statement in a book like this—and I am told that Mr. Aumond took a smaller house because his family was smaller, that he moved into lodgings because it suited his convenience, and I believe that the same man has had some favours from the department since that time, that he has had an occasional day's work. But, to call it brutal to superannuate a man at $1,350 for the rest of his life seems a most extraordinary thing that any commissioner should dare to say.

I would like to bring another matter forward. There happened to be, in the Militia Department an officer by the name of Lieutenant-Colonel Guy, an English officer, or rather I think he was a sergeant when he came to this country 45 or 50 years ago. He had served in the Crimean war, he came to Halifax and was made use of by the government of Nova Scotia before confederation. Some time after confederation he was brought up here. He served in the Northwest rebellion. This officer was sent to Halifax because he had had a great deal of experience as the paymaster of troops and when we took over Halifax and Esquimalt he was sent from the head office to Halifax by the accountant and paymaster general as the most suitable man in our employment for that purpose, being an old imperial officer, who had been paymaster in the Northwest rebellion and had had years and years of experience. We had no man in the service who was as competent to do that work as Colonel Guy. So, he was sent there. The commission goes out of its way to state in its report that this man was too old to do his work and that we had simply sent him to Halifax in order to try and give him a good retiring allowance. The evidence is on page 747. I think it is just as well that we should reveal the fact that there was such a thing as animus of a very unpleasant character behind the conduct of this commission, animus begotten during the time that the chairman of the commission was the Deputy Minister of Finance. I have no hesitation in saying that that gentleman took a special dislike to poor Guy and I believe, as surely as I am standing here, that this dam-

aging report about an honest man who had served his country faithfully for sixty years and who has now passed away, was simply to satisfy a malevolent disposition.

Q. Are you aware that the paymaster sent to Halifax was a worn out officer in the service of the department, who died a few months after he was sent?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Who asks that question?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The ex-Deputy Minister of Finance, the chairman of the commision. It is General Lake who is giving evidence.

A. Yes. I know that he died, but he was not worn-out when he was sent, though he was old. He had exceptional qualifications, and I concurred in the selection.

Q. Was not one of the effects of sending this officer as paymaster to Halifax that he became a member of the military branch of the department and came under military control rather than civil?—A. I do not know; I do not think so. There was no Army Pay Corps at the time.

Q. When he went down——

This is an assertion, not a question.

—he ceased to be an officer of the department on the civil side and became an officer on the military side, entitled to draw a pension?—A. That is news to me.

Q. And that pension is continued to his widow?—A. He did not leave a widow.

As a matter of fact his wife predeceased him. It shows how determined this commission was to create a scandal of some kind. The chairman goes on:

Q. At all events, this man, who was worn-out in the service, was sent to Halifax, the principal point, to inaugurate a new system?—A. I understand that he was the only man competent for the work they had available to send.*

Here is a note put in by General Lake.

*The circumstances of this case were as follows: The British troops at Halifax were to be paid by the Canadian government at imperial rates of pay and under the imperial regulations. It was thought desirable to send for this job a paymaster (Lieutenant Colonel Guy) who had been in the imperial service and knew their system, rather than an inexperienced civil officer.

Now, I want to call your attention, Mr. Chairman, and the attention of the committee to a note appended by the chairman of this commission, and I will read it:

I deem it right to append to the evidence a statement of the facts upon which the questions relating to the paymaster at Halifax were based.

When, in 1902, I was a member of the commission appointed to inquire into the Martineau defalcations, while examining the work of the accountant's branch of the Militia Department I found that one of the officers in that branch (Lieutenant Colonel Guy) appeared to be very dazed and enfeebled and quite unfit for duty.

I suggested his superannuation but it was intimated to me that on account of his short term of service his retiring allowance would be small, and that it would not be generous at that time to retire him. To my astonishment, when the system of paymasters was set on foot, Lieutenant-Colonel Guy was made paymaster at Halifax. This was on July 1, 1905. The salary of Lieutenant-Colonel Guy was increased from $1,650 to $2,400 per annum, and, in addition he was brought under the provisions of the Militia Pensions Act. From the outset Lieutenant-Colonel Guy had to procure assistance to do the work and he obtained help from an official of the Halifax post office.

Which is untrue.

As the post office official could not demand two salaries in a short time he was appointed assistant paymaster and certified the accounts. A year after Lieutenant-Colonel Guy went to Halifax, and when the Militia Pension Act permitted it, he was retired. Had he remained in Ottawa under the Superannuation Act Lieutenant-Colonel Guy would, on his retirement, have received about $650 per annum.

Would that have been 'brutal'? The man whom I retired at $1,350 a year was brutally treated according to this gentleman, but here he pursues the memory of a man who is in the grave because he was not retired on a miserable allowance of $650 a year, which was all he wanted him to get.

As it was by an addition of fourteen years military service he was retired on $1,450 per annum.

He got $100 a year more than the man who was 'brutally' treated.

Lieutenant-Colonel Guy died about a year after his retirement, being predeceased by his wife a very short time before his death. Such are the facts, and I feel certain that General Lake was not fully aware of the case when Lieutenant-Colonel Guy was sent to Halifax.

J. M. COURTNEY.

Let us see what General Lake has to say about that:

Report Civil Service Commission, pages 747 and 748 of evidence.

Re Lieutenant-Colonel Guy.

The foot note signed by Mr. J. M. Courtney is not a full and correct presentation of the case.

Lieutenant-Colonel Guy was one of the most capable, hard working and conscientious clerks in the service, and up to within a few months of his retirement was not only capable of doing, but did do a very large amount of work each day as the records of the department will show. As a clerk, his work was to examine the great bulk of claims that came in for payment, abstract them in duplicate and prepare them for payment. This involved a large amount of work which was always correctly done and which a man dazed could not do.

When the garrison at Halifax was taken over, it was necessary to send a paymaster down there who was thoroughly capable of

taking charge of the work. Lieutenant-Colonel Guy was considered eminently fit, both on account of his long experience and his knowledge of the departmental system of accounting. He had put in nearly fifty years of public service under the two governments as follows:—

Joined the British army just at the close of the Crimean war and was sent to the Crimea with the last draft, continued in the British service until the Trent affair, when as sergeant-major he was sent to Halifax with the troops at that time. He took his discharge at Halifax and received an appointment immediately afterwards, viz., in 1864, as chief clerk in the adjutant general's office, Halifax, Nova Scotia Militia.

I have been in camp with him many a time in Nova Scotia.

He held this position until 1869 when he was appointed superintendent of stores, Halifax, under the Dominion government with rank of captain, remained in that position till 1884, when he left the service but on the breaking out of the Northwest Rebellion, in 1885 he entered it again as paymaster of the forces in the field at that time.

He received the recognition of this parliament at the close of the rebellion, and $1,000 was voted to him.

After the rebellion he served on the Northwest Claims Commission and after that, was appointed in 1889 to the inside service, Ottawa, where he remained till he was transferred to Halifax as paymaster in 1905. After having satisfactorily established the pay office he applied for and received his pension.

Surely he had earned his pension.

It will be seen from this that he had nearly fifty years of service, the only break being between 1884 and 1885, and of these fifty years nearly forty were under the Canadian or Nova Scotia governments.

It is not, therefore, easy to understand wherein the iniquity lay of giving Lieutenant-Colonel Guy some recognition and making him paymaster at Halifax, after nearly fifty years of service. If there was any iniquity it would appear to lie in the fact that recognition was so long deferred.

Mr. Courtney points out that had he been superannuated as a civil servant, he would have received but $600 per annum. What a magnificent reward to a man who had given nearly fifty years of valuable service to his country!

Nothing brutal about that.

Now as regards the 'Clerk from the post office, Halifax,' who, it is claimed, was got to assist him, the facts are as follows:

Major Sircom was an officer of the militia, he was also employed in the post office, Halifax, as assistant inspector.

Before Lieutenant-Colonel Guy was sent to Halifax, Major Sircom made application for the position of paymaster, this application was favourably considered, but he was informed that, owing to his inexperience in paymaster work, he would have to take the appointment at first of assistant paymaster. His appointment was intended to be made concurrently with Lieutenant-Colonel Guy's, but there was some delay in getting Major Sircom's through, and it did not appear till a few months afterwards. The statement that Lieutenant-Colonel Guy had to get a clerk from the post office to assist him, was intended apparently, to convey the impression that he was not capable of performing his duties when first sent down there, which is entirely incorrect. Of course, he had to have assistance in the office as the work was too much for one man. His predecessor, the army paymaster, had an assistant paymaster and a staff of seven clerks. Lieutenant-Colonel Guy had only three clerks and his work was heavier than the army paymaster's, as in addition to the garrison, Lieutenant-Colonel Guy had all the militia of the three maritime provinces to attend to.

Lieutenant-Colonel Guy was, no doubt, not as vigorous during the last six months of his service as he was in his early days, but to assert that he was unfit for the duties of paymaster when appointed to that position is incorrect.

J. W. BORDEN,
A.P.M.G.

Appended to this memorandum in the handwriting of General Lake, which I know well, is the following:

I entirely concur in the above. I saw Lieutenant-Colonel Guy just before he started for Halifax and Mr. Courtney's description of him is certainly not truthfully applicable to him as he then was.

P. LAKE, C.G.S.

I ask the committee to define if they can what possible good motive this gentleman could have in criticising as 'brutal' the conduct of the Militia Department in superannuating a man who had forty years' service at $1,350 a year, and declaring that the department had practically put up a job on the country because it did not insist upon superannuating a man at $600 a year who had servied his country fifty years, but had given him a retiring allowance of $1,450 per annum. That is a conundrum that I cannot solve.

I have to congratulate my deputy minister, with whom the commission sympathized so deeply in his distress because he was only getting $3,500 a year, while gentlemen sitting on the board next him were getting $4,000; I have to congradulate him that if the Civil Service Bill gets through the Senate, and is approved by His Excellency the Governor General, he will have $1,000 per year more than his brothers on the Militia Council. I do not think it will be the cause of any jealousy at that board. Neither do I believe the statement made by this commission that my deputy minister, Colonel Fiset, was greatly troubled because his pay was a little lower than that of his breathern on the board. Now, I have one more, and only one more, illustration to give you of the extreme fairness of these, I might almost say, heaven-born

military critics. In the report the following statement appears :

Your commissioners have noticed that it has been held to be of serious importance that the expenditure of the militia in Canada should increase with the growth of the revenue, and that once the revenue has arrived at a hundred millions a year the expenditure should be in the same proportion to thirteen millions as thirteen millions is to one million, that rate being paid for conditions at the time of confederation. It would follow, therefore, that with a revenue of $100,000,000 a year, the expenditure should be at the rate of eight millions. How this can be adjusted with the various retardations which must occasionally happen through a bad harvest, stringency of the money market and other causes, the commissioners cannot understand. It would seem that the militia expenditure would have to be cut down in proportion to the revenues. The better method, in the opinion of the commissioners, is that the expenditures should be increased according to the growth of the population and be put on a per capita basis.

Now, it so happened that in the Nelson year, 1905, I was asked to contribute an article for the 'United Service Magazine' on the Canadian militia. The chairman of the commission asked General Lake if there had not been an article contributed by somebody to some magazine. I do not know that the general had seen the article ; he evidently did not understand the point of the question. This is what is said in the article :

At the time of confederation the revenue of Canada amounted to thirteen millions, and the militia expenditure was one million, or one-thirteenth of the revenue. The annual revenue this year will probably exceed seventy millions, so that it will be observed that the ratio of one to thirteen is being somewhat exceeded. It is not necessary to assume that this ratio must be maintained indefinitely, but it would seem probably that, to remain an efficient and effective militia force in Canada, will cost annually something like eight million dollars, an amount, however, which need not be approached until the revenue has reached the hundred million mark. It would seem probable that the ratio of one to thirteen need not be carried farther than the point just named.

I afterwards made a similar statement in the House in this language :

In 1867, when the revenue of Canada was $13,000,000 we began with a militia expenditure of about $1,000,000 or one-thirteenth of the total revenue of the country. The militia expenditure to-day is $5,500,000, still not more than one-thirteenth of our gross revenue. I do not mean to say that it would be fair to lay down the rule that because we began with a militia expenditure of one-thirteenth of the total revenue we should keep that up, but I do not think we should keep it up until we have reached the point at which we have created an effective and an efficient defensive force for Canada. Whether that will be $6,000,000 or more I cannot say, but should think it will not go very much beyond that sum. I do not think that the ratio between one and thirteen as to the revenue, will be increased in the expenditure on the militia. I hope that before we have reached a revenue of $100,000,000, one-thirteenth of which would be about $8,000,000, we shall have reached the maximum which will be required for our militia force.

I quote this because there is an evident attempt to misrepresent what I said. As is quite obvious to everybody, the amount of money to be spent upon the militia is the amount that is necessary to make the militia efficient and effective, whether the population is five millions or ten millions. According to the absurd proposal of this commission, if our population should reach fifty millions, and we established the rate at a dollar a head, a good deal more than it is, then of course we would have to spend fifty millions on the militia, whether we required it or not. General Lake shows how absurd the proposal is, on page 9 of his memorandum, in the following words :

The commissioners state that they 'have noticed that it has been held to be of serious importance that the expenditure of the militia in Canada should increase with the growth of the revenue,' and devote some space to arguing against that theory. They do not state where the view to which they refer is set forth, so that it is not possible to verify their statement.

It is more of importance, perhaps, to see why they have brought in this reference. It is in order, apparently, that they may propose, as a preferable arrangement, 'that the expenditure (on the militia) should be increased according to the growth of the population and be put on a per capita basis.' If this means anything, it must apparently mean that the requirements of the defence of the country do not affect the question. No matter how imminent or how great the danger may be, the expenditure is only to increase in the same ratio as the population—no matter if the danger decreases or disappears altogether, the expenditure is to go on increasing because the population does. Their reasoning may embody some economical doctrine, but it is hardly common sense. The only reasonable plan is to regard military expenditure as an insurance against national danger, the amount of that insurance being decided by the extent and imminence of the danger and by the degree to which the nation can afford, and is willing, to insure itself.

I had intended dealing in my statement in defence of the department against the outrageous, extraordinary and unjustifiable attack of this commission, with a number of other points mentioned by the commission, but time will not permit me to do so. I would like, however, to reproduce two tables which will be found at the end of General Lake's memorandum, Appendix D and Appendix E.

APPENDIX D.

TABLE to show establishments of organized Units of the Canadian Militia in 1895–6, 1903–04 and 1908–09, respectively.

Corps.	Establishment, 1895–6.		Establishment, 1903–4.		Establishment, 1908–09.		Remarks.
	Number of Squadrons, Batteries or Companies.	Total Numbers.	Number of Squadrons, Batteries or Companies.	Total Numbers.	Number of Squadrons, Batteries or Companies.	Total Numbers.	
Permanent Force. (Note 1.)—							
Royal Canadian Dragoons—Squadrons	2	132	2	109	2	200	
Royal Canadian Mounted Rifles—Squadrons	Nil.	.....	1	60	1	120	
Royal Canadian Artillery—							
Horse or Field Batteries	1½	173	2	258	2	315	
Heavy Batteries	Nil.	.....	Nil.	.....	1	165	Establishments provided for in the Estimates for 1908–9. (See Note 4).
Garrison Companies	2	171	2	225	4	629	
Royal Can. Engineers—Garrison Companies	Nil.	.....	Detachments....	132	2	300	
Royal Canadian Regiment Companies	4	324	5	407	10	1,079	
Permanent Army Service Corps	Nil.	.....	Detachments....	6	Detachments....	120	
Permanent Army Medical Corps	Nil.	.....	Nil.	36	Detachments....	100	
Canadian Ordnance Corps	Nil.	.....	Detachments....	104	Detachments....	214	
Canadian Army Pay Corps	Nil;	.....	Nil.	.....	Detachments....	34	
Military Staff Clerks	Nil.	.....	Nil.	.....	Detachments....	35	
		800		1,337		3,311	
Active Militia—							
Cavalry or Mounted Rifles—Squadrons	44	2,115	62	5,106	101	8,232	
Field Artillery—Batteries	17	1,345	17	2,013	25	2,712	
Heavy Artillery—Batteries	Nil.	.....	4	478	14	1,675	
Garrison Artillery—Companies	32	2,462	28	1,868	10	1,241	
Field Engineer Companies	2	151	4	768	5	762	
Corps of Guides	Nil.	.....	Detachments....	36	Detachments....	107	
Infantry—Companies	615	28,962	654	34,257	710	36,849	
Canadian Army Service Corps—Companies	Nil.	.....	8	848	12	1,281	
Can. Army Medical Corps—Field Ambulances	Nil.	.....	8 F. Hos., 9 B.C.	705	18	1,460	
Corps of Signallers	Nil.	.....	Detachments....	7	Detachments....	88	
Totals	.....	35,835	.....	47,423	.....	57,718	
Number of horses	2,872		7,892		11,798		*Estimated.
Number of men trained (Note 2)	19,000		32,000		46,000*		

NOTE 1.—Authority was given by Parliament in 1905 to increase the establishment of the permanent corps up to a maximum of 5,000 men, as might be found necessary in order to provide for the garrisons of Halifax and Esquimalt, and to allow for organizing additional units for instructional purposes to keep pace with the growth of the Active Militia. Up to the present time only a total establishment of 3,311 all ranks has been authorized.

NOTE 2.—The permanent corps have been included in each case in the number of men trained.

NOTE 3.—All units of the Militia provided for in the authorized establishments for the financial year have been shown in each case. In each of the two earlier years, the formation of some units, though provided for, was not carried out in that year, and the same thing may possibly occur in the present year.

NOTE 4.—Of the difference in numbers between the establishments of the permanent force in 1903-4 and 1908-9, the assumption of responsibility for the defence of Halifax and Esquimalt accounts for 565 artillery, 150 engineers, 745 infantry and 150 departmental corps; total, 1,610.

APPENDIX E.

COMPARATIVE TABLE to show the Arrangement and Equipment of the Militia, also Cadet Corps and Rifle Associations, in the Years 1895-6, 1903-4 and 1908-09.

Subject.	1895-6.	1903-4.	1908-9.
Light field guns	80 9-pounder muzzle loading. 36 12-pr. breech loading (under order).	90 12-pounder breech loading 8 5″-Howitzer, B.L.	90 12-pr B.L. 12 15-pr. B.L. 36 18-pr. Quick Firing. 8 5″-Howitzer, B.L.
Heavy field guns	5 40-pr. Armstrong	17 40-pr. Armstrong (obsolete). 4 4·7″ Q.F.	16 4·7″ Q.F. 12 60-pr. Q.F. (for delivery in 1908).
Rifles and carbines	40,000 Sniders (obsolete) 5,000 Martini-Henry 2,000 Lee and Martini-Metford 42,000 Lee-Enfield (under order)	39,000 Lee-Enfield and Lee-Metford. 1,000 Martini-Metford	39,000 Lee-Enfield and Lee-Metford. 1,000 Martini-Metford. 42,000 Ross.
Maxim guns, ·303 calibre	15	18	20 and 8 Pompons.
Ammunition for field artillery	About 300 rounds per 9 or 40-pr. gun. 400 per 12-pr. gun (under order)	About 400 rounds per gun About 130 rounds per Howitzer	About 500 rounds per gun for all guns.
Rifle ammunition	About 200 pounds per Snider About 350 rounds per ·303″ rifle	About 350 rounds per rifle	Over 400 rounds per rifle.
Fortress armament (Breech loading guns only.)	8 7″ R.B.L. (obsolete) 8 12-pr. Q.F. (under order) 8 6-pr. Q.F. (under order)	1 6″ B.L. (Drill purposes) 2 6″ Howitzer (Drill purposes) 4 12-pr. Q.F. 8 6-pr. Q.F.	Halifax and Esquimalt are completely armed, Quebec partly so. It is inadvisable to give details of these.
Ammunition for fortress guns	About 250 rounds per 7″ gun. Complete to scale for smaller guns (under order) as above.	Practically complete for Q.F. guns above on Imperial scale.	Supply complete for above guns.
Camp equipment	Enough for perhaps 15,000 men	Enough for about 30,000 men	Enough for about 45,000 men.
Personal equipment of men	Knapsack, obsolete, only partly distributed.	Oliver equipment	Oliver equipment complete for all authorized units.
Harness and saddlery	Incomplete, some 30 years old	Practically complete	Complete for all authorized units.
Engineer equipment	None	In progress	Complete for 4 Field Cos.
Army Service Corps equipment	None	In progress for 8 companies	Complete for all existing units.
Medical equipment	Practically none	For bearer cos. and field hospitals, making good progress.	Field Ambulance completely equipped. Regimental medical equipment nearly complete.
Signalling equipment	Practically none	Commenced and some progress made.	Complete for all existing Sections.
Reserve transport (registered)	None	A commencement made	800 wagons, 1,600 horses.
Cadet corps	Few—no reliable record	104—Members about 5,000	152—Members about 8,000.
Rifle associations	42	93 Military, 257 civilian, 28,000 members.	130 Military, 371 Civilian, 38,000 members.

These tables give some idea of the present state of efficiency of the militia which has been branded by this commission as being less efficient than it was fifteen years ago. The objects of the militia are, as we know, three-fold, the maintenance of the civil power within our own borders, the repelling of any attack from without and the assisting when the parliament of Canada sees fit to undertake it, or whenever it may be necessary, of the mother country. The militia of Canada has performed great services for this country. It is a very old institution, and it has done its work well. One essential difference between the militia of to-day and of the time prior to 1895-1896 is that in the past on every occasion when an armed service was required in Canada, it was necessary that the imperial troops should take the initiative. We had not the departments necessary, our force was not a self-contained force; but to-day, the militia of Canada is in a position to place in the field a considerable number of men and to take the initiative itself and probably do so effectively until assistance could come, if it were necessary, from the mother country. Now, it seems to me that those of us who take an interest, a broader interest, in our future, and recognize the imperial obligation or duty, ought to feel proud that we are in that position and are no longer, as we were up to a very few years ago, absolutely dependent upon the mother country. It should be some comfort to those of us who think—though I do not believe there are many such within the sound of my voice—that this country should subscribe a sum of money for the maintenance of the British navy to know that, while we do not possess a fleet, we possess at least the nucleus of an army, with all the departments necessary and able materially to assist the mother country if it were necessary to do so. It is absolutely in our own power to say whether we shall do so or not, but it is a great thing to have the power. I would like to read a sentence or two which I have taken from the budget speech of Sir Alexander Galt when Finance Minister of Canada in June, 1866,—before confederation. These are the notable words to which he gave utterance and which are as applicable to-day as they were then:

> We must all feel that the security of the country is to be found in its own power, not in the forbearance of another or in the discharge of duty by another, but by its own ability to maintain our independence and safety.

These are sentiments which, I believe, every man in this committee, every man in this House, every man in this country, will subscribe to.

I shall not detain the committee further. I hope I have succeeded in answering some of the very unjust statements which have been made. I hope I have been able to satisfy the committee that the increase in expenditure is justifiable and that it is not due in the slightest respect to the reasons alleged by the commission—the change in the law in 1904 by which an advisory board, a militia council, was established. I hope I have been able to satisfy the committee that this country has something to show for money that is being expended. I hold that an inefficient militia is an undesirable thing; I would rather spend no money at all on the militia—I would rather wipe out the militia altogether—than have a militia that is a mere pretense and therefore absolutely worthless. You can have that by spending one or two millions, but you cannot by such an expenditure provide anything at all adequate for the services required for a country like this, and for a people occupying the responsible position which we occupy as Canadians, as people responsible for the enormous territory which we administer and as the most important member of the great British empire to which we are proud to belong. I am proud to feel and to know that the money which has been spent in the department has resulted in bringing about great efficiency; and I believe that a very small portion, if any, of the money has been improvidently spent. I invite the closest inspection—and we have had some of it already—into the expenditures that have taken place in that department—we welcome it. I consider that our system of purchasing is as good as any system in any government, and will compare favourably with the system of many large business establishments.

I thank the committee for their great patience. I would not have trespassed so long, but for the fact that the forbearance of hon. members has shown that they feel that I should be privileged at least to state my side of this case.

Mr. SPROULE. At this early hour in the morning, and very late stage of the session, it would be very much out of place for me to devote any length of time in criticism of the speech of the Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden). But I will say this: though I have been in the House for over a quarter of a century I never saw at this stage of the session such an exhibition by any minister of the Crown, one at the head of a department whose expenditure is very heavy and increasing rapidly for years. The minister has devoted about two hours and a half, not to defending the expenditure, not to showing that it was wise and economical, that it was beneficial to the country, but simply attacking the Royal Commission which he himself helped to appoint, a commission that, I frankly confess, I always thought was composed of able men, eminent men, men of high aims and great ability. They did their work accord-

ing to their lights; they gave the benefit of their time to the country and to this House; and now the Minister of Militia who assisted by order in council to appoint these men as a royal commission has taken up two hours and a half to abuse and condemn them, and very little to defend the expenditure of his department. I have here in brief an account of some of the increases in the Militia department which, as it is in more condensed form than anything I could offer, may fairly be quoted in dealing with this subject. I have taken this from the Montreal 'Gazette' of some time ago:

In 1896 the cost of the Militia Department was $2,193,372, of which $1,000,000 was for arms and accoutrements. In 1906 this had grown to $5,664,192, an increase of 158 per cent. Of the latter amount only $1,299,875 was for arms, &c. The balance of $4,294,124 covered the same expenditures as the $1,193,372 spent in 1896, the expenditure for administration purposes having increased by 360 per cent.

Is the militia three times as efficient or three times as numerous as it was in 1896?

An idea of how this vast increase has been created may be gained from a comparison of the cost of the headquarters staff at Ottawa in the two years. This was the staff in 1896:

1 major-general commanding	$ 4,000
1 adjutant-general	3,200
1 quartermaster-general	3,200
1 inspector of artillery	2,300
1 assistant adjutant-general	1,800
1 A. D. C.	1,000
2 clerks of miltary stores	800
Total, 8 officials at	$16,300

Nowadays it is supposed to require, to do the same work, the following officials:

1 chief of general staff	$ 6,000
1 inspector-general	6,000
1 master-general of ordnance	4,000
1 quartermaster-general	4,000
1 adjutant-general	4,000
1 director-general of medical service	3,400
1 director of clothing and equipment	3,200
1 assistant director of operations	2,400
1 assistant adjutant-general for musketry	3,200
1 intelligence staff officer	2,165
1 director of transport and supplies	3,200
1 director of artillery	3,200
1 director of engineer services	3,200
1 assistant adjutant-general	2,800
1 assistant director intelligence	2,400
1 staff officer to inspector-general	1,200
1 intelligence staff officer	2,400
3 staff lieutenants	3,660
1 director operations and staff duties	3,200
1 medals board officer	2,600
1 assistant to A.A.G.M.	2,000
1 rifle factory inspector	2,800
23 officers at	$73,425

But this is not all. Attached to this small army of commanding officers there is another small army of staff clerks, about forty in number, apparently employed to do all the work except the deep thinking and public parades. Then, again, there has been an increase in the cost of the civil staff of the department amounting to about $10,000 per year. The total result is that the salaries paid in the department at Ottawa have increased in the period under review from $70,000 to $180,000.

Feathers come high.

The head quarters staff at Ottawa has grown from eight officials, costing $16,300 per year, to twenty-three officials costing $73,425. These are all the items I intend dealing with to-night but they are a fair sample of the increase of expenditure all along the line, and I am quite sure that the people of this country, especially the agricultural class, will not be inclined to congratulate the minister when they are properly informed of the rapid increase in our militia expenditure. I am not denying that in many respects the militia are very much better, but I am not prepared to admit that up to a few years ago we had practically no militia at all. We had some in 1885 when the Northwest rebellion was quelled, and in 1866 when the Fenian raid was repulsed and in 1871, and at various times before this heavy increase of expenditure we certainly had some kind of militia which we found very useful.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I did not say that we had no militia or that it had not done good work. I said the militia had done good work always, but we had none of the departments or branches which go to make up an army and always relied on the Imperial troops and officers who happened to be in Canada at the time.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the minister to say that we had simply a militia in name and nothing more.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, no.

Mr. SPROULE. Who was it did good service for the country then?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I did not say that. My hon. friend is doing me an injustice.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not wish to do my hon. friend an injustice but that was my understanding of what he said.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That was not what I intended saying.

Mr. SPROULE. I always thought that in practice our militia proved themselves efficient every time their services were called upon.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. So they did?

Mr. SPROULE. The expenditure has grown very rapidly and we are not getting full value for it. It is too late however in the session and the hour is too late to criticise in any detail, and we shall have to content ourselves with taking some other opportunity in the future to discuss our military expenditure and force at greater length. But let me say with regard to the

commission, that it comes with bad grace from a minister who helped to appoint them, to take up two and a half hours of our time in abusing these men after they have done their work so faithfully. The hon. gentleman has put the commission on trial and they have been quartered to the Queen's taste.

Experimental farms, $130,000.

Mr. SPROULE. As we shall have supplementary estimates on these various subjects, it might be understood that any member of this House who desires to discuss any of these questions may do so.

Mr. FISHER. I am quite willing.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I know that my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) is anxious to speak on the same item.

THE DOMINION POWER AND DEVELOPMENT COMPANY.

Mr. FIELDING. Owing to an error on the part of one of the clerical staff, a Bill which had been practically rejected by the Private Bills Committee was sent back to the Senate as if it had been approved by the House. As it is entered in the records of the Senate, we shall have to pass a motion that the Senate be requested to return it. I beg to move therefore a message be sent to the Senate requesting them to return Bill (No. 173), letter H of the Senate, entitled an Act to incorporate the Dominion Power and Development Company.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the order of business for to-morrow ?

Mr. FIELDING. There are several Bills on the Order Paper—the Gold and Silver Marking Act, the bounty to South African volunteers, the Canada Shipping Act, and at a later stage we may take up the Election Bill and then Supply.

Motion agreed to and House adjourned at 1.05 a.m., Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, July 10, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

AMENDMENT OF CHAPTER 38, 1907.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 204) to amend chapter 38 of the statutes of 1907. He said : The purpose of this Bill is to repeal one section of the statute referred to. That statute contained a number of provisions with regard to the deposit of mortgages as railway security. The retention of one provision, which was inserted in the Senate, was due to a misunderstanding between the gentleman who was interested in obtaining legislation, a legal practitioner in the city of Ottawa, and the Deputy Minister of Justice. The deputy minister assented to a number of sections, but not to this one ; but by a misunderstanding it was included among those that were passed by the Senate and concurred in by this House. As soon as the matter was noticed—in fact, within a day or so of prorogation—a letter was written to the gentleman interested in the legislation, asking him to inform his clients of the misunderstanding, and stating that it would seem to be necessary to reconsider the provision in question.

Mr. LANCASTER. What is the effect of the legislation ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. It is difficult to state the effect of the section which is sought to be repealed without reference to the exact language of it. It relates to the registration of mortgage securities by railway companies, and the effect of that on the claims of creditors. When the Bill comes for discussion on the second reading or in committee, I shall be happy to give all the explanation in my power as to the exact nature of the provision.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PROHIBITION OF OPIUM.

Mr. LEMIEUX moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution :

Resolved, that it is expedient to prohibit the importation, manufacture and sale of opium for other than medicinal purposes.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Mr. Chairman, this resolution speaks for itself. In moving it I——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Resolution reported read the second time and agreed to.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I may say to my hon. friend that he is very much in the position of a certain practitioner, a friend of mine, who many years ago made a motion in court in a certain case. The court was so much in favour of the motion that they refused to hear him, and he complained most bitterly because he was not allowed to make his argument.

Mr. LEMIEUX moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 205) to prohibit the importation, manufacture and sale of opium for other than medicinal purposes.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PURCHASE OF SEED OATS.

Mr. BLAIN. Before the orders of the day are called may I be permitted to direct the attention of the Minister of the Interior to a question on page 12747 of 'Hansard,' only a part of which was answered. He answered parts 1 and 2, but left parts 3, 4, 5 and 6 unanswered. Perhaps the hon. minister will give the matter his attention and have these parts of the question answered to-morrow.

JUDICIARY OF MANITOBA AND ONTARIO.

Mr. AYLESWORTH moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution :

Resolved, that in the opinion of this House it is expedient to provide for the payment to one additional county court judge in the province of Manitoba, and two additional district court judges in the province of Ontario, each $2,500 per annum during the first three years of service, and after three years of service each $3,000 per annum.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I presume that this resolution is made necessary by provincial legislation in each case.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. What is proposed is two extra judges in district courts in the new portion of the province of Ontario and one extra county court judge in Manitoba. The districts in Ontario are the district of which Sudbury is the centre and another new district, in the territory of Rainy River. The Sudbury district was constituted by provincial statute a year ago. It was assented to in the provincial legislature a day or two before this House prorogued in April, 1907. It was then too late to legislate here in pursuance of that statute and the consequence has been that up to the present it has not been possible to appoint a judge for the new district of Sudbury, though the necessary legislation has now been on the provincial statute-book for some 15 months. The officers of the court, I understand, have been appointed and the court is in existence ready to do work except that there is no judge. The appointment of a judge is very urgently needed in that district. The court in the district of Rainy River is a new district court which has been established during the session of the Ontario legislature of the present year. The work of establishing the court, so far as the appointment of officials is concerned, has not gone so far in Rainy River as in Sudbury. I am not aware whether the sheriff and other officers have been appointed, but the growing needs of that portion of the province where settlement is proceeding and where the settlers are situated at very long distances from the nearest towns where courts can be held, made it absolutely necessary that these appointments should be provided for without further delay.

With regard to Manitoba there is a general statute under which the government of that province, when the appointment of another county court judge is needed, may so declare and in that way bring into force, automatically as it were, the statutory prerequisites for the establishment of the court. This county court judge is required in the northern part of the province, in the part which is at present, as I understand, filling up with settlers to a very considerable extent, and therefore, in the opinion of the provincial government, the establishment of a new court is required. It is simply with regard to these three cases that this provision is made and in each case there has been the necessary action by the provincial authorities.

Mr. GERVAIS. Might I say a few words with respect to the request which has been made to the government for years for an increase of salary to the circuit court judges of the city of Montreal. As we know, in Quebec there are but three circuit court judges, who have been appointed to sit for the district of Montreal, in the other twenty districts, the circuit court work is done by the superior court judges. They have been discharging their duty for many years ; they are hearing during that time over 20,000 cases per year ; they sit about every day in the year and they are receiving a paltry salary. I think it but fair to ask that they should now be granted the increase of salary which were granted two years ago to all the circuit court judges of the other provinces. They are but three, they are clever, painstaking learned men, assiduous in their work and I think I am safe in saying that all the people in Montreal, the bar of Montreal, everybody in the district would be highly pleased to have an increase of salary of about $1,000 given to each of these judges. They are Mr. Chief Justice Lebœuf, Mr. Justice Dorion and Mr. Justice Purcell. I hope that my remarks will be given due consideration and that some provision will be made during this session. The bar of Montreal have been petitioning for years that such an increase should be granted this year if possible. These judges deserve the increase of salary that has been granted to the circuit court judges in Ontario, and I do not know why they were left out when the general increase of salaries to judges was voted by this House.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The question raised by the hon. gentleman is one to which a good deal of consideration has been given. Not long since a memorial on the subject was presented and I must concede that so far as my own views are concerned, I could not but recognize the justice of many of the representations with regard to the salaries of the circuit court in Montreal which were made in that memorial. The whole question of judicial salaries is, however, a very difficult one to deal with and a very awkward one to reopen. Judicial salaries were considered by this parliament only three years ago and a very considerable measure of increase given to nearly all of the judges throughout the Dominion. I cannot pretend that there are not some inequalities in those salaries and those who suffer from the inequalities think that there is lack of equity and lack of justice in the relative salaries as compared with the amount of work that falls on different courts or judges to do and press very strongly that recognition of their position should be had and some betterment of their salaries granted. Personally I am not willing so soon to open that troublesome question again. Inequalities, I am afraid, will always exist, even under the most careful revision that could possibly be made. We are, I think, and I suppose all lawyers think, not at present paying our judges enough, we are not getting throughout the country as good service as we could get if we paid better figures. I think that judicial service is just like any other service and that the cheaper you try to get it, the poorer the quality of the product. In that view I certainly should be better pleased if we could provide some considerable general increase to our judicial salaries. I am afraid, however, that that is not the sentiment of parliament and I doubt if it is the sentiment of the country. I am afraid the general view is that a lawyer is a lawyer and the cheaper you can get him, the better for your own pocket.

Mr. GERVAIS. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice should know that everybody is satisfied throughout Canada with the general increases of salary granted to the judges. There is no complaint on that score and we shall not want any more increases for twenty years to come, I think; but I would like to know from the minister whether he is aware of the fact that out of the judges who got increases of salary two years ago, the three circuit judges in the city of Montreal were omitted? There were only three judges in all Canada who got no increase of salary and these were the three circuit court judges of Montreal. I took some interest in their case and was told that it was through an oversight that no increase had been given them. That is why I call once more the attention of parliament to this omission and inequality of treatment.

Resolution reported read the second time and agreed to.

Mr. AYLESWORTH moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 206) to amend the Judges' Act. He said: This Bill contains not only provisions embodying the terms of the resolution just passed but also a provision with regard to the chairman or assistant chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners, where such official has been a judge of the Superior Court prior to his appointment. The effect of the amendment is to reduce from fifteen to twelve years the period of service which would entitle the chairman, in such a position as I have described, to the usual retiring allowance.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

GOLD AND SILVER AND PLATED WARE.

Bill (No. 197) respecting the sale and marking of manufactures of gold and silver and gold and silver plated ware—Mr. Fisher—read the second time and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Mr. KEMP. What are the changes in this Bill from the Act formerly passed but which never came into operation? It was to have come into operation in some seven or eight months but I doubt if it ever did. That Act was carefully thought out in committee, and I would like to know what the changes are.

Mr. FISHER. The Act to which my hon. friend refers was passed in 1906. The different interests were represented in the committee which considered that measure and they threshed out their different views, But before the Act came into force, the interests concerned found that some of its provisions would interfere with their trade and they asked the government to postpone its coming into force.

Mr. BRODER. Did it come into force by proclamation?

Mr. FISHER. No, automatically at a certain date. It was not as usual the date of the assent to the Act, but the date fixed was March 13 last. Shortly before that date, the wholesale dealers in jewellery, the retail dealers and the manufacturers met together to discuss how it would affect them and found it would act prejudicially. They made representations to the government a few weeks before the date fixed for its coming into force. The government did not see how it was possible to make the necessary amendments and put them into shape before March 13, so we brought down a short Bill simply repealing that Act, and told the interested parties that we would if possible this session bring in a new Act to meet their views. The chief difference was with regard to the amount of gold in what are called pure gold articles. The dispute was whether nine carats or ten should be required as the minimum. The old Act re-

quired ten and the English law requires nine. Therefore with a ten carat requirement, the importation of English goods was practically prohibited. Eventually the manufacturers, while not agreeing to the change to nine carats, said they would leave the decision with the government. The importers and dealers all wanted nine carats substituted for ten. Various minor amendments were also suggested and the question was threshed out between the officers of the Crown and a committee composed of representatives of the retailers, wholesalers and manufacturers. This committee drafted a new Bill, but it was found that, owing to their inexperience in drafting legislation their Bill was not in proper shape to present to parliament, and the Justice Department undertook to draft another.

Mr. KEMP. Is the change from ten to nine ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes. The other amendments are minor ones.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Has the Bill been threshed out by the representatives of the various interests concerned and found satisfactory ?

Mr. FISHER. The accredited representatives of the retailers, wholesalers and manufacturers went into the whole matter and discussed it with the law officers of the Crown, and they have agreed on the provisions of this Bill, which has been well discussed in the Senate and meets their views.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Does it come into immediate operation ?

Mr. FISHER. No, on the 1st of October next.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture one question about the Bill. I have had a communication about it, in which a reference is made to section 9:

The original intention of the manufacturers was to have goods marked in such a way that the public could distinguish between spurious and reliable articles. To accomplish which it was proposed that gold jewellery when stamped should possess such marks, and only such marks, as would enable the consumer to determine, first, the maker; second, the period of time when made; third, the quality of the article made. Section 9 deals with this question, but absolutely fails in every particular. As we read the section, permission is given to stamp or apply either a trade mark only, or a quality mark only, or numbers not denoting quality only, and a trade mark combined with a dealer's initials only, or if the dealer prefers, all or any combination of said referred to marks, and the date mark is eliminated entirely.

I think the minister has a letter containing the same statement, that is from Mr. Ellis. The matter is a highly technical one, and I do not profess to understand it, but I thought it my duty to make these observations and to read this communication, in order to be sure that the matter has received the attention of the government, and that the minister is satisfied, if he is satisfied, with the present condition.

Mr. FISHER. I had the same communication from Mr. Ellis. While perhaps his views may be slightly different from the accredited representatives of the trade, we have looked into that matter, and the Senate went into the question carefully, and this section 9 seems to cover the consensus of opinion of the trade. As I understand it, Mr. Ellis' objection is to the removal of the necessity of the trade mark. But the Bill provides that the article must contain a trade mark registered in Canada, and that the trade mark contains the date. If the article is marked with a foreign trade mark, it must be registered, and the mark must be put on at the time of manufacture. But if there is no foreign trade mark put on, then it could be imported without that trade mark.

Mr. SPROULE. What is to indicate the day of the manufacture? If only the registration trade mark is given, that would give no indication to the public.

Mr. FISHER. If there is no trade mark on, the date of the manufacture would be in the record, but the importer would have to comply with the Act. If there are any trade marks, any special marks, they must be in accordance with the Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think we are all agreed that the object of the Bill is to prevent the practice of fraud on the public, but at the same time, while securing that object, it is desirable to disturb as little as possible the trade of the country in this important branch. I assume that the government has taken this question into careful consideration, but I do not suppose that at this stage of the session we will be able to give the subject any elaborate discussion, even if we had the technical knowledge to be able to do so. I would like to know from the minister whether he is satisfied, and whether the officials of the government having that matter in hand, are satisfied, that this Bill does, to as great an extent as practicable, prevent fraud and imposition upon the public. Some cogent illustrations of that evil were brought to my attention last year by gentlemen who were engaged in the trade, particularly by Mr. McNaught, who thinks the Bill in its present form is calculated to do away with those evils. Is the government satisfied that this legislation will have that effect?

Mr. FISHER. I can say, practically yes, in regard to that. There could be greater protection, but I think it would be an interference with trade which would not be desirable. We must recognize the conditions,

and we must recognize the evidence of those who are engaged in it. The provisions of this Act seem to prevent any fraud, so far as that can be done with fair consideration for those engaged in the trade. It might be possible to invent greater restrictions, but I think it would be impracticable to enforce them. Mr. McNaught is urging upon us very strongly that this Bill should become law.

Mr. KEMP. I am not quite clear whether it is compulsory that the imported article should have a trade mark on it.

Mr. FISHER. It is not compulsory that it should have a trade mark, but if it has a trade mark, it must be a trade mark registered in Canada.

Mr. KEMP. Then it is compulsory that all articles made in Canada should have the name of the maker on them?

Mr. FISHER. No, it is not.

Mr. KEMP. It is voluntary whether a man puts it on or not?

Mr. FISHER. If he does put it on, it has to be in conformity with the Act.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. What is the least quality of gold that can be stamped as gold?

Mr. FISHER. Nine carats.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. That is less than half gold.

Mr. FISHER. The old Act was ten carats.

Mr. KEMP. I am a little anxious about the matter, although it is so late in the session that I realize that there is not much time to give it consideration. There are some things in this Bill under which it seemed to me the public will not be protected in the way we desired to protect them when the matter was first initiated in reference to the old Bill.

Mr. HENDERSON. As I understood the Bill anything that is not stamped or marked will certainly be regarded as spurious. The public has no guarantee whatever.

Mr. FISHER. That is it.

Mr. HENDERSON. An article may be eight karat, but because it has no stamp the public has assurance what the character of it is. It does seem to me that this is not a tremendous amount of protection to the public. I do not see any great advantage to be gained by it, but if I know that it is a matter that excites some considerable interest in the country and if the interests of those who are mostly concerned in providing an article for sale to the public that is reasonably good are protected I do not think we can take much exception to it. I fancy the public will have to take care of themselves in this matter as they have done before.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the public be protected against jewellers selling goods as gold, or pure gold, without being stamped, thereby deceiving the public and without any punishment provided for such deception? If that is permitted it seems to me that the Bill is of little use.

Mr. FISHER. The public will look for the mark, they will not find the mark and they will know the article is not genuine.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose the article is stamped 'pure gold'?

Mr. FISHER. They could not do it under this Act.

Mr. SPROULE. They could do it outside of this Act and not be amenable to punishment?

Mr. FISHER. No they would be amenable under this Act.

Mr. SPROULE. What provision is there in the law to punish them provided that were done?

Mr. FISHER. This Act says that if an article bears any mark it must have applied to it the following marks and descriptions and amongst these is the number of carats.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The Act calls for stamps representing a certain quality of gold in the article, and if the stamp is not on it is prima facie evidence that the article is not gold. The principal change in this Bill is the difference between nine and ten carat gold. The former Bill prevented nine carat jewellery coming in from Great Britain. The change in this Bill is to conform with the English trade mark rather than with the American. It is a well understood fact that the English hall mark cuts down the quality of gold stamped on the article. The American Act says that while it is stamped ten carats it must contain at least nine and a half carats of gold, and that if the article is soldered it must contain not less than nine carats, Seventy-five per cent of the jewellery that came in from the United States stamped ten carat was really only nine carat. It would have been a great injury to the retail jewellery business in this country had they continued the ten carat mark for the simple reason that retailers have an immense business in those nine carat hall mark goods and they are excellent wearing articles. I have a letter from one of the largest wholesale and manufacturing jewellers in Canada who says:

> We think it would be in the interest of the trade if the Bill were put through in its present shape this session.

The wholesale dealers, the manufacturers and retailers have had over twenty meetings in Toronto over this Bill and practical-

ly the Bill, as presented to-day, is their own drafting.

Mr. KEMP. The drafting of the retailers.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. No, the drafting of the wholesalers, manufacturers and retailers, with one exception. I understand there was one manufacturer who took exception to the nine carat gold. He wanted to see it ten carat but he stood at one side and said that he would leave it to the government.

On section 7—exceptions; certain articles of silver.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why do you require the exemption of articles by the Acts of the Governor in Council?

Mr. FISHER. I think there will have to be a more lengthy description of these articles made by the regulations which will have to be made by experts. You could hardly do it in the Bill.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

MANITOBA GRAIN ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 188) to amend the Manitoba Grain Act.—Mr. Oliver—read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 2,

Mr. STAPLES. I would like an explanation of this legislation. It is one of the most important Bills of this session, affecting the interest of the farming community of the west, and I hope the committee will not rush it through without giving it the consideration to which it is entitled.

Mr. LAKE. I may say that certain proposed amendments to this Bill were laid before the members yesterday, and I have done my best to look into them. Two sets of amendments have been brought down and distributed among the members, the second set only yesterday. I understand that the minister has gone very thoroughly into this matter, and is pretty well posted in all the details. We want to know what the proposed amendments mean before passing the various clauses of the Bill.

Mr. OLIVER. In regard to the two sets of proposed amendments, they have been distributed for the information of the House, so that no one would be taken by surprise. The difference between the two sets of amendments proposed, with regard to section 31 of the Bill, is a difference not in principle but only in detail. I may say that the Bill which has come down from the Senate is based on the report of the Royal Grain Commission which was appointed in 1906, and which made a very exhaustive examination of the grain trade, both in the west and in the east and in Great Britain. That commission embodied its views in a report which has been before the House for a considerable time. Preparatory to the framing of the Bill which would embody the propositions of the commission, a conference was held under the auspices of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. That conference was attended by representatives of the railway interest, the milling interest, the grain dealing interest, the farming interest, as well as by a number of members of this House and the chairman of the Royal Grain Commission; so that there was a fair opportunity for all sides of the question to be presented. As a result of that conference it was decided not to follow in all particulars the views of the Royal Grain Commission. Some things which they recommended were not acted upon, and some of their recommendations were varied; but in the main the Bill as it was presented to the Senate and as it has come down to us is the embodiment of the views of that commission. When the report of the Royal Grain Commission got into the hands of the public generally, especially the farming community of the west, there was of course brought to bear upon it an interest that was not fully in evidence in the conference before the Minister of Trade and Commerce. In other words, the great farming interest of the country had an opportunity to discuss pro and con the merits of the question and to give their views directly as to what they wanted; and it is in accordance largely with the views that have been expressed directly by the grain-growing interest that the amendments which have been placed before the House in sheet form have been prepared. It was thought right that any amendments that were to be suggested should be printed and placed informally in the hands of members. We thought it would save time in discussion to have them distributed in convenient form.

Mr. STAPLES. This question, I understand, arose in the Committee on Agriculture three years ago, when the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) moved for a committee to thoroughly investigate the grain trade of the prairie provinces. The committee granted that request, and there was a committee formed. Parties were summoned from all over the western country, as well as millers from the east, and the matter was gone into very fully, with the result that a royal commission was appointed and given authority to go all over the country and even to Great Britain to ascertain what was the best way to protect our grain until it reached the foreign market. That grain commission cost the country something over $30,000, although it was anticipated that $10,000 would be sufficient; so that this legislation up to the present time has cost the country an enormous sum of money. The Grain Growers' Association, who represent the agricultural interest of the prairie pro-

vinces, have been very active in trying to guard that interest. When they got the report of the Royal Grain Commission, they asked for an interview with the government here. That was granted. When the delegates from that association arrived here, they were surrounded by other parties who were apparently very much interested in the grain trade. They came here, not expecting to be confronted with the bankers and the railway magnates of the country. I understand that they have had no easy task in trying to get the legislation they desire, and I regret that the legislation which is before the House to-day is far short of what they were looking for. For that reason I think the committee should go very carefully through every clause of this Bill and see if we cannot work out a measure satisfactory to the grain growers of the west. The Grain Growers' Association are so much interested in this that since that Bill has gone through the Senate, they sent their delegates back here. I understand that delegates from Saskatchewan and Manitoba are here in the interests of the grain producers of the prairie provinces. There have been many conferences to which we on this side of the House have not been asked. We did not know what legislation was going on or what provisions were being discussed, and in so far as regards what has taken place between the committee and the farmers' delegates, we are in the dark. Therefore we are entitled to all the time necessary to find out from the minister, as well as those who were with him in the conference and who were all western Liberals, how the matter really stands. I remember that when the delegates came down to meet the Minister of Trade and Commerce, we were not even given an invitation to go over to the meeting and hear the evidence. But knowing that the conference was taking place, we did go over, and were told we could not be admitted until the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford) was consulted, and he came out and graciously allowed us to go in. I hope that the interests of the farmers will be protected by this legislation.

Mr. CONMEE. The general Act, of which this is supposed to be an amendment, has certain regulations regarding the inspection of grain in the Manitoba division. It deals with other divisions, but I am more particularly interested in the Manitoba division. Under that Act and the amendment now proposed, all grain going east of Winnipeg for shipment to the terminal elevator or any point east of Winnipeg must be inspected as it leaves the car into the elevator. But that is not the practice at Winnipeg. Grain shipped to Winnipeg is not inspected as it goes into the car, but as it comes out. That grain is reinspected and a check inspection made at the terminal elevators at Port Arthur and Fort William before it enters these elevators. If it is not found up to the standard given at Winnipeg, the car is detained until it can be adjusted by the chief inspector. The law further provides that the certificate given at Winnipeg is final as between the buyer and seller. At Port Arthur or Fort William there is a better opportunity of inspecting the grain as it goes into the elevators, because the whole car load is under the eye of the inspector, and according to the rule it shall not be inspected at night. There is, therefore, a better opportunity for inspection there than at Winnipeg where the grain is not inspected in the elevator,, but samples taken from the cars after it comes out of the elevator. If the grade given at Winnipeg when inspected at the general elevator is not found to be the proper grade, the car is held up until adjusted. Under the law the certificate given at Winnipeg is final between the purchaser and the seller. This is for the purpose of facilitating grain transactions. But the grain may be discarded at Port Arthur or Fort William, because it is not up to the standard grade and may be held up. If the inspector can get a surrender of the certificate given at Winnipeg, the grain can be reinspected. But if that certificate has been negotiated and gone into other hands, it may not be secured, and in that case I am unable to find out what becomes of the grain. I am told that in some such cases, everybody gets tired. The elevator man, the inspector and the railway people, if they find some other grain will stand it, will dump it in with this other grain and somebody gets a less valuable grain. If the certificate is still in the hands of the party who got it, no doubt it could be surrendered, but frequently it changes hands and in some cases they do not get the certificate surrendered. That illustrates my point. The grain that is shipped to Winnipeg they take simply from the car, but do not give it any grade. They take it into the elevators and clean it and mix it, and then grade it after it is reloaded into the cars again. That same grain is inspected at Port Arthur going into the elevators there. The grade cannot be changed. Even if the inspector at Port Arthur or Fort William finds a difference, the chief inspector is the only one who can determine whether the grade should be changed or not. I am not finding fault with that, but it is not as speedy a way of dealing with the thing as might possibly be worked out. The result is that under this amendment it is proposed to hold cars at Winnipeg 24 hours in order that there may be a sample mark and the grain sold there without inspection. If that grain is not sold or dealt with at Winnipeg it may go to the terminal elevator without being graded, as I understand it. If it is ordered into the Winnipeg elevators and not inspected going in, it is inspected coming out after it has been treated. I am not speaking now of scoured grain. I am

speaking of the ordinary grades. Now, that privilege which is allowed to the elevators and dealers in Manitoba is taken away from the elevators and dealers of the province of Ontario, and I do not think that is fair. I will give notice of an amendment which will at least to some extent remedy the evil. If it is satisfactory to the grain or elevator people at Winnipeg to try to make an artificial condition where nature never intended it, I am willing to let them struggle with it and I do not want to interfere with their programme. If it is proper and right to take this grain and clean it and improve it to a point or two in grade in the city of Winnipeg, it is certainly right to do it at the terminal elevators. There may be some difference of opinion as to whether my amendment should be to Bill (ZZ) of the Senate or to the Grain Inspection Bill. known as Bill (CC) of the Senate. The Bill now before us is the Bill that imposes the conditions, and I think this is the proper place for the amendment. I beg to give notice of the following:

All grain not inspected and graded at Winnipeg, shipped to any terminal elevator in the Manitoba inspection division, if inspected before entering such elevator shall at the request of the owner, and upon the surrender of any certificate of inspection previously given, be reinspected and graded according to its merits, before, or at the time of shipment from such terminal elevator.

I believe this amendment would to some extent overcome the discrepancy I have pointed out. There is a considerable quantity of grain which goes through Winnipeg and which may be held there, and which may not enter the elevators at all, and as to that class of grain I simply ask that the same privilege which is extended to the Winnipeg elevators shall be extended to the terminal elevators at the head of the lakes.

Mr. OLIVER. The remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Conmee) would apply entirely to Bill (CC) of the Senate, and not to the Bill we are now considering. There is a certain relationship between the two Bills, but the Bill now before the House has reference to the transportation of grain and the identity of the grain, whereas the other Bill is to establish grades, and to that Bill this amendment is pertinent. I do not think it is in order to accept notice of this as an amendment to the Bill (CC) of the Senate, which is not before the House, but that informality might be waived.

Mr. CONMEE. This is the Bill that imposes a condition on grain going east of Winnipeg—why that line should be drawn has always been a mystery to me—and, therefore, it seems to me that my amendment is relevant to this Bill. However, I do not care which Bill it goes in, if I am given an assurance that Bill (CC) of the Senate will be considered by the House. I was told that if a certain amendment to the Bill prevailed in the Senate the promoters intended to withdraw it. My position is that I want a fair consideration for this amendment, and if the House rejects it I will have to be content.

On section 3, (i) eastern transfer elevator.

Mr. OLIVER. This is in line with the suggestions of the Royal Grain Commission, and is a very important section. It provides that western grain, in transit to eastern points or to the sea-board, shall be subject to the same control, the same supervision and the same inspection in the transfer elevators as it has hitherto been in the terminal elevator at Fort William. It is a preliminary provision, looking to the preservation of the identity of the grade of the grain during its whole course of transportation, or from the collecting point to its ultimate destination, either the mill or the sea-board. While every provision was made in the original Act for the preservation of the grade of grain in terminal elevators, the transfer elevators were left free, and of course there was an opening for abuses, for which the Royal Grain Commission has suggested this as a remedy.

Mr. STAPLES. How many extra officials will be required to do all this work ?

Mr. OLIVER. I could form no idea how many would be required. The proposition certainly will involve the appointment of a considerable number of responsible officials, and will involve the payment of a considerable number of salaries. I do not wish to minimize the importance of this section, it is a radical departure from the Act as it stands to-day. The Royal Grain Commission believes this provision to be necessary in the interest of the grain growers of the west, to securing that their products shall reach the market in proper condition.

Mr. STAPLES. This is a very important section, and is drawn, I understand, to meet the views of the farmers of the west, and to protect the identity of their grain until it reaches the foreign market. As to whether the provision contained in this Bill is the best one for securing that result, we do not know. The Bill has been up in the Senate, and has been well considered there ; I believe it has also been before a caucus or committee of gentlemen sitting on the opposite side of the House, and it has come down to us in this form. So I suppose we shall have to hold them responsible for it.

Mr. OLIVER. The present section comes to us as it was framed by the wisdom of the Senate, and no one so far has suggested any amendment to it. It embodies the result of the investigations of the Royal Grain Commission, and the application of the wisdom of the Senate to its suggestions.

Mr. BLAIN. There have been several complaints from gentlemen sitting on this side of the House, that they were not invited to the meetings and the investigations that have been going on. Perhaps the minister would give us an explanation of that.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend is under a wrong impression, there has been no special committee of the House.

Mr. BLAIN. I do not mean a special committee appointed by this House, but a committee composed of members on the government side of the House, with the minister occupying the chair. Perhaps the minister will explain why gentlemen on this side of the House were not invited ?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know that there is any explanation to be offered. If any members of the House see fit to associate together for the purpose of considering a measure which is to come before the House, I do not see that their course requires any explanation.

Mr. HERRON. I am not very familiar with the grain growing business myself, but if I had had an opportunity of consulting with the delegates that have been here for the last week or ten days, I would have considerable more information than I have to-day. I have heard that there have been meetings from time to time of the western members on the government side of the House, but I only heard of them after they were all over each day. I regret that we have not been admitted to their councils, and have not consequently been able to get the views of the representatives of the western grain growers. I am as much interested in grain growing as any other member of this House, and I would like to see the interest of the grain growers well protected.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. This is not a party question, so far as I am concerned. I want the very best conditions possible to prevail as regards the grain growers of the west. Personally, I represent a district that grows more wheat than the district represented by any other member of this House. I think that the courtesy might have been extended to us of inviting us to take part in these meetings. It is another evidence of the hole and corner work done by certain members on the other side of the House. There was absolutely nothing in this question of a party nature. As we have not been able to confer with these representatives from Manitoba and the other western provinces that have been down here, we come to this discussion under great disadvantages. We should have had an opportunity of attending those meetings of which the Minister of the Interior was chairman. We knew that these meetings were going on, but we could only get in there, as it were, by pushing ourselves in. We are here, western members, trying to do our utmost in the interests of the farmers. We find that in the past we have not received justice, but that will come up a little later. However, I want to enter my protest. The Minister of the Interior may say that hon. members on this side of the House, if they had liked, could have met together and talked matters over. But, this is a little different. This is a matter which affects both sides of the House equally and I say that very small courtesy was extended to the members of the House. These meetings have been going on from day to day and we were not given the benefit of attending them. Because we did not have the opportunity of hearing what the wesern representatives had to say we are hampered in this discussion.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not think that my hon. friend's complaints are well founded. I do not think they have anything to do with the case.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I think they have.

Mr. OLIVER. If my hon. friend has had consultations with his friends on the other side of the House with regard to matters which are not necessarily party questions, I do not see why he should deny to other people the same privilege.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. We had none with the representatives from the west.

Mr. OLIVER. With regard to this particular case, this Bill is before the House to-day exactly as it left the Senate. Nobody has suggested any interference with it. My hon. friend has had just as much opportunity to follow the discussion in the Senate as anybody else has had. He has had just as much opportunity to consider the provisions of the Bill as anybody else has had. If he is not able to give a reasoned judgment with regard to the question it is his fault and not the fault of any one else. As far as the suggestions which have been placed before the House in printed form are concerned, I will have to take the responsibility, together with those with whom I have consulted, but in so far as the Bill is concerned it is as it left the Senate, and so far as we have not attempted to make any change in it, my hon. friend is just as much responsible for it as any other member of the House. There is no change in the conditions whatever, and I think he is certainly undertaking to make a grievance when none exists.

Mr. LANCASTER. My hon. friend from Souris (Mr. Schaffner), as I understand it, complains that some hon. gentlemen in this House have been enabled to receive some information which would throw light on the matter, which is not a party question, which has been denied to himself.

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is the complaint that has been made by my hon. friend

from Souris. The people of the west have thought that this was a matter of sufficient importance to justify them in sending down special envoys to inform—the government and the members of the House supporting the government?—no, but to inform the whole House as to the scope of the measure and the provisions which they thought it should contain. My hon. friend from Souris is as much a member of the House as the hon. gentlemen opposite who were permitted to receive the information imparted by these representatives from the west. If the minister means to say that gentlemen on this side of the House can bring no intelligence to the discussion of the subject, we have nothing to say about that. He is entitled to his opinion.

Mr. OLIVER. That would not apply to the western members, only to some of the eastern members.

Mr. LANCASTER. But if he acknowledges that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, coming from the west, possess as great an amount of intelligence as hon. gentlemen on the other side, I cannot see how he will say that the grievance of my hon. friend from Souris is not well founded. It is in the interest of the people that all possible information shall be obtained by the members of this House, whether from the government or anywhere else, because we are binding the people by the legislation that we make. I do not see how the hon. gentleman can justify the exclusion of some hon. members of the House from information which is possessed by others. because when a matter of this kind comes before the House to be discussed, and when hon. gentlemen on this side are called upon to discuss it, they are entitled to the same information as that which has been received by hon. gentlemen opposite, and I do not think that hon. members on this side have been properly treated in this respect.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend speaks of the exclusion of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House from sources of information. There has been no exclusion of any one on the part of any one from any source of information. As far as the intelligence of hon. gentlemen from the west is concerned, my hon. friend, in undertaking to speak for them, is casting a reflection upon them that I do not think he is justified in doing.

Mr. KEMP. I would like to ask the minister if this is the Bill which created so much interest in the Senate, in regard to which the Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright. representing the government, and Senator Davis, representing some one else——

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. KEMP. May I inquire from the minister if he takes the same position in this House that Sir Richard Cartwright took in the Senate with respect to this Bill?

Mr. OLIVER. We are not dealing with that Bill at all. It has not come down yet.

Mr. LAKE. The two Bills are mixed up together in a way, and it is a very difficult matter to keep them separate. The conferences which I understand have been held have been in connection with both Bills, I presume, as we have amendments proposed to this Bill as sent down from the Senate. The hon. minister of the Interior speaks of this as a conference between party friends, and he says that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House may have their own meetings just the same as have hon. gentlemen on the other side. But I would point out that these conferences which have, I understand, taken place, have been on a different footing. I have been informed that not only have the members on that side been meeting together, which, of course, they had a perfect right to do, but that they have had before them the chief inspector, a paid official, to give evidence, and that they have also had before them, I presume on invitation, the representatives of the two great railways in the west, the Canadian Northern and the Canadian Pacific Railway. the two parties most interested in the conveyance of the grain and the representatives of the farmers. That being the case, it seems to me that it partook more or less of the nature of an official conference. However, the minister did not see fit to invite hon. gentlemen on this side of the House to that conference, and, of course, he takes the responsibility of that. I only express the same belief as that which has been expressed by an hon. gentleman on this side of the House already, and that is that the Bill has been treated from a purely party standpoint and not as a matter in regard to which both parties should do their utmost to agree upon some mutual understanding for the benefit of all concerned in the grain business of the west.

Mr. BURROWS. The hon. gentleman is under a misapprehension regarding what has taken place. As far as I understand. the representatives of the railway companies came here themselves. They were not asked to come here, and they were not asked to come to the meetings that the members on this side of the House had. At the same time representatives of the Grain Growers' Association also came here. They came of their own accord, they were not asked to attend our meetings, but they did attend them. It was quite open to hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House to have also met these gentlemen if they wanted to do so.

Mr. LAKE. We never heard of them until several days after these meetings had been held.

Mr. BURROWS. These gentlemen are all here. It is open to hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House to hold meetings and discuss the matter with them. I am sure that they would be very glad to place their views before hon. gentlemen. This is not a party question, but I am sorry to see that hon. gentlemen opposite are attempting to make it so.

Mr. STAPLES. Does the hon. gentleman mean to tell me that these gentlemen came to their meetings without an invitation, that they simply came and walked into the minister's room without being invited?

Mr. BURROWS. If the hon. gentleman would use his brain a little he would understand. I said that these gentlemen were not asked to come to Ottawa, that they came of their own accord, they came while this Bill was being discussed, and they had a right to come to any meetings that they could get into and we were glad to confer with them.

Mr. LANCASTER. Why did not the hon. gentleman send an invitation to hon. members on this side to attend those meetings and hear what was said by these gentlemen from the west?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot give an answer to my hon. friend and I think my hon. friend and his friends are doing their best to give an answer that the country will accept. That is, that these gentlemen are prepared on any occasion to make any question a party question and to obstruct business when they think they can take a party advantage.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is an absolutely unworthy statement of the Minister of the Interior. He is relapsing into his old mood; he had been improving lately but evidently the strain of the hot weather has upset him again.

Mr. LANCASTER. Midsummer madness.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the way to make this a party question? It is for the minister to take sources of information such as those which have been available and to call the members on his own side of the House together and to absolutely ignore gentlemen on this side of the House. That was the way to make it a party question. If he desired to have the advantage of the services of all the members of the House on this Bill, when these gentlemen from the west came here to express their views upon a subject as to which they had special knowledge, he would have called together all the members from the west whether they sat on this side of the House or on that side of the House if he did not intend to make this a party question. If he desired to make this Bill the best Bill possible in the interests of the country he would have called together the Liberal and the Conservative members from the west; if he did not desire to make this Bill the best Bill in the interests of the country but the best Bill in the interests of the Liberal party then he would do exactly what he has done. And when a respectful remonstrance is made in the House about it and when information is asked the Minister of the Interior flies into a passion and accuses hon. gentlemen on this side of obstructing. It is just what might have been expected from the minister when he is a little off his base.

At one o'clock the House took recess.

Committee resumed at three o'clock.

On section 5—sections 10 to 16 repealed.

Mr. OLIVER. These sections relate to the appointment of a weighmaster and the weighing of grain. They were contained in both the Grain Inspection Act and the Manitoba Grain Act, and it is thought better, in order to prevent confusion, to strike them out of the Manitoba Grain Act, of which this is an amendment, and leave them standing in the Grain Inspection Act.

On section 8—bond of licensee.

Mr. OLIVER. This relates to the bonds which are given by the operator of a terminal warehouse. It adds to the proviso of section 18, which reads: 'Provided that when any person procures a license for more than one elevator, no more than one bond may be given'—and then comes the amendment—'the amount of which shall not exceed the above maximum;' the maximum set out in the preceeding part of the section, which is $50,000.

On section 9,

Mr. OLIVER. I move that subclause 4 be struck out and the following be substituted:

No grain shall leave a public terminal point without being officially weighed unless the owner or his agent orders otherwise.

The difference between this amendment and the one in the Senate Bill is this: According to the latter all grain billed to any public terminal elevator within the Manitoba inspection division shall not leave that inspection division without being officially weighed. My amendment provides that if the owner orders to that effect, it need not be weighed, and the owner will not have to pay the weighing charges.

Mr. STAPLES. That would apply to dealers in grain particularly?

Mr. OLIVER. To anybody.

Mr. LAKE. Does this apply to grain placed in a terminal elevator?

Mr. OLIVER. It applies to grain that is passing through a terminal point and is not put into the elevator. The Senate Bill provides that such grain must be unloaded and weighed and then put back into the car again before it goes forward and a charge

is made against the grain. It was considered by the Senate sound public policy that grain passing east should have the advantage of being officially weighed where there were conveniences for weighing it. But on further consideration it was thought that if a man did not want to take that precaution and would rather save the expense, he could give an order to that effect and his grain would be sent forward without being weighed.

Mr. STAPLES. One of the objects of the amendment would be to hurry the grain along.

Mr. OLIVER. Precisely.

Mr. LAKE. The amendment in the Senate Bill speaks of grain billed to any public terminal elevator and the hon. minister's amendment speaks of a public terminal point.

Mr. SPROULE. What distinction between a terminal point and a terminal elevator?

Mr. CRAWFORD. The grain might be billed to a public terminal elevator and ordered forward to a further point. According to this clause, if billed to a terminal elevator, it would have to be weighed, although an order was subsequently given to send it on to a further point.

Mr. STAPLES. If it is put into an elevator, it will certainly be weighed; but if it was ordered on, it is optional with the owner whether he has it weighed or not.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. STAPLES. I do not see any objection provided the shipper thoroughly understands the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAM WRIGHT. What does it cost to remove the grain from the car and weigh it ?

Mr. OLIVER. It costs three-quarters of a cent a bushel to officially weigh the grain which is a considerable tax.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 10—subsection 11,

Every public terminal warehouseman in the Manitoba inspection division shall insure against fire with companies satisfactory to the commissioners, all grain received, handled or stored by him.

Mr. OLIVER. I move that the following words be inserted ; Provided always that this subsection shall not apply to eastern transfer warehousemen. The reason for making the exception in the case of the transfer elevator, is that when the grain reaches the eastern transfer elevator it is under insurance by the owner, and there is not the same necessity of making a provision for insurance that exists in the western part. So far as the Fort William terminal to which point the farmer sends his grain, he is not in a position to take special means to insure. Therefore we require the warehouseman shall insure everything in his warehouse. But we except the eastern division, because the warehouse man puts on the insurance, and the dealer makes his own insurance.

Mr. STAPLES. Therefore the owner is fully protected all the way through.

Mr. OLIVER. He protects himself after he leaves Fort William. He is protected to Fort William, and after he leaves Fort William he must protect himself, so far as insurance is concerned.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. It has been suggested that no grain shall leave the point after being inspected unless the owner or his agent gives an order by writing, so there shall be something to show.

Mr. CONMEE. He might do so by telegraph.

Mr. OLIVER. It might be held that the telegram was not a sufficient order, though it would be sufficient.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. It is a better order than exists now.

Mr. CONMEE. The elevator man must have some evidence that the order is given, he will look out for himself.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It could be done by wire or telephone.

Mr. OLIVER. I move to add this subsection :

Provided always that this subsection shall not apply to eastern transfer warehousemen.

Mr. CONMEE. I want to refer to subsection 8 of section 9 which reads:

In no case, whether in a public terminal elevator in the Manitoba inspection division or in an eastern transfer elevator, shall grain of different grades be mixed together while in store.

I want to point out what may possibly take place. The machinery of that clause simply provides that while they may mix the grades at Winnipeg and St. Boniface, by legislation, that same action is prohibited at the terminal or transfer elevators. That comes back to the point of the motion I suggested this morning. I think it is decidedly unfair. Whatever treatment or arrangement there is for handling the grain at Winnipeg should apply to other elevators. I do not see why that should not include all elevators in the Manitoba inspection division. If it is intended to include the terminal elevators of that division, and the Port Arthur and Fort William elevators are in the Manitoba division, and to include the eastern transfer elevators as well, I wish to ask the minister if he does not think that the wording of that section should be changed so as to include the Winnipeg elevators.

Mr. LAKE. Why is there a distinction made between the cleaning and scouring

elevator at Port Arthur and Fort William, and that at Winnipeg. There seems to be a distinction made with regard to the grading.

Mr. OLIVER. The reason for the difference my hon. friend speaks of is that for the purposes of trade it is found necessary to handle the grain on grade instead of on sample. Grain is bought on sample, but it is sold on grade; it is bought from the farmer on sample, but it reaches the consumer on grade. There is a point of change between the conditions of handling by sample and handling by grade. The consensus of opinion is that that point of change seems conveniently located at Winnipeg. There must be a change somewhere, and the consensus of opinion is that the change should occur at one point, and not at interlocking points. The opinion is that Winnipeg is the point at which it is best for everybody that the change from sample to grade should take place. Generally speaking, the grain comes together at a certain point, and there it is inspected. Therefore, as the conditions between the purchasing and handling on sample and the purchasing and handling on grade, change at Winnipeg, it is thought advisable that the provisions which are intended to preserve the identity of the grain from Winnipeg east, should not apply to Winnipeg or points west, Winnipeg being the point of the assemblage of the grade and the point of inspection.

Mr. CONMEE. I cannot agree with the view of the minister on that point.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not stating this as my view, I am simply stating the fact that this is the consensus of opinion. It is simply a statement of the facts.

Mr. CONMEE. I am glad that the minister has an open mind on the subject. The fact is that most of the grain now shipped from the west is not inspected at Winnipeg at all. Another large quantity comes into the Winnipeg yards, and under this Bill the owner may hold it for twenty-four hours to be sold on sample, if he wishes. If he does not order it into the elevators or on to some siding for handling, it goes on. That grain is not in some cases graded at Winnipeg, grain is not in all cases inspected at Winnipeg except that which comes from the elevator. This clause prepares the way for selling on sample, and change of conditions, and change of ownership at Winnipeg. I venture to say that perhaps 90 per cent of the grain changes its ownership before it reaches Winnipeg. When it comes to Winnipeg it is not the grain of the farmer, except in very few instances; it is the grain of the grain dealer, and the grain dealers through this Bill say: We want the privilege of taking it into the elevator and advancing its grade, advancing it from No. 2 Northern to No. 1. We want the authority of mixing it, of grading it, but we will not allow anybody else to do so. We stipulate by law that they shall not do it at the public, general or transfer elevators or in the Dominion of Canada. It is, I submit, unfair to pass such legislation.

Mr. TURRIFF. My hon. friend would give the impression that the bulk of the wheat shipped from points west of Winnipeg goes into elevators in Winnipeg before it is graded. I am satisfied that not more that one per cent is thus treated ; the great bulk is shipped from the different stations west of Winnipeg, inspected and graded on its way through Winnipeg and goes into the terminal elevator at Port Arthur.

Mr. CONMEE. Is not much of the wheat placed in elevators in Winnipeg without inspection and sent out of these elevators on grade ?

Mr. TURRIFF. Only a very small proportion. Most of it goes from the elevator at the country point through to the terminal elevator.

Mr. CONMEE. My honoured friend is mistaken, even if he is from the west. I consulted Inspector Horn and his statement was that no grain was inspected before going into the Winnipeg elevators so the Winnipeg inspection of that grain is inspection after the grain has been cleaned. I I offer no objections to the sample market or anything else at Winnipeg but I do say : Please take your hand off our throat, we do not want to be treated differently from Winnipeg.

Mr. BURROWS. This amendment is inserted at the instance of the farmers and for their benefit.

Mr. CONMEE. I did not say who had it put in.

Mr. BURROWS. You said it was done in the interest of the grain men. It is true that grain is put into elevators in Winnipeg without inspection, cleaned, possibly mixed to some extent, and then graded out of the elevator. The object of this amendment, as I understand, is that the farmer shall have the privilege of detaining his car in Winnipeg for twenty-four hours, in order that he may, if possible, sell it on sample, on its intrinsic merits, to get any possible advantage from its being above the average of its grade. I do not think it will be satisfactory to have grain inspection at Port Arthur but that is a matter for the House to decide.

Mr. LAKE. Do the cleaning elevators clean any grain in Winnipeg, except what belongs to the elevator companies ?

Mr. BURROWS. I think not. We want to give the farmer the privilege of selling on sample in Winnipeg before the grain is inspected.

Mr. CONMEE. I was not discussing the detention of the car but subsection 8 which

prohibits the mixing of grain in a public terminal elevator, or an eastern transfer elevator. If it is good legislation for the terminal elevators and the eastern transfer elevators, it should be good legislation at Winnipeg. I would like someone to show me how the farmer is to be benefited by this. It is amazing to me how many men from Winnipeg and its vicinity have a deep affection for the farmer; all this legislation is for his benefit

Mr. OLIVER. The farmer has sent them here.

Mr. CONMEE. Then all I can say is the Lord help the farmer. This is clearly a provision not for the benefit of the farmer but for the benefit of the gentleman who manipulate matters in the grain business in Winnipeg, because it is a provision which is prohibitory against everybody else. I submit that the section should be altered to include all elevators, or at least the Winnipeg and St. Boniface elevators, the terminal elevators and the eastern transfer elevators.

Mr. STAPLES. I would like to ask the minister what were the views of the delegation of the Grain Growers' Association upon that particular point. He was at the conference with them and it is quite obvious that the hon. member for Rainy River has not been.

Mr. CONMEE. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon; I talked it over with them.

Mr. STAPLES. No doubt you did, as I can see by the fight that you are putting up. I rather appreciate the position you are taking now and I have some sympathy with your argument. Whether it would be wise to adopt it or not I am not prepared to say, but it does seem there is a discrimination against the elevators at Port Arthur. I can understand that grain going down by way of the back lane, by way of Morris, coming from county elevators, loading platforms and farmers farms, would not be treated the same as other grain passing through Winnipeg, and the question occurs as to why the shippers of that grain should not have the same privilege at Port Arthur and Fort William as the farmers whose grain goes through the city of Winnipeg. There is some force in the hon. gentleman's argument and I would like an explanation along that line. Whether it would be wise to extend the privilege as far east as Fort William and Port Arthur I am not prepared to say at the present time, not having had the opportunity of considering the question in the same way that the hon. gentlemen opposite have had. What are the views of Mr. McKenzie and Mr. Langley upon that point?

Mr. OLIVER. This subsection that has been specially amended is not proposed to be amended. It is as it comes from the Senate, and as far as I am aware there has been no suggestion on the part of the hon. gentlemen whom my hon. friend (Mr. Staples) has mentioned that there should be any change.

Mr. STAPLES. Is there any objection to the argument that the hon. member for Rainy River has set up?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot say that, but there is no objection to the wording of the subsection as it appears in the Bill other than the objection that my hon. friend from Rainy River makes. There is no doubt that with respect to grain that does not pass through Winnipeg there has to be provision made for the inspection of that grain at Fort William, and there is such a provision, but, unfortunately, my hon. friend thinks the provision for the inspection of that grain at Fort William does not permit of the mixing process being carried on at Fort William, while, as he says, there is a possibility of the mixing process being carried on at Winnipeg, or at any other point farther west. That is true, and, if it is a grievance, that is his grievance. I am not stating any personal opinion on this subject. I am merely stating the facts. Every one knows that every farmer in the west is fully imbued with the idea that he loses, in some way or another, by the improper mixing of grain. He has that idea, whether it is correct or not, and the very purpose of the appointment of this royal commission was to go into the question of the handling of the grain after it left the farmer's wagon, so that some means might be provided that would ensure that the grain went forward in as nearly its identical condition to the ultimate market as possible. That being the case, I am satisfied that the farming interests of the west would look not only doubtfully, but with the very strongest objection, at the proposal that mixing should be recognized at any elevator beyond the point of first inspection, that is at Winnipeg. My hon. friend has said that he would make provision that there might be mixing at Fort William, at Winnipeg and at eastern elevators. I can only say that he is in the same position as the celebrated juryman who remarked, after the verdict had been rendered, that he never sat with eleven such obstinate men. My hon. friend is very definite in his opinion. But the only difficulty is that he holds it, as far as I am aware, absolutely alone, as far as the grain producing element is concerned. He may be right and the rest may be wrong. But I am bound to represent the view of the majority in this case, and the view of the majority is distinctly against any liberty of mixing grain at any point farther east than Winnipeg.

Mr. STAPLES. Has the minister any evidence as to whether or not mixing takes place in these Winnipeg elevators?

Mr. OLIVER. I think it is admitted. I do not think there is any question about it.

Mr. STAPLES. If I may be permitted to mention what another gentleman who is not here said, one of the delegates from the west stated his view to be that mixing should be prevented in Winnipeg just as much as it is attempted to be prevented at Port Arthur and Fort William.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Why not?

Mr. OLIVER. That is another question that I am not prepared to answer at the moment. Let us deal with one thing at a time. I merely point that out to show how far in the minority my hon. friend (Mr. Conmee) is in declaring that mixing ought to be permitted not only at Winnipeg but at Port Arthur and points east.

Mr. STAPLES. If the farmers object to mixing in any case why should they be allowed to mix at Winnipeg, or if they are permitted to mix at Winnipeg, I do not see why they should not be allowed to mix anywhere. There should be the same objection to mixing at Winnipeg as at the terminal and transfer elevators.

Mr. CONMEE. I am not in as hopeless a minority as the minister seems to think. Who were the jury? The jury were the grain buyers at Winnipeg and some of the railway men who are not interested in this matter. There were a couple of farmer delegates here, and I submit that these delegates were of my opinion. I submitted this resolution to one of them and he approved of it—I forget the gentleman's name; he thought it was perfectly correct.

Mr. STAPLES. Was that one of the delegates from Manitoba or Saskatchewan?

Mr. CONMEE. He was from Saskatchewan. I submitted it to another this afternoon and he said: That would mean mixing at the terminal elevators? I said: Yes, that would mean mixing of the regular grades, but it would not mean the mixing of scoured wheat or bleached wheat. He said: I am not in favour of mixing at all. I said: Do you not know that mixing goes on in Winnipeg He said: No. I said: Are you in favour of it at Winnipeg? He said: No. So I claim that the farmers' representatives are with me in this matter. If it is proper to do it at Winnipeg, then it is proper to do it at other places; just do what they do at Winnipeg. That is all I am asking. I am not asking more, and I am not going to be satisfied with less.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The minister has very clearly set out the position of the farmers with regard to mixing. They are under the impression that they are losing by the mixing of grain in the elevators. This provision is placed in the Bill for the purpose of getting away from that condition as far as possible. The farmers expect to extend the same supervision all through the west, and they ask that the prohibition against mixing of grain at Fort William be extended to Winnipeg. The western farmers believe that they or the country are going to own all the elevators in the country and they wish to provide conditions whereby the grain can be sent forward with its particular grade and identity maintained until it reaches the miller. That is the object of the farmer, and he expects to work that out in the future. The great bulk of the grain is inspected at Winnipeg, and once that grain is inspected there should be no interference with it, and the grain should carry its inspection certificate clear through until it reaches the miller. If this amendment be adopted the existing abuses will continue. There may be a little mixing done at Winnipeg, but the great bulk of the grain is sent through in carloads to Fort William. Not five per cent of the wheat of the west that passes through Winnipeg goes into the Winnipeg elevators.

Mr. CONMEE. The hon. gentleman stated that nearly all the grain was graded and inspected at Winnipeg and if that is true it is not graded until it comes out of the elevator.

Mr. STAPLES. Why not inspect it in the elevators; would not that relieve the situation?

Mr. CONMEE. That would relieve the situation. The grain at Winnipeg being inspected out of the elevator it means they have had an opportunity of treating it and mixing it if they want to. I do not believe that any intelligent farmer will believe that my proposal would be detremental to him. If the member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) were here I believe he would endorse my statement that the farmer can keep the identity of his grain and that by mixing the better grades with some of the other grades he can make a car of grain worth $100 more to him. In 90 per cent of the cases the farmer parts with his grain before it reaches Winnipeg. Who gets the benefit of the raising of the grade. By this process you improve the wheat by taking the dirt and small grain out of it and you enhance its value and it is the grain dealer who gets the benefit of that. Whether grain is inspected at Winnipeg or west of Winnipeg it is all reinspected at Port Arthur and Fort William. I agree that you should not change the grade that is given at Winnipeg but Mr. Horne is chief inspector and if there is a difference of opinion he decides. Every day at Port Arthur and Fort William it occurs that they will not grade wheat as it is graded at Winnipeg and the cars are held up until the matter is settled between the inspectors. Unless a certificate of the Winnipeg inspection is surrendered there appears to be no

adequate remedy in the law and it is difficult to determine just what becomes of the grain under those circumstances. There is an inspection at the terminal elevator in every case and that is the only reliable inspection. If your inspection at Winnipeg was reliable why do you inspect it over again at Port Arthur and Fort William. The fact is that the terminal elevator is the only proper place for inspection. My position is that if this mixing is permitted at Winnipeg you should not prevent us from doing the same thing at the terminal elevators. Just prevent it at Winnipeg and you will see how soon there will be a delegation down here wanting you to change the law.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. It is my opinion that we should not have any mixing at all and with that end in view I move to amend the clause so as to make it read :

In no case, whether in a public or private elevator in the Manitoba inspection or in an eastern transfer elevator, shall grain of different grades be mixed together while in store.

I desire by this amendment to prevent this mixing in Winnipeg.

Mr. LAKE. If this amendment prevents the mixing of different grains at Winnipeg I would be in support of it. If a farmer wants to have his grain properly cleaned before inspection he has to sell it to the owner of one of these mixing elevators in Winnipeg which are in private hands. Of course he has the alternative of sending it to an elevator at Fort William but in that case it has to be inspected before it is cleaned.

Mr. CONMEE. And there is no reinspection.

Mr. LAKE. And there is no reinspection after it is cleaned. There are many cases in which the farmer would wish to have his grain properly cleaned and improved before it is inspected but this Bill would compel him to sell it before it is cleaned and therefore it discriminates against the farmer and in favour of the buyer. We have heard something about this all being in the farmer's interest, that the grain should be capable of being cleaned at Winnipeg. That is not so. The grain has to have passed out of the farmer's hands before it goes into the cleaning elevator. For my part I concur in the view of the minister that the great concensus of public opinion in the west is that the wheat should be kept intact after it leaves the farmer's hands and should be inspected and graded just as it is. I certainly do not approve of the mixing that takes place at Winnipeg, and in order to treat all alike and to have no discrimination against any one, I think that all the grain should be inspected and graded before it gets to the mixing elevator either at Winnipeg or at Port Arthur.

Mr. CONMEE.

Mr. CASH. We have to handle this subject pretty carefully, for this reason. I know that the farmers of the west very generally want an order point at Winnipeg ; but if you pass such an amendment as this, you are going to do away with the possibility of an order point. There is no doubt that five-sixths of the grain of the Northwest is mixed in elevators. The elevators have not the capacity necessary for maintaining the identity of any man's grain. There is no doubt also that the grain is inspected in Winnipeg in carload lots. The hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) has the idea that the grain is put in an elevator to be inspected, whereas any western man knows that it is inspected while in the car. The samples are taken from the car and inspected, and the grain passes on to Fort William. I do not know what percentage of that grain is sold in Winnipeg or passes through the elevator there, but a very small per cent. It is unfortunate that the special privilege should be accorded to elevator men in Winnipeg to buy grain and mix it, whereas the same privilege is not accorded at Port Arthur or Fort William. As I understand this business—and I have been at all the conferences except one—there is an elevator man at Port Arthur who makes a specialty of cleaning, drying and scouring grain. The grain is inspected in the elevator and it is inspected out again. The inspector at Winnipeg inspects that grain ; and when it goes into the elevator at Port Arthur it is mixed, so that its identity is not preserved, except so far as it is No. 1 scoured it would go into a bin of No. 1 scoured, and it is inspected out as No 1 scoured, and is sold as that particular grade. Therefore I think it would be most unfortunate to allow the mixing of grain in this elevator. I know that the owner of that elevator thinks that when he scours the grain it is bettter than it was before—better than No. 1 hard. He also thinks that No. 1 damp is better after he has dried it than the other grain which was not damp at all. If that is his opinion, and he mixes the grain, it will have a very unfortunate effect. The main object of the farmers in asking for this legislation is to prevent the mixing of grades and also to have an order point in Winnipeg ; so that if their grain goes above No. 2, though it will not grade No. 1, or if it grades between No. 2 and No. 3, they will get the benefit of the increased value of their grain ; and the only way they can get that is by having an order point at Winnipeg where the grain can be sold on a sample. The buyer in Winnipeg will have the same privilege as the miller from Ontario or the old country of buying that grain. If a dealer buys it, he may mix it in the Winnipeg elevator, because it has not been graded. The farmer is then more likely to get the value of his grain. After the grain is once inspected, no more mixing should be allowed. If you

are going to have an inspection at Fort William, you will require the same force of men there as you have at Winnipeg; it would require a duplication of the entire force. It seems to me that you should have one point for inspection, I do not care whether you make it at Winnipeg or at Fort William.

Mr. LAKE. The hon. gentleman's argument in regard to a sample market at Winnipeg is quite correct after you get to the 15th December; but up to that time the farmer is at his disadvantage as compared with the private grain dealer, that he cannot have his grain mixed and cleaned before inspection, while the private grain dealer can do so in the Winnipeg elevator.

Mr. BURROWS. Because he has not an elevator.

Mr. LAKE. Because the farmer has not an elevator; that is the reason. Now, we have been told that possibly 5 per cent of the grain which passes through Winnipeg goes into the Winnipeg elevators; that is to say, the grain dealers mix the grain together and form a grade which is just as close as possible to the line between the different grades and themselves reap the benefit of that mixing, while the farmer cannot do so. I hold that it is better not to allow any mixing at all. All the grain when it arrives at Winnipeg should be inspected and graded. I am strongly in favour of preventing the mixing of grain at Winnipeg, more especially as we do not permit that to be done at Port Arthur, and in this way are discriminating against the farmer who have to use elevators at Port Arthur and Fort William.

Mr. CONMEE. I would be in favour of grading the grain into its proper class on its merits as they do in Minnesota, but I find I am in a minority. But the Winnipeg elevators have the same machinery as Mr. King has and so have nearly all the elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur. There is no necessity for singling out Mr. King's elevators, because the others have the same machinery, whether they use it to the same extent or not. At Winnipeg they have the facilities for doing everything Mr. King can do at Port Arthur. I have an amendment here which I would like to read because perhaps hon. gentlemen who are supporting the other amendment first moved might possibly prefer this one. If any one will look at the first section of the proposed amendment, it will be seen that it is proposed to change the interpretation clause. In the old Act——

Mr. STAPLES. What does the hon. gentleman mean by the old Act.

Mr. CONMEE. I mean the present law the Manitoba Grain Inspection Act, chapter 83 which we are now amending. The interpretation of clause 8 of that Act provides:

Public terminal elevator includes every elevator located at any point declared by the minister to be a terminal and doing business for compensation, in which grain is stored in bulk or the grain of different owners is mixed together or in which grain is stored in such a manner that the identity of the different lots or parcels cannot be accurately preserved.

A terminal elevator, in the provisions of this Act relating to terminal elevators and warehouses includes a warehouse.

That is changed in the proposed amendment and the reason is obvious. A man might say, mine is not a public elevator, I am handling only my own grain and not grain for compensation, and I have the right to mix when I choose. The minister's amendment reads:

'Public terminal elevator' includes every elevator located at any point declared by the minister to be a terminal, and 'terminal elevator' in the provisions of this Act relating to terminal elevators and warehouses, includes a warehouse.

This takes some ambiguity out of the old section. There was a doubt as to whether the minister could declare an elevator a public elevator, the owner of which would divide it into two, at Winnipeg or elsewhere, and say this half is public and the other half private, and in the private portion I can do as much mixing as I like. The gentlemen controlling elevators at Winnipeg are not subject to the Act. They are not public terminal elevators and are not under the regulations to which the public terminal elevators everywhere else are subject. They may be private elevators or elevators of any other kind, they do not come under the operation of this Act. I propose this amendment which I think will meet the objections of some hon. gentlemen and be perfectly fair:

Provided that all elevators at Winnipeg and St. Boniface in which grain is stored, cleaned or mixed and from which grain is shipped east of the said ports shall be deemed public terminal elevators.

If that be adopted all these Winnipeg elevators that do that kind of business will be on the same footing as other terminals as to the mixing and other conditions. In my opinion mixing is the proper thing. If you clean the grain, you enhance its value. You get a better grain and it realizes more money. The reason the farmers cannot do it is because they have not the machinery. But it is unfair to discriminate against that class of farmers, whose grain is not inspected at Winnipeg, but goes to the terminal elevators for treatment. They ought to have the same privileges that they have in Winnipeg.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I beg to withdraw my motion in favour of that of my hon. friend.

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot accept the amendment. In the first place it is not necessary because at any point declared a terminal by the minister, all elevators are subject to the control of the Act. It is quite competent for the minister to bring into operation all the provisions with regard to the Winnipeg elevators. Therefore this legislation is not necessary. The only difference is that my hon. friend proposes that wherever a terminal point is declared all the elevators shall be public elevators. There is no difference in the authority of the minister to declare any point a terminal.

Mr. STAPLES. This parliament should decide and not leave it to the minister.

Mr. OLIVER. If my hon. friend (Mr. Staples) is correct, then the farmers and everybody interested in the appointment of the Royal Grain Commission were under a mistake. He has argued for the mixing of grain in transit. It may be that he is right and all the rest wrong, but he is on one side and all the rest on the other side. The change he suggests appears to be a dangerous one. There must be mixing of grain in the ordinary commercial handling of the crop, because the farmer cannot ship his individual load of grain all the way to the British market and preserve its identity. Winnipeg is the great converging point for grain in carlots, the grain must be brought together somewhere, and that coming together must take place before the grain reaches Winnipeg or in Winnipeg, as at Winnipeg it receives its final grading. To prevent that grain coming together and constituting grades in Winnipeg would unquestionably be to the detriment of the farmers. To say that there shall be no mixing in Winnipeg is to say that there shall be no dealing on sample in Winnipeg. The whole idea we have gathered from the farmers is that they wish to reap whatever benefit is to be derived from making Winnipeg an order point. In the country elevators there must be mixing, you could not legislate to prevent it.

Mr. STAPLES. I contend that the grain should go out of the Winnipeg elevators on the same grade as it goes in. This sample grain should go forward in carlots the same as other grain.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. The farmers claim it would be a great advantage to have a sample market in Winnipeg.

Mr. STAPLES. I agree.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. Suppose we have a sample market. Then if a farmer has a No. 2 which is nearly a No. 1, he can reap no benefit from it unless the man who purchases it can mix it with other grain and make a No. 1.

Mr. STAPLES. I agree that the establishment of a sample market in Winnipeg or the west would be one of the finest things that could take place.

Mr. SCHAFFNER.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. That is what we are doing.

Mr. STAPLES. But it should be purchased as sample and go forward as sample wheat, not under any particular grade, then it has its intrinsic or commercial value wherever it goes. If you allow it to be mixed and to go out under grade the benefit is a question.

Mr. CONMEE. The point under discussion does not touch the question of sample market. If the Winnipeg elevator operators are permitted to clean and mix grain they and not the farmers would reap the benefit of the enhanced value of that grain due to its cleaning at Winnipeg.

Mr. LAKE. It is thoroughly understood that in order to derive the full benefit from a sample market owners at Winnipeg must be permitted to mix to grade after December 15, but before December 15, I submit there should be no mixing at Winnipeg terminal elevators or anywhere else.

Amendment, Mr. Conmee, negatived.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 19,

Mr. OLIVER. In the printed sheets before the members, there is a proposal to add to this new section 40 the words 'or upon his written order.' I do not know that it is very important, but it has been suggested.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. That is just what I wanted in the previous clause.

Mr. OLIVER. In that case the warehouse man will not make the delivery unless the order is such as will be satisfactory to him. I do not think he needs the same protection.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 22—provision for failure to redeem cash purchase ticket.

Mr. STAPLES. What is the object of that clause ?

Mr. OLIVER. In a transaction between the seller and the purchaser, in case the purchaser of the grain, after giving a ticket to the farmer, is not able to cash the ticket, it gives the farmer a lien upon the grain. If he does not get his money within so many hours he can put his lien upon the grain in the elevator. That is a recommendation of the Royal Grain Commission.

On section 23.

Mr. OLIVER. I desire to move, in addition, that the following penalty clause be inserted :

23a. Section 60 is amended by adding thereto the following subsection:

4. Except in the case of accidental damage to, or the accidental desertion of, any public country elevator in which grain has been accepted for general storage as herein provided,

if the person operating it, when called upon to do so by the owner of the grain, fails to account for the grain in accordance with the terms of the warehouse receipt given under the provisions of this Act or of the further orders of the owner, he shall be deemed guilty of an offence under section 355 of the Criminal Code, and shall be liable to the penalties therein provided, and, in addition, to the forfeiture of his license.

Motion agreed to.

On section 24—storage, special bins; sample to be preserved, &c.

Mr. STAPLES. There will be a good many receptacles required in some of the country elevators.

Mr. OLIVER. This only applies to grain that is special binned, so that there will not be a large number. Of course, there is a suggestion that samples should only be taken on the request of the owner, but there are objections to that. Perhaps it is better to leave it as it is. This is the recommendation of the Grain Commission. I beg to move a penalty clause to the special binning clause as follows:

24a. The said Act is amended by inserting the following section immediately after section 64:

64a. An operator of a country elevator or warehouse who sells, assigns, mortgages, pledges, hypothecates, or in any manner charges any grain stored in the said elevator in special bin in accordance with the provisions of this Act, which is not the sole and absolute property of the said operator, shall be deemed guilty of an offence under section 390 of the Criminal Code, and shall be liable to the penalties therein provided, and, in addition, to the forfeiture of his license.

Mr. STAPLES. It will make the grain merchants sit up.

Mr. OLIVER. These penalty clauses are in the Criminal Code and they do apply to these cases now, but it is thought better to put them in the Act so that everybody will see what his responsibility is.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. What about a sample being a 'fair and proper' sample? It is not very definite.

Mr. OLIVER. It is hard to make it any more definite.

Mr. STAPLES. You could not get a more perfect sample than by taking it out of every load.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. How much?

Mr. STAPLES. About a handful.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. It does not say so.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. OLIVER. I move that subsection 8 of section 30 be stricken from the Bill. It is considered that this subsection would unduly disclose to competitors the private business of grain handlers. The intention of the section is to make the commissioner aware of the conditions under which each elevator operator is handling his business, and subsection 8 requires that every patron of an elevator should be entitled to that same statement. It is believed this would be an undue burden upon the men who are operating elevators, and as the interests of the public are protected by the reports to the commissioner this subsection does not seem necessary.

Amendment agreed, to, and clause 8 stricken from the Bill.

Mr. CONMEE. This subsection only applies to country elevators but if it is good for country elevators it should be better for other elevators. I suggest that the word 'country' be struck out so as to make the section read:—'Public elevators and warehouses.'

Mr. OLIVER. The new section simply amplifies the provision in the existing Act and requires that there shall be a detailed statement. The country elevators are patronized by the farmers of the surrounding country who are not in the same position as business men would be to acquire knowledge of the standing of the men with whom they are doing business, and it was considered that this section would be a protection to them. It is in the line of protection for the man who is doing business with the elevator, and it is not necessary to take the same precaution in the case of the great terminal elevators who are doing business with business people.

On section 31,

Mr. OLIVER. I beg to move that subsection 3 be omitted and the following substituted:

3. In the case of a flag station or siding from which grain is shipped, the commissioner may, in his discretion and for such period or periods as he deems necessary, require the railway company to provide at such flag station or shipping siding a suitable person whose duties shall be:

(a) to keep open for the use of shippers at all times during the day a car-order-book, as provided under this Act, in which orders for cars may be entered in accordance with the provisions of this Act;

(b) when the loading of cars is completed, to seal such car or cars;

(c) to provide shippers with the regular form of grain shipping bill; and

(d) when such grain shipping bill is properly filled out by the shipper, to hand it to the conductor of the train that picks up such car or cars or place it where such conductor may get it.

The purpose of this amendment is to provide for a convenience of shipment at railway sidings where it has not been found necessary by the railway company to establish an agent. It could not reasonably

be required of a railway company that it should establish an agent with telegraph facilities at every siding, and it was thought that if the railway company would engage some person resident at the siding to keep an order book and to allow grain to be put in the cars and to be carried on to a station where the billing would be done, every interest would be served. The railway companies were willing to do that, and as the Bill left the Senate it provided for that. But it was thought that the dates fixed in the Bill might not be satisfactory, and as the railway companies did not object, the amendment was finally agreed to, as it is now proposed—that the railway company will appoint such a person at the order of the warehouse commissioner to act during such time as is necessary, and his duties shall be as defined in the Act. This proposition will certainly be a great convenience to the farmers in the more thinly settled parts of the country. Subsection 4, which makes it possible to limit the operation of subsection 3, is struck out altogether.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Were the representatives of the farmers agreeable to that?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Section 31, as amended, agreed to.

On section 37—equitable distribution of cars.

Mr. LAKE. With regard to 99a under this section, would the amount of grain available for shipment apply only to grain in the elevator ?

Mr. OLIVER. It would apply not only to grain in the elevators but also to the cars ordered. We would be bound to assume that grain was available for shipment when the cars were ordered.

I move to insert the following on page 12, line 26, as section 99c :

99c. Grain in carloads offered for shipment to points in Canada east of Winnipeg may be consigned 'to be held at Winnipeg for orders' en route to its destination on the direct line of transit on the following conditions:

(1) The shipper shall pay to the agent of the transportation company at the point of shipment the sum of $3 per car.

(2) The shipper shall endorse upon the consignment note and shipping receipt 'This car to be held at Winnipeg for orders,' with the name and address of some company, firm or person resident in Winnipeg, who will accept advice from the carrier of its arrival in Winnipeg and who will give to the carrier instructions on behalf of the owner for its disposal.

(3) Twenty-four hours free time after such advice of arrival shall be allowed the advisee in which to dispose of the property.

(4) If the carrier, within twenty-four hours free time referred to in paragraph 3, receives written directions for delivery within its Winnipeg-St. Boniface terminals, such delivery shall be made to team tracks or industrial spurs or sidings within its own terminals upon payment of the current grain rate in effect to Winnipeg or St. Boniface at the time of shipment.

(5) The carrier may, in the absence of written instructions from the advisee for the disposal of the grain within the free time mentioned in paragraph 3, forward the grain to its destination as consigned.

(6) Grain shipped 'to be held at Winnipeg for orders' delivered in Winnipeg or St. Boniface, as provided for in paragraph 4, may be sent forward to any point in Canada east of Winnipeg within six months of its receipt at Winnipeg or St. Boniface at the balance of the through rate from the initial point to destination, as provided in the carrier's authorized tariff in force on the date of the initial shipment, plus one cent per hundred pounds terminal charges, less the $3 per car mentioned in paragraph 1.

(7) The detention of grain at Winnipeg-St. Boniface, under this section, shall not affect the application of the provisions of the Inspection and Sale Act with respect to such grain.

(8) In case of the congestion of traffic caused by the operation of this section, the Board of Railway Commissioners may make an order suspending the operation of this section for the period mentioned in such order.

(9) The provisions of this section shall have effect only from the fifteenth of December in any year to the first day of September in the following year.

Mr. LAKE. When does the inspection take place of this grain which is being held in this way ?

Mr. OLIVER. As it leaves Winnipeg.

Mr. LAKE. Is that provided for ?

Mr. OLIVER. There is no specific provision. The provision with regard to inspection is contained in the Inspection Act. This Act gives no direction to the inspector. It has nothing to do with the inspection, but merely with transportation. Therefore the provision with regard to delays in transportation, and so on, are put into this Act. Under the provisions of the Inspection Act, cars going through without being unloaded are inspected during their necessary detention of a couple of hours at Winnipeg, and grain that has been unloaded in Winnipeg and is being sent east from there is inspected out of the elevator. Grain held there under the ordinary point system would be similarly graded going out.

Mr. CONMEE. As I understand, if the grain stands there for twenty-four hours, samples are taken, an inspection is made but no grade is given and if that grain does not go into a Winnipeg elevator it passes on to the terminal elevators without a grade.

Mr. OLIVER. Oh, no, the detention for twenty-four hours makes no difference in the grading.

Mr. LAKE. The charge of $3 is for demurrage for the day's detention.

Mr. OLIVER. That is a charge for detention with the privilege of unloading in Winnipeg. The order point is a railway question rather than a grain question, and we had to deal with the railway companies. At first the railways objected to this proposal as it would interfere with their business. They now do this in the case of the miller or shipper. They will hold a car in Winnipeg and for unloading and reloading they charge one cent per hundred, that is $6 for a 60,000-pound car. In securing for the farmer the same privilege as is given to the miller we have to make some compensation to the railway and it is arranged that the railway company shall collect one-half the ordinary charge for detention from the farmer, that is $3, and then the other three dollars is to be paid by whoever ships the car out. The farmer has the same privileges and pays the same amount as the miller.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. What provision is there for the shunting of the car?

Mr. OLIVER. If he sells for delivery in Winnipeg, the $3 pays for delivery in any siding or spur there.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. The ordinary charge for that is $5.

Mr. LAKE. Am I correct in understanding that this whole provision was arrived at as a compromise after the conference held by the minister, the Grain Growers' Association and the railway companies during the last few days? If that is so, it is a matter of negotiation and it would be useless for us to discuss the fairness of the proposition.

Mr. OLIVER. When the Bill was before the Senate an amendment was introduced providing for an order point at Winnipeg. The railways and the grain growers asked to meet representatives of the government to discuss this and some other important questions in connection with the Bill before it came to this House. We met and at first the railway companies opposed granting any such privilege as was suggested in the amendment before the Senate, as they said it would be burdensome on them and would interfere with their business, but on further discussion we found that they already accorded this privilege to the milling and shipping interest and they agreed to grant the same privilege on the same terms to the ordinary shipper or the farmer. As a matter of fact the provision was drafted by one of the railway solicitors.

Mr. LAKE. The privilege is practically granted to the millers all through the season.

Mr. BURROWS. That is part of the present traffic arrangement. They stop the grain and mill it.

Mr. LAKE. I merely want to point out that this is giving a limited time to the farmers to take advantage of through rates. I think there should be a sufficiency of cars. If that were the case, this arrangement could be carried out the whole year round.

Mr. CONMEE. This arrangement with the grain shipper and the miller is that, in the case of the mills, the cars are unloaded and go off for another load; in this case they are held for twenty-four hours.

On section 41—loading lines for grain to be marked inside cars.

Mr. OLIVER moved to:

Leave out section 118a and substitute the following therefor:

118a. For the purpose of preserving the identity of grain in transit from Winnipeg to points of consumption in eastern Canada or to ports of export shipment on the sea board, the warehouse commissioner may grant to any shipper permission to lease for such term as is approved by him special bins in such terminal or transfer elevators as are necessarily used in the transportation of grain eastward from Winnipeg for the special binning of grain in transit. The bin capacity which may be so leased in any terminal or transfer elevator shall be as the warehouse commissioner shall approve, but shall not be less than 16,000 bushels in any elevator. The term of the several leases shall be as approved by the warehouse commissioner.

2. The shipper receiving such permission may, subject to its terms, enter into agreement for the lease of special bins in terminal and transfer elevators necessary to the transportation of grain from Winnipeg to the point of destination.

3. The rates to be paid for the lease of such special bins shall be such as are agreed upon: provided that on payment of the regular rate for the full capacity leased for the full term of the lease the shipper acting under the permission of the warehouse commissioner, as in this section provided, shall be given a lease of the bin capacity to which he thereby becomes entitled.

4. Upon the shipper who has secured such permission producing to the warehouse commissioner satisfactory evidence that he holds leases of such special bins in the several terminal or transfer elevators necessary to the transportation of grain from Winnipeg to the point of destination as will enable him to preserve the identity of the grain during its transportation from Winnipeg to the point of destination in not less than 16,000 bushel lots and that such leases are in accordance with the permission already granted, the warehouse commissioner may authorize such shipper to take such means as are necessary or possible within the provisions of this Act and of the Inspection and Sale Act to preserve the identity of grain which he desires to ship through the elevators in which he holds leases of special bins.

5. The warehouse commissioner shall issue such instructions and regulations within the provisions of this Act and of the Inspection and Sale Act as are practicable and necessary for the preservation of the identity of grain which is being shipped by the shipper to whom permission has been given as provided

in this section, using bins specially leased in the several elevators as above provided for the storage and trans-shipment of such grain: provided always that nothing in this section or in such instructions or regulations shall be construed to authorize the placing of grain of different grades in the same special bin in any terminal or transfer elevator.

6. An infraction of any of the instructions or regulations issued by the warehouse commissioner under this section shall be deemed to be an infraction of the provisions of this Act.

7. The provisions of the Inspection and Sale Act shall apply to grain specially binned in transit under the provisions of this section.

8. The provisions of this section shall have effect only from the fifteenth day of December in any year to the first day of September in the following year.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. If it is limited to the period from the 15th December to the 1st of September that about destroys all the good that may be in it.

Mr. STAPLES. The decision is in the hands of the commissioner as to whether special bins shall be allowed or not.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. STAPLES. And only within those dates.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. It is of very little benefit.

Mr. OLIVER. Possibly. Of course, a great many people hold that it will be a very serious detriment.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. But, if the Grain Growers' Association, after consulting with hon. members on the other side, in regard to which we know nothing, are willing to subscribe to such a condition they should not expect members on this side of the House to advocate very enthusiastically what they want. If they want special binning, they want it, but if it is limited to the period from the 15th December to the 1st September it will not be of very much benefit to them.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. The representatives of the farmers are perfectly satisfied to have this from the 15th December to the 1st September, because they know that with the large crops that we expect to have the yards in Winnipeg will be so congested that it will be impossible for them to do any business.

Mr. STAPLES. If the farmers' delegation do not want this privilege—the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jackson) says he has been in conference with them while we are allowed to remain in the dark—I suppose we will have to accept the Bill as it has been prepared. But, from the information I have from the Grain Growers' Association of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, I am satisfied that they do want the privilege of special binning. I think that special binning, if it does not create too great a congestion, is a proper thing.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Do I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jackson) to say that the farmers do not want this special binning privilege ?

Mr. COMMEE. No, he did not say that.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. No, I did not say that.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I understood the hon. gentleman to say so.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. Were you talking with reference to special binning before I came in ?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Yes.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. I did not understand that at all.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I have not received an answer to my question as to whether the members of the Grain Growers' Association of the west are willing to accept this Act as presented now under which the special binning privilege will only prevail from the 15th December in one year to the 1st September in the next year.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The farmers want special binning all the year around, but I think that they are pleased to get the principle approved of. They are willing to accept this for the present as an experiment.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Will the hon. gentleman please tell us how he obtained that information ?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Well, it comes.

Mr. STAPLES. It is in the discretion of the commissioner to say whether the privilege of special binning shall be permitted or not.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. The reason I asked that question was not perhaps the same reason as that which might be taken by hon. members on the other side. I have come to the conclusion, perhaps wrongly, that it is not of very much use for us on this side to protest against this provision, because it has been cut and dried by the minister, the members on the other side of the House and representatives of the farmers. If the farmers had not agreed to this proposition I would have moved an amendment that this privilege of special binning extend over the whole year but, as I believe the representatives of the farmers of the west have agreed to it, there is not very much use of my moving an amendment. If they are satisfied I am.

On section 44—schedule ; new forms.

Mr. STAPLES. I do not see anything in the Bill that provides for the tariff that shall be charged by the interior elevators. The farmers' elevators in Manitoba have

suffered greatly and, in fact, a good many of them have had to go out of business through the competition of the elevator corporations. For example, at my own point, we have a farmers' elevator which has done more towards regulating the market than anything else could possibly have done and which has been the means of the farmers obtaining better prices for their grain than they otherwise would. But it works out in this way: I have known the elevator companies to put their tariffs down and instead of charging 1¾ cents a bushel they have charged 1 cent. That should be regulated in some way so as to prohibit that, because the effect of it is practically to cause the farmers' elevators to go out of business.

Mr. OLIVER. If the hon. gentleman will look at section 111b on page 4 of the sheet which has been distributed he will see that a section has been introduced which is intended to meet the case that he has spoken of. The idea is that the owner of any elevator must make the same charges in all the elevators he owns.

Mr. STAPLES. That is right.

Mr. OLIVER. It is not so right as it looks. Suppose a company has a large number of elevators and, at a certain point, some other company cuts rates, this section provides that the company may cut rates at that point without compelling it to come down at all of its elevators.

Mr. STAPLES. Then it is not as far reaching as I think it should be.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. The farmer will get the benefit and that is what we are working for.

Mr. STAPLES. The farmer will undoubtedly receive the benefit for a time, but the moment the farmers' elevators are crowded out of business, good-day, Mr. Farmer, because they will fix the price as they choose.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. The farmers own the elevator.

Mr. CONMEE. If the farmer is the aggressor and lowers the rate, then the elevator company will lower its rate at that one point also; but if the elevator company is the aggressor and lowers the rate, it will have to lower it at all other points. I think the farmer is well protected in that case.

Mr. STAPLES. It is all right if the farmer is well protected.

Mr. OLIVER. I move to repeal paragraph (h) of section 2, and to substitute the following:

'Public terminal elevator' includes every elevator located at any point declared by the minister to be a terminal, and 'terminal elevator' in the provisions of this Act relating to terminal elevators and warehouses includes a warehouse.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. STAPLES. Before this Bill comes up for third reading it should be reprinted.

Mr. OLIVER. I will move that the committee report progress and ask leave to sit again, and in the meantime I will try to have the Bill reprinted with the amendments agreed to placed in their proper order. This will enable the Bill to come up for reconsideration with the Grain Inspection Act alongside of it, so that we can see whether there is any clash between the two.

Mr. LAKE. The opposition should have a day's notice of when this Bill will again be taken in committee. It has been brought down so late in the session that, with the long hours we have to work, it has been impossible for us to give it the consideration it should have received. Again, the amendments were only brought down within the last day or so, and the members of the opposition have not had the same advantages as the members of the government side have had in consultation with the officials of the government and with the representatives of the railway companies. There is no doubt in my mind the Bill is a step in the right direction, but it does not go nearly as far as I think it should. There is the further objection that the Bill was sprung upon us to-day, for we were told last night that other Bills would be taken up, and hence we were not prepared for it. The Bill was introduced in the Senate, which is supposed to have plenty of time on its hands, and it only came to this House within a week of prorogation. The responsibility of it must rest upon the government, for the members of the opposition have not had a proper opportunity to make a thorough examination of its various provisions and to discuss them.

Progress reported.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 203) to amend the Grain Inspection Act.—Mr. Oliver.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 192) to incorporate the Alberta and British Columbia Railway Company—Mr. Herron.

Bill (No. 195) respecting the Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Railway Company.—Mr. Zimmerman.

Bill (No. 185) respecting the Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Company.—Mr. Johnston.

BOUNTY TO SOUTH AFRICAN VOLUNTEERS.

Bill (No. 109) to authorize a bounty to volunteers who served the Crown in South Africa—Mr. Oliver—read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 2—application of Act.

Mr. OLIVER. I desire to move that the following be substituted for this section:

This Act shall apply to all officers and men who served in South Africa with any corps raised in Canada during any of the years 1899, 1900, 1901 and 1902, and who at the time of their appointment to or enlistment in such corps or any corps so raised were resident or domiciled in any part of Canada.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You have a resolution on the Order Paper designed for the purpose of permitting the amendment now suggested by the minister. The usual course is to move the resolution first. Its object is to meet certain objections raised on this side to the effect that the Bill did not include but should include persons now proposed to be included.

Mr. FIELDING. The resolution should certainly be moved first.

Progress reported.

House went into committee to consider the following resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to provide in connection with the Bill now before this House, intituled: 'An Act to authorize a bounty to volunteers who served the Crown in South Africa,' that it shall apply to all volunteers who resided or were domiciled in Canada at the time of their enlistment for military service in South Africa; that, in the event of a volunteer's death between the date of his enlistment and December 31, 1910, the proposed grant of land may be made to his legal representatives; and that any person entitled to choose scrip in lieu of land may give notice of his choice before December 31, 1910.—Mr. Oliver.

Mr. SPROULE. Might I ask if this will apply as well to the South African Constabulary which went to South Africa from Canada?

Mr. OLIVER. That is the intention.

Mr. KNOWLES. Would it apply to Canadians who enlisted in South Africa itself?

Mr. OLIVER. No, it does not apply to any who did not enlist in Canada.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It applies to volunteers who resided or were domiciled in Canada at the time of their enlistment.

Mr. LAKE.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. There is another point. There are hundreds of good Canadians who went to South Africa and joined different corps there, such as the Roberts Horse, and I would respectfully point out that these men are all omitted. Their career can be traced just as well as the career of those who enlisted in Canada. Take my own case, I was not a member of any corps that left Canada. I did not enlist in any corps in Canada.

Mr. DANIEL. This resolution refers only to volunteers who enlisted for military service. That means enlisted men and does not include commissioned officers.

Mr. OLIVER. The amendment which I have placed in the hands of the chairman provides for that.

Mr. HERRON. I would like to know if the Northwest Mounted Police are to be included. They were excluded in some way from participating in the benefits that accrued to volunteers who took part in the Northwest rebellion of 1885, and I believe that was due to some misapprehension or misunderstanding. I always think they were entitled to recognition in the shape of lands, medals or other honours which went to men who served in the Northwest Rebellion.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. They got the medals but never got the land.

Mr. HERRON. I want to know if the members of the Northwest Mounted Police who enlisted in South Africa will be included.

Mr. OLIVER. They will.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister is going to propose an amendment which differs in terms from the resolution. The very reason which makes this resolution necessary would prevent that amendment from taking effect. Your resolution should be in exact conformity with the terms of the proposed amendment.

Mr. OLIVER. The resolution simply states the principle, and as long as the amendment does not go outside that principle, I imagine it is in order.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I thought the hon. gentleman said it did go outside.

Mr. OLIVER. Not outside the principle of the resolution.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What do you mean by the principle?

Mr. OLIVER. The question raised was whether officers would be included. I submit that when we speak of volunteers who served the Crown in South Africa, that includes officers.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That may be, but I certainly understood from the hon. gentleman's answer to my hon. friend from St.

John (Mr. Daniel), that there was something not included in this resolution which would be included in the amendment.

Mr. OLIVER. There was something contained in the second clause of the Bill that did not cover the point raised by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Daniel), but the amendment I intend proposing does and it comes within the terms of the resolution.

Mr. CROCKET. Does the amendment cover all the cases provided by the resolution? I understood from my hon. friend from Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes) that it did not.

Mr. OLIVER. Perhaps not. It may not cover all the cases which the resolution would cover, but it certainly is covered by the resolution.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The amendment can be smaller than the resolution but not larger.

Mr. STAPLES. I have had several communications from the pioneers and a petition from the association of western pioneers asking for a land grant. Mr. Isaac Cowie, the secretary of the association, has written me quite a long letter, according to which they appear to have a very just claim; and I think that while this South African Land Bill is being considered, the western pioneers should have their interests considered and some land grant made to them. I might read the letter which accompanies the petition:

The letter is as follows:

Re old settlers' claims.

I am directed by the petitioners, for whom I am acting, to inclose for your information a reprint, from the Manitoba 'Free Press' of this date, of the petition of the western pioneers, with a full list of signatures, amongst which you will find many respected names, and probably a few of your own constituents. There are probably three hundred other claims not represented by signatures—some of the persons to whom the circulation of the petitions was entrusted having failed to attend to the matter.

You are respectfully urged to give this matter your best personal attention, and to see that the petition be not only received by but also acted upon by the House of Commons, whose proceedings will be keenly watched in this respect by the parties interested.

The claims of the original white settlers and pioneers, who probably conferred more benefit upon the land of their adoption than any other of its pre-confederation inhabitants, are the only ones which have not long ago received the attention—if troublesome the double attention—of the government. And we now wish to strongly emphasize the concluding paragraph of the petition, praying for the prompt settlement of a claim held in abeyance for the last thirty-eight years by the present parliament.

I have brought this matter before the House after waiting in the hope that these people might be dealt with, but I think they are entitled to some consideration.

Mr. OLIVER. The subject of this petition is not connected with the subject of this Bill. It is, of course, a matter that can be dealt with in due course.

Mr. STAPLES. Is it the intention to deal with this petition in any form this session?

Mr. OLIVER. I am afraid it is rather late to deal with it this session.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. Would it not be possible to include the men who fought in the Fenian Raid? They fought to defend our own land, and are as much entitled to consideration as the men who went abroad to fight.

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. I wish to support this suggestion. It would be highly appreciated by the veterans who went to the front at the time of the Fenian Raid, and I would be very much pleased if the government would see their way clear to include them in this grant. They did as much to deserve recognition as any, and there are many of them in Quebec as well as Ontario. I do not think the government would make any mistake in including them.

Mr. FOWLER. As we are proposing to include all the veterans, I would suggest that the survivors of the Aristook war, who have not been spoken of, should be included, also the veterans of the rebellion of 1837.

Mr. BENNETT. And the survivors of the local elections in New Brunswick.

Resolution reported, read the first and second time and agreed to, and the House went into committee on Bill (No. 109) to authorize a bounty to volunteers who served the Crown in South Africa.—Mr. Oliver.

On section 2,

Mr. OLIVER moved:

That the following clause be substituted for clause 2:

This Act shall apply to all officers, non-commissioned officers and men who served in South Africa with any corps raised in Canada during any of the years 1899, 1900, 1901 and 1902, and who at the time of their appointment to or enlistment in such corps or any corps so raised were resident or domiciled in any part of Canada.

Mr. J. D. REID. Would this include such a case as was suggested by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes), that of a Canadian who happened to be in London at the time who went direct to South Africa and returned to Canada?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. For instance, I know several men who lived in the Yukon and who could not get into the first corps and went to Africa on their own account.

Take Colonel Hamilton Merritt, of Toronto: Charlie Ross, the scout——

An hon. MEMBER. And Sam. Hughes.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Yes, and Sam. Hughes. These men went to South Africa, and I think those three officers, 'although I say so, as shouldn't,' probably reflected as much credit on Canada as many others. But they are only instances of hundreds, possibly thousands, who went under similar auspices, who returned to this country and who represented Canada in South Africa to the best of their ability. I would suggest it might read:

This Act shall apply to all officers, non-commissioned officers and men who served in the South African field forces during any of the years 1899, 1900, 1901 and 1902, who at the time of their appointment or enlistment in such field forces were resident or domiciled in any part of Canada.

Mr. HERRON. I would refer to a case in my district where a man who had resided there twenty or twenty-five years telegraphed for permission to enlist in the Duke of Cambridge's Own. In that corps a man had to pay for his uniform, horse, accoutrements and everything but his rifle, and put $500 in the treasury before he would be permitted to join. This man left my county and went over and joined the Duke of Cambridge's Own corps, served throughout the war, and is living in that country to-day. I think it would be very hard if he is going to be excluded from this small grant.

Mr. J. D. REID. Would the amendment of my hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes) cover such a case as I have instanced?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not think it would, because the amendment speaks of their being being domiciled in Canada at the time of their appointment or enlistment, resident or domiciled in Canada.

Mr. J. D. REID. In case a young man happened to be in England at the time, if he was over 21 years of age, his home would be wherever he was at the particular time he enlisted. Therefore, if he were then in England he could not take an affidavit that at the time he was domiciled in Canada as his home.

Mr. STANFIELD. I would ask the minister about this case: A young man going to school in England at the time the war broke out was a native of my own county, and he went out and served with considerable distinction. Since then he has returned to his native town. Would this Bill cover his case?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think there can be no doubt whatever that in the case the hon. gentleman has just mentioned, his domicile is Canada, because he was only going to school temporarily. Therefore, if he was entitled in other respects, there could be no question as far as his domicile is concerned.

Mr. FOWLER. But if he did not join a corps raised in Canada?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The amendment suggested by the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes) would cover his case. I do not understand that the Minister of the Interior objects to a clause which will cover all Canadians who served in South Africa.

Mr. OLIVER. I have an open mind on the subject.

Mr. DANIEL. Would the Minister of Militia say whether the amendment would cover those who served in the field forces in a military capacity in any corps? Because there are other forces, perhaps they are not called field forces, that might not come under that designation. For instance, would the medical department come under that designation, would the army service department and various other departments of the army—would they come under the designation of field forces? If they would, then I have nothing more to say; but if they do not, I think we should be careful in adopting the amendment of the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton without knowing exactly what we mean.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They are all serving, are they not?

Mr. DANIEL. It is a technical term, and perhaps the Minister of Militia will be able to elucidate it.

Mr. BEATTIE. Any Canadian, if his name is on the roll, should be entitled to a land grant. The fact of his name being on the roll should be a guarantee that he has served with a Canadian corps and is entitled to the land grant, no matter where he came from. I do not think you should shut him out.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Certainly not.

Mr. HERRON. A man whom I know enlisted and started out in charge of horses. After they had started on their journey he met with an injury and was invalided by the doctors of the corps. Unfortunately his injury did not permit him to go to South Africa. Does the minister think he would come in under this Bill?

Mr. OLIVER. I am anxious to know just how far the House would like to have this privilege extend. We are anxious of course to meet the views of the House. I think myself that we should deal liberally with those who sacrificed their time and risked their lives in the cause of the empire in South Africa. We do not wish to give any restricted privilege for the sake

of restriction, but what we must do is to put a proposition before the House that can be carried out in a practical way, so as to include what we wish to include and exclude those we do not want to include. I do not think it is possible to frame a Bill that will absolutely meet every case. No such legislation has ever yet been devised, and I do not think we can devise such legislation to-day. After I have heard from the House just how far they wish this privilege to go, I will do my best to put their views in concrete form.

Mr. FOWLER. I understand that some of the later contingents did not take any part in active hostilities in South Africa. I think there was one lot who just reached there after the war was concluded. I do not know whether they landed even. Would they be included?

Mr. OLIVER. I am afraid the amendment of my hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton would exclude those.

Mr. FOWLER. I thought so. That amendment seems more restrictive than the Bill.

Mr. OLIVER. I am afraid it is.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It is not intended to be.

Mr. OLIVER. We all want to do what is right and fair by the men who served the empire, as these men did, or who intended to serve. I want to know just how far we can go. From the expressions I have heard here to-night it would not be possible to draft a section that would cover all the cases that have been brought forward, that is, it would not safely cover them. It is best to decide how far we want to go, and then give time to draft a section to cover the points.

Mr. LANCASTER. I think the suggestion of the hon. member for London (Mr. Beattie) is a good one, that is, to take those who have signed the roll of any Canadian contingent.

Mr. FOWLER. That would shut out such a case as the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton mentions.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That would shut out any superior officer.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the committee is disposed to accept the suggestion that all persons domiciled in Canada who served in the South African war should come within the provisions of this Bill, it is not a difficult matter to alter the amendment so as to cover them. If it is desired that any person resident or domiciled in Canada who served in South Africa in a British field force——

Mr. LANCASTER. Or who enlisted for such service.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am dealing with the one thing at a time. That can be added afterwards.

Mr. OLIVER. As suggested by the hon. member for Kings and Albert, that might cut out those who enlisted and who arrived in South Africa just after the close of the war, but who are entitled to consideration.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is not difficult to add that:

Or who were appointed to or enlisted in any corps raised in Canada during any of the several years for service in South Africa.

Mr. OLIVER. Then my hon. friend cuts out those Canadians who enlisted in corps that were not raised in Canada.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No, I have covered that case by the first amendment, and I have covered the other case by the second amendment. If you ask that any other case be provided for, I will cover that by a few more words.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I think it will be admitted that the wise policy is to give recognition to Canadians who went to South Africa in Canadian forces. It does not seem to me that it is wise to extend this privilege beyond the men who went out in Canadian regiments. I think this right of recognition should not depend upon whether these men actually went into battle or served in any particular engagement, but that those who left the shores of Canada to go to South Africa to fight and were prepared to fight if necessary, should receive recognition. If you take the case of men who chose to go over to England and enlisted in English regiments you are dealing with men who did not go as Canadians, and I therefore think that this recognition should be confined to those who went and served as Canadians.

Mr. STANFIELD. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to correct him?

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I was not referring to the case mentioned by my hon. friend from Colchester (Mr. Stanfield), but the case mentioned by my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Herron)—the case of a man living in the Northwest who went over and enlisted in an English regiment.

Mr. HERRON. At the time this man cabled to England for permission to join the forces he did not know that we were going to send troops from Canada.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. If you deal with cases of that kind, you will have all kinds of excuses which no department could follow up in order to arrive at a proper basis for determining who should be entitled to this grant. There may be cases of officers who served with distinction who being Canadians served in the

Imperial forces and who are deserving of recognition, and those can be dealt with separately. But if we are dealing with non-commissioned officers and men, I think this country would only be disposed to give recognition to Canadians who went as members of Canadian forces.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Take three cases that I have in mind; one was that of Charlie Ross, of the Northwest Mounted Police, the scout, and the man who won the battle at Cut Knife Hill in 1885. Charlie Ross went to South Africa and did splendid service. But the particular cases that I have in mind are those of two young men in Toronto—Wasson and Jackson. These two men could not get into the first corps. They were away earning their living and not within reach of their regiments. They started back to the regimental headquarters, but when they arrived the corps were filled. They went to South Africa in a hay ship. I could give the name of another young fellow, Charley Graham, from my own town of Lindsay who also went out in a hay ship. They joined Roberts' forces, and by their conduct reflected credit on the name of Canada. Yet these men would be excluded under this resolution.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Where are you going to draw the line?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Any Canadian who served in any corps in South Africa. Take the case of Colonel Hamilton Merritt, of Toronto; he served on General Brabant's staff.

An hon. MEMBER. You are included.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Certainly. I could not go to South Africa because of the tyranny of an English general who was serving under the Canadian government.

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. I would like to ask the minister if a man availing himself of his privilege and locating on land would be entitled to a homestead and to a pre-emption also?

Mr. OLIVER. The provisions of this Bill admit of a volunteer or his assignee getting the full benefit of the Act whether he has already a homestead or not.

Mr. HERRON. Or whether he is going to get one?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes; it is precisely the same thing.

Mr. FOWLER. You are going to allow a man to have a homestead in addition to this?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. And a pre-emption, too?

Mr. OLIVER. If he takes it in a pre-emption area.

Mr. FOWLER. You will give him a whole square mile of land? He will be glad to see another war break out.

Mr. HERRON. I have given notice of an amendment to this motion. The minister has made some change in it, but I have something to add when the time comes.

Mr. OLIVER. I think we had better allow clause 2 of the resolution to stand and proceed with the Bill. We can have an opportunity to redraft clause 2.

Section 2 allowed to stand.

On section 3—grants of land authorized.

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to move an amendment to that section as follows:

That the word 'volunteer,' in the first line of clause 3, be struck out and that the following words be substituted therefor: 'officer, non-commissioned officer or man, or in the event of his death, between the date of his enlistment or appointment and December 31, 1910, to his legal representative.'

Mr. STAPLES. What will be the necessary procedure for a widow to take in order to get this land grant?

Mr. OLIVER. She would simply have to establish her identity and the rights of her husband before the Militia Department.

Mr. HERRON. Before that section carries, I have given notice of an amendment to this clause, and I think it is necessary to put it in here. I propose that clause 3 be amended by inserting after the word 'volunteer' the words 'legal representative,' by striking out the word 'adjoining' as it appears in the second line, and by providing that it shall apply to odd and even numbered sections all over the country. The Land Bill we have just passed may possibly have a bearing on clause 3.

Mr. OLIVER. Under this provision and under the Land Bill the volunteer may take his land anywhere on the odd or even-numbered sections or on adjoining odd or even sections, but it does not provide for him taking them up except they do adjoin.

Mr. HERRON. The South African veterans are generally residents in portions of the country that are well settled, and if a man could get a quarter-section in his locality, even though it did not adjoin his own quarter-section, it would be far better to let him have it than to compel him to move 100 miles away.

Mr. J. D. REID. I cannot see why the nurses who accompanied the physicians to South Africa should not get a land grant. Does this clause include the chaplains?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. If they were enlisted it would.

Mr. J. D. REID. The minister should take into consideration the question of including the nurses.

Mr. HERRON. I would move that section 3 be amended by striking out the word 'adjoining.' I believe the word 'adjoining' will work very great hardship in the cases I have referred to. I do not see what difference it makes to the country whether the South African veteran gets his quarter-section adjoining his own, or whether he gets it some other place in the neighbourhood.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is legislating for an exceptional case instead of for a general one.

Mr. HERRON. It is so general that it will apply to more than half the volunteers who are residents of that country.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. If the hon. gentleman from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) was at all familiar with the conditions in the Northwest he would understand that it is very difficult to get quarter-sections adjoining each other. The Bill now practically amounts to nothing, so far as a number of young men residents of Alberta and Saskatchewan who went to South Africa are concerned.

Mr. OLIVER. If the opinion of the House is that the Bill amounts to nothing there are many people in the country who would much prefer to see the Bill withdrawn.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. I am certainly not of the opinion that the Bill should be withdrawn. On the contrary, I have advocated in this House for several sessions the granting of land to the South African volunteers of Alberta and Saskatchewan. I am not speaking of the men who enlisted from other provinces and who received grants from Ontario and British Columbia, but I do think some provision should be made to set aside a grant of land to the young men who went to South Africa from the western provinces. What I want to point out to the minister is that if a man takes up a quarter-section under this Act he has to comply with the regulations of the homestead law, and while that may be well enough for a farmer or a rancher who wants to get more land, still there are many young men in the cities, towns, and villages who cannot leave their business, and the only benefit of this Act to them is that that they will get scrip for $160, which if they can sell for $80 they will be lucky. I have protests from this class of veterans and at the proper stage I shall move amendments to the Bill. That is what I intended to convey when I said that the grant to this class of young men in Alberta and Saskatchewan has been practically whittled down to nothing.

Mr. TURRIFF. I do not see why a South African veteran should be allowed to locate on two separated quarter-sections any more than you should allow a homesteader who has the privilege of taking out a pre-emption to do so. There will be millions of acres of land available for the South African veterans, and I do not think there is any hardship whatever if they have to locate on quarter-sections adjoining. Let me point out to my hon. friend (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) that if the veteran does not want to live on the land and earn the patent by performing homestead duties, it is not necessary for him to take $160 in scrip. He can take his warrant which he has the privilege of selling and his assignee has the privilege of locating on two quarter-sections and performing the homestead duties and having the patent issued in his own name. I believe the warrant will be worth more to him than a separate patent for a quarter-section.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Suppose a volunteer does not want to take 320 acres and go and farm it, but prefers to take the 160 acres, what title would he have to the 160 acres? Would he get scrip for it?

Mr. OLIVER. He has the chance of taking 320 acres as a homestead, or the chance of assigning his right to another person who will fulfil the duties on the 320 acres; the effect of which is, as my hon. friend from East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) has said, to give him a free patent for 160 acres, or scrip to the amount of $160, which is receivable at its face value in payment for Dominion lands.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. How would the assignment be equal to 160 acres?

Mr. OLIVER. In this way, that whoever he assigns to gets 320 acres for fulfilling the duties that are required of a homesteader on 160 acres.

Amendment of Mr. Herron negatived.

On section 4—conditions.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not think you should allow a substitute. I think there should be just two alternatives; either give the man a grant if he wants to go to the land himself, or give him the scrip if he does not want to go on the land. But do not allow a substitute to take up the land, because the result will be that these rights will be sold for a trifle, especially by many eastern men, to some person who has never been in South Africa, but who will reap all the benefits barring the few dollars he pays for the right. If the volunteer himself wants to go on the land and fulfil the conditions, let him have the 320 acres. If not, let him take the $160 of scrip which he can use as he likes.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Suppose a man entitled to the 320 acres could not conveniently go on the land himself, could he place somebody else there to do the work for him?

Mr. OLIVER. Not unless he assigns his rights to that other person.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Suppose he had a brother who would do the work on it?

Mr. OLIVER. That is a matter that he and his brother would have to arrange between them; but he would have to assign his rights to his brother. It seems to me that the opportunity given in the section as it stands is all that can reasonably be asked.

Mr. G. H. McINTYRE. I presume that the general purpose under this Bill is to reward Canadians who have served the empire in South Africa; but in addition to that you desire if possible to get these good Canadians to settle in the Northwest, for various reasons that will suggest themselves. A young man who is sufficiently loyal to risk his life in South Africa is a pretty good kind of man to mix with certain elements that will go into that country. Therefore it is desirable to do everything in our power to get that young man to go out there and settle; but the idea of a substitute does not appear to fulfil the purpose of the Bill, and I agree with the hon. member for Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler) that if he will not go out and take up the land and become a settler, we would do well to drop the provision for a substitute and let him accept the scrip.

Mr. THOS. CHISHOLM. Could the minister not arrange to diminish the number of months the veteran is required to remain on land? A man who has served his country for three years in South Africa in such an arduous way should not, I think, be bound to remain so long on the land. I think it would be sufficient to require him to remain three months on the land to do his settlement duties. I am in favour of seeing that the settlement duties are effectually done. It will not do to allow the land to lie vacant, and if necessary he could make up for the diminished time the veteran would have to be on the land by doing an extra amount of settlement duties. A good many veterans might remain three months on the land, but could not conveniently stay the whole summer. It would make very little difference to the country so long as the settlement duties were thoroughly done. These veterans should certainly get some advantage in this respect. And the time limit should not be so strictly enforced against them, considering the time they have already served their King and country.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am very glad that the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Chisholm) has brought up that point. I might draw the minister's attention to the American regulations at the close of the Cuban and Philippine war. The volunteers on their return were each handed their scrip, and the time they had served in the campaign was counted in their homestead duties.

Mr. FOWLER. I believe in being generous to the young men who went out to South Africa to fight the battles of the empire, and I think the provisions of this Bill are very generous. Under it, as I understand, a South African veteran can take up 320 acres of land as a veteran; he can then take 160 acres more as an ordinary homesteader, which gives him 480 acres; then by paying $480 he can pre-empt another 160 acres, which gives him 640 acres, or a mile square, for the small sum of $480. I think we are dealing pretty generously with these South African veterans without letting up at all on the homestead conditions. It would be much better for you to give a cash bonus to the veteran than permit him to sell his rights to some person and thus let some one who never made any sacrifice whatever get all the benefit. The provisions of the Bill are quite broad and generous enough and you should strike out the substitute.

Mr. BARR. I presume that the object is to recognize the services of the volunteers who went to South Africa, and I do not think this recognition would be of much value to them if they could not hold their land by engaging others to do the settlement duties. There are many of the volunteers engaged in other business besides farming, and this grant would be of no advantage to them if they were not allowed to provide a substitute. I think this Bill is not too liberal and that you might go a little further. No doubt many of these volunteers would appreciate very much having a farm of 160 acres, and if they could, without giving up their business, go out there and work a short time on the land or engage others to break it up for farming, they would hold it for all time to come and hand it down to their children as a memento of the services they had performed. I think they should be given the advantage of holding their land without having to give up their business connection in other parts of the country. Those Canadians who went to South Africa made their mark there; they won several battles, and to a certain extent taught the British soldiers how to fight and how to manage without exposing themselves unnecessarily, as British soldiers were accustomed to do. In fact, they introduced a new life into the army of that country. It is a pity this Bill does not deal with them more liberally by enabling them to hold their land without breaking up their business.

Mr. FOWLER. I would like to hear an expression of opinion from the minister with regard to this question. We know what has been the fate of this scrip in the past. Scrip speculators went over the country and bought the scrip for a mere song and many made large fortunes out of it. In like manner fortunes will be made, though in a smaller degree, by men who have no title to any recognition. Take this land a mile square to-day, that is worth $3,000 or $4,000, and you are giving it for

the price value of the scrip. In a few years it will be worth $25,000 to $30,000.

Mr. TURRIFF. I do not think the question of a man's right to homestead and preemption need be mixed up with this at all. You are giving a veteran something for his work in South Africa. If he has had a homestead, he cannot get another. If he has not you cannot, when giving him something you say he is entitled to, cut him out of his right to a homestead. As regards the cutting down of the settlement duties, that would be most unsatisfactory. You are giving a half-section, half a mile wide by a mile long, to a South African veteran, and he has to do the necessary homestead duties and six months residence each year for three years. It would be most unsatisfactory to other settlers in the vicinity if he could earn his patent by doing less homestead duties—if, for instance, he could earn it by a three months' residence or less, or by doing the cultivation duties instead of residence. I agree with the hon. member for Kings (Mr. Fowler) that they are being dealt with liberally. They are being given half a section instead of the quarter-section, which was what most of them expected, and I do not think we are asking too much if we ask that they should perform the necessary homestead conditions. Then as regards doing away with the right to substitute; a substitute may be just as good a settler, and that is one of the chief objects the government has in view, namely, that in giving this land to the South African veterans you ensure that the land will be occupied, cultivated and settled upon.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What the hon. member for Kings (Mr. Fowler) said about the scrip holder in days gone by selling his scrip is absolutely true, because very few people could be induced in those days to go and settle in the Northwest, but it is entirely different to-day. I know hundreds of boys who are just waiting for this scrip to go up and settle in the country. Many no doubt will sell their scrip, but there are scores who will go there and settle.

Mr. FOWLER. My suggestion will not apply to them.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The young fellows in the towns who cannot afford to go out should not be discriminated against.

Mr. HERRON. There should be a distinction between a man who is a resident and a man who has never been in that country. Partially the object of giving this land is to promote the settlement of the Northwest, and I think that a man who has not been there, either before, during or since the war, should be asked to go and reside there either on his land or at least in the country.

Mr. BEATTIE. The best plan to adopt is to compel the volunteer to settle on the land or take his scrip. Otherwise you will have the land sold and held vacant by speculators for many years to come. In the case of scrip given after the Riel rebellion not one in a hundred of those who were entitled to it and received it settled on the land. The scrip was sold as low as $10 to $15. I tried to sell mine and all I was offered for it was $15. The hon. member for Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes) says he knows of hundreds of boys who will go out and settle on the land. Well, that is the best argument we can have for making them settle on it or take their scrip.

Mr. BARR. The Ontario government have dealt more generously with the veterans in that province, they have exempted the land granted to them from taxation, except for school purposes, for ten years, and if the grantees do not settle on the land the government buys it back, sometimes of course for a small amount, $50 or $100. I do not think that this government would be wise in following their example and exempting the lands in the west from settlement duties. Even in New Ontario that retarded settement to such an extent that the Ontario government would probably not do it again.

Mr. FOWLER. There was some reason for the Ontario government granting this exemption from duties as they valued the land at only $50.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I do not think we should make the restrictions so very onerous. The idea in my mind is that these volunteers should be induced to settle there but you must not place too many restrictions on their mode of settlement. I have heard it suggested, and I think it is a good idea, that the nurses and chaplains who attended to the spiritual wants of the volunteers should have land as well, but I do not see how you could force these to live for six months on the land. If you make the conditions very onerous you force the grantees to take scrip, and we know that in the past many people have made it a trade to go to the west and deal in scrip. In many cases the grantees would sell their lands for very small amounts. I would again urge consideration for the chaplains and nurses, those who went there in any capacity to serve their country in the hour of need. Their action gave Canada more standing in history than perhaps any other event in the last twenty years. It will redound to the credit of this parliament to deal very generously with those volunteers. If I had my will about it I would do away with the scrip altogether. I do not think it is a fair or a good way to do the business. Some system of permitting substitutes to take the land might be adopted. I have heard this evening of a man who is ready to sell his claim for $25 and I have no doubt that some men will be ready to buy scrip at that rate.

Mr. BLAIN. As reference has been made to the Ontario Act I may quote from it:

Any person who was resident in the province and who went from the province to South Africa, to act as chaplain or nurse or Red Cross commissioner or a newspaper correspondent during the said war or any period thereof——

These classes are allowed land under the Ontario Act. I think this is an example that might worthily be followed in the passage of this Bill.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. Reverting to clause 2, I know a young man, Mr. Muckle, who happened to be visiting in New Zealand when the war broke out. He volunteered in the New Zealand contingent, fought through the war and immediately returned to his birthplace in Manitoba and resides there.

Mr. CONMEE. There is a similar case in Port Arthur of a young man named Gillis who was in South Africa and volunteered there.

Mr. HERRON. I wish to offer an amendment to clause 4 beginning at the sixth line. I move:

That clause 4 be amended by adding thereto the words: But this section shall not apply, in so far as residence and cultivation are required, to persons incapacitated as mentioned in section 2 thereof.

The effect of this amendment is that persons incapacitated in the war may get their land without settlement duties. There are a few special cases known to every member in this House. There are a few men in my own county and if they were explained to the committee I am sure the committee would have no hesitation in adopting this amendment. There are not more than ten or twelve such cases in Canada.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Can a person entitled to this land assign it to any other person who must perform the duties, or would the man purchasing scrip be considered a grantee?

Mr. HENDERSON. With regard to scrip, we must all admit that in by-gone years there was a great deal of improper handling of scrip. It was no doubt bought up at very low prices, sometimes for a mere song. People there made it a business to gather up large quantities of this scrip, and buy large tracts of land with it, notably, I understand, the Saskatchewan Land Valley Company, in the purchase of 250,000 acres used a large amount of scrip. I do not think it is right that any person outside the volunteers themselves should get any advantage out of that scrip. The minister should so arrange the law that no person would be allowed to apply that scrip in the purchase of land unless he is prepared to make an affidavit that he paid the full $160 for it. I do not believe in these speculators in scrip being allowed to gather it up at a mere nominal price, and then come to the government and purchase land with it, dollar for dollar.

Mr. TURRIFF. That cash scrip at the present time would have a market value of between 90 and 95 per cent, so any one that took scrip good for the payment of $160 for Dominion lands, would be able to sell it for about $150. There is a good demand for the scrip on the part of those who have payments to make to the Dominion government, so any one who took that scrip would be sure to get close to $150 in cash for it. Of course, you can make a regulation that the purchaser must pay the full $160, but if you do there will be no sale for the scrip, because if any one had $160 to pay to the government, unless he could make five, six or seven per cent on the scrip, he would not bother buying it but pay cash instead. But there is so little of that class of scrip to be had, that he would not be sure of getting over 90 per cent for its face value.

Mr. BARR. There is another class of people that have been overlooked in the enumeration of those who ought to be entitled to a land grant, I refer to the newspaper correspondents. Like the soldiers, they went out to that country and took their lives in their hands, and they did more to advertise the country probably than the volunteers did. In my opinion they should receive recognition in this Bill.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. With reference to some of the contingents who went out to South Africa, and did not serve, and then returned, will they be entitled?

Mr. OLIVER. That is a matter for consideration under clause 2, which has been hung up in deference to the unanimous view of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. A difficulty about the amendment of my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Herron) has been brought to my attention, namely, that section 2 is not yet amended, and the amendment which is proposed to section 2 would not be relevant there. I would suggest that my hon. friend's amendment be in the following terms:

But this section shall not apply in so far as residence and cultivation are required, to persons who, by reason of physical or mental incapacity arising from service in South Africa as aforesaid, are unable to comply with the conditions as to residence and cultivation prescribed in section 4 hereof.

The object the hon. gentleman desires to attain is this, that the conditions as to residence and cultivation should not be imposed upon persons who, by reason of physical injuries or mental condition arising from the war, are unable to perform the duties which otherwise they would be required to perform under the law.

Mr. OLIVER. I think the provisions of the Dominion Lands Act would be sufficient to meet the cases suggested. Beyond that point it would be dangerous to go. The provisions of the Land Act are framed to meet just such cases as my hon. friend has in mind. I think it would be safer to leave such cases to the operation of the Dominion Lands Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister then is satisfied that the provisions of the Lands Act would amply cover the case mentioned by my hon. friend from Alberta.

Mr. OLIVER. I could not say they would amply cover the case, but I think they would cover it so far as it would be safe to go in administration ; otherwise we might have to deal with what might amount to a scandal in the matter of medical certificates and other means of avoiding settlement duties.

Mr. HERRON. I had in mind one or two very severe cases in which I thought the applicant should get his patent forthwith without putting in the necessary three years. I have a case in mind where the man has been in the hospital ever since the end of the war, and he has a large family of ten children. I only know of two cases, but they are very special ones. I had them in view, and thought that they should be entitled to get their patents without performing the homestead duties. Does the minister think such a case could be dealt with in section 2 ?

Mr. OLIVER. I think clause 4 as it stands should be carried. The cases my hon. friend suggests can be met to a measurable degree under the provisions of the Dominion Lands Act. I could not support his amendment.

Mr. HERRON. Perhaps the minister would not mind explaining what the provisions of the Lands Act are with respect to that particular case.

Mr. OLIVER. One provision is that where a homesteader is physically incapacitated from fulfilling his duties, by order of the Governor in Council, he may be granted a patent without residence.

On section 5—substitutes.

Mr. OLIVER. I have an amendment to clause 5 that I propose shall be added as subclause 3 as follows :

No such instrument shall be accepted or recognized by the department which is not executed and dated after the date of the warrant of the Minister of Militia and Defence, provided for in section 7 of this Act.

Mr. HERRON. I would like an explanation from the minister as to what the addition to this clause means. I believe there are cases in the country in which some men have made arrangements to dispose of their land. I suppose this is what it has reference to.

Mr. OLIVER. The amendment I have moved is for the purpose that is set forth in its wording, that the assignment of the volunteer is of no value until this right has been accorded by the Department of Militia and Defence; that is to say that the trafficking in rights which is going on at the present time will be at the loss of the enterprising purchaser and not at the loss of the volunteer.

Mr. TURRIFF. I think there should be a change made in section 5. It reads :

No person shall be accepted as a substitute unless he is a British subject.

It is perfectly right that a man must be a British subject before a patent issues to him, but I do not see any more reason why a settler who purchases a warrant, and resides on the land should be required to be a British subject any more than a man who takes up an ordinary homestead. It will be a great mistake if the clause is left in its present shape. You will prevent a great many men who might wish to become purchasers from obtaining this land.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Say 'or makes the declaration to become a British subject.'

Mr. CONMEE. That would be better.

Mr. TURRIFF. The law which applies to the ordinary homesteader would cover this case; he cannot get his patent unless he takes out his papers and becomes a British subject. I therefore move to strike out the words 'a British subject.'

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Then a foreigner might come in and hold this land. Can a volunteer get his patent under this section without becoming a British subject?

Mr. TURRIFF. The same provision can be made as that which is contained in the Land Act.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. He should be a British subject or be required to declare his intention of becoming one the same as a homesteader.

Mr. TURRIFF. I do not think a homesteader has to make that declaration. I think it would be advisable to put in a provision that the patent should not issue to any one unless he is a British subject.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Mr. Turriff moves to strike out the words 'a British subject.'

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. CONMEE. I understand he has to be a British subject before he gets his patent.

Mr. LANCASTER. No, it is the other way.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to have the amendment explained.

Mr. TURRIFF. I think there is a general misapprehension as to what I mean. I propose to strike out the words that he must be a British subject in order to become a substitute for the original grantee, but I do not propose that he shall be allowed to receive the patent for the land until he becomes a British subject. Take the settler coming in from the United States; he can take up a homestead but he does not become a British subject until he has lived three years in the country.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Has he not to declare?

Mr. TURRIFF. Let him make his declaration, and provide that before he gets the patent he must become a British subject.

Mr. LANCASTER. Where we grant lands to men because they went to fight for the British Crown no one should be allowed to speculate in these lands unless he is a British subject. The Bill is all right as it is.

Mr. M. S McCARTHY. Under the Lands Act we permit a man to make a homestead entry who has declared his intention, and why should there be any distinction made in this case?

Mr. TURRIFF. I will ask that my amendment should read this way:

No person shall be accepted as a substitute unless he is a British subject or has declared his intention of becoming a British subject.

Mr. FOWLER. The whole idea of allowing a substitute in such a case as this is absurd. But if it be allowed it should be confined to a man who is already a British subject.

Mr. CONMEE. It should be provided that before receiving the patent he should become a British subject.

Mr. OLIVER. There is no provision in the section as it stands for a substitute becoming a British subject before getting his patent, and while I have no objection to the amendment as proposed, it should be followed by a provision that the substitute should be a British subject before he gets the patent.

Mr. FOWLER. Where is the necessity for this? Are there not sufficient British subjects to purchase these rights. It is ridiculous to extend this privilege to foreigners.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. These scrips will undoubtedly be speculated in, and that being so, it is desirable to make them as valuable as possible. If we refuse to give the privilege to those who have not yet taken out their naturalization papers we limit to that extent the market value of the scrip.

Mr. LANCASTER. If I felt that these scrips were to be speculated in I would vote against the whole Bill. We should approach this with the idea that British subjects should settle on these lands as far as possible. It is not like a foreigner coming in and taking up a homestead entry in the ordinary way. This is a special grant to certain brave and loyal British subjects whom we desire to honour and we should restrict it to British subjects.

Mr. CONMEE. We encourage foreigners to come here and declare their intention to become British subjects, and when they do so in good faith we ought not to restrict them in their privileges of citizenship.

Mr. LANCASTER. I am quite content that such a one should have all the ordinary privileges of citizenship, but this is a special case altogether.

Mr. TURRIFF. I would add to my amendment the words:

And no patent shall issue for any lands under this Act until the holder has become a British subject.

Mr. OLIVER. The difficulty could be met by adding to section 2 of the Bill the words:

The patent shall not issue until he has become a British subject.

Mr. FOWLER. Suppose John Smith fought in South Africa and he sells his rights to Thomas Brown, who becomes his substitute; could Thomas Brown sell his rights to another person?

Mr. OLIVER. No. The Bill expressly says that the volunteers may sell to a substitute and the substitute must earn the patent.

Mr. FOWLER. No, it does not say that.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. Every restriction we put on these grants is just lessening the value of the man who gets it. Our experience from 1871 to 1875, when there was plenty of scrip in the market—and at that time anybody could buy it and there was no requirement that he should be a British subject—was that better prices were got than if there had been no restriction. Any restriction is bound to lower the price to the man who holds the property.

Mr. FOWLER. This violates a very important principle that we should not lose sight of, and that is the principle of settling these lands with people who are going to farm them. It is better to have four farmers farming 160 acres each than to have one farmer owning a farm of 640 acres. You are increasing the holdings to these settlers and in that way are keeping out settlement. I do not think the minister has looked into this thing as he should. What we want to do is establish a population out there and not a few big land holders.

Mr. OLIVER. Not a peasant population.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not quite understand what the hon. gentleman means by 'a peasant population.' Do I understand the minister to say that a man with 160 acres is a peasant farmer? Does he want to establish a system of landlordism in that country? No man can possibly work 160 acres by himself. What the minister wants is to establish an aristocratic class who will have servants at their command. He desires to put the lands of this country into the hands of a favoured few. What is the secret of the success of the French nation? It is the fact that the lands of France are divided up amongst small holders—a peasant class, if you will, but the bone and sinew of the French nation. And if you call that a peasant class, I would that we had in Canada a peasant class, for that is the class which is the salvation of France where the land is held by the men who work it and not by the employers of labour. I think a very great mistake is being made when we allow any substitution and do not compel these men, who have, by their sacrifices in the past, earned their right to this land, to go out themselves and settle on it. For my part I protest against this policy in the interests of the people of the west as well as of the whole of Canada.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to protest against this land being given to the volunteers of South Africa?

Mr. FOWLER. If I have not made myself clear to the bright intellect of the hon. gentleman, it will be impossible, with the slight command I have of the English language, for me to use words which would convey my meaning to his intelligence. I am not opposing the grant to the South African veterans, but I am opposing the right of substitution which is attached to the grant and which is not in the interests of this country, because it will enable some of these men to sell for a song to the scrip shark, who has been the curse of the west and who has already his eyes fixed upon this Bill. There can be no doubt about that. The speculator who deals in scrip is already looking to this Bill. He has not gorged himself quite full enough with the scrip of the half-breed and is now after the scrip of the veteran. I say it is not in the interests of the west that large tracts of land should be held by individuals, but rather that smaller holdings should be the rule, and that there should be what my hon. friend the minister terms 'a peasant population' rather than a population of rich landlords with servants and serfs at their command.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend is under a misapprehension as to the purpose of this Bill. This Bill is not for the purpose of benefiting the west, and none know that better than the people who represent the west. It is supposed to be a discharge of the duty of the whole Dominion to those who went to South Africa to serve the empire. This is a sacrifice on the part of the west and is recognized as such, but the west is prepared to do its part in recognizing the service of these men. It is useless to speak of this as though it were a benefit to the west. It is a case in which the west is carrying the burden of the whole Dominion in making some recognition of the services of these men.

Mr. FOWLER. If that be true, better strike the Bill off the record altogether; and if it be necessary to provide some recognition for these veterans, we should do it by means of a money grant. This is only another illustration of the mistake we are committing in keeping the control of these lands in the federal government and not giving them to the provinces. What right have we to impose a sacrifice on the west? What right have we to do an act of injustice towards the west if, as the minister says, this is an act of injustice to that portion of our country. Let us from the Dominion treasury give these men proper remuneration for what they have done and not give an opportunity to the speculators to make a lot of money out of this grant, whereas our veterans will only get a very small portion of it.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not want to accept the suggestion, and have it put on record in 'Hansard,' that this is an injustice to the west.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is what you said.

Mr. OLIVER. I said it was a burden.

Mr. FOWLER. A burden is an injustice.

Mr. OLIVER. Not necessarily. It is a burden the people are quite prepared to bear. I want my hon. friend to understand that the honourable part which the west took in South Africa was a burden but not an injustice. It was a burden which the west bore proudly; and when we are doing what we can to recognize the services of these men in South Africa, we are acquitting a debt of honour and the west is proud to bear its share of that burden.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. How many scrip can the speculator buy?

Mr. OLIVER. The speculator can buy as many scrip as he has money to pay for, but his scrip will only be of use to him if he can fulfil the duties and obligations required to earn the patent.

Mr. FOWLER. That means he will get a few more substitutes just as he had to produce the half-breed, and he did not always produce the half-breed he was supposed to produce. The minister says this is a burden on the west. In what respect? Is it because these lands are being granted? Then why should the west bear the burden? Why should not the whole of Canada bear

it? If you make a money grant out of the Dominion treasury, the whole of Canada will bear the burden and not the west alone.

Mr. OLIVER. Precisely.

Mr. FOWLER. Why do you want to be unfair to the west? Is the west crying out for an opportunity to bear the burden? I have not heard the cry.

Mr. OLIVER. The west is perhaps more willing to bear the burden than other parts of the country are willing to share it.

An hon. MEMBER. Why?

Mr. OLIVER. There has been no suggestion from any part of the country in the line my hon. friend suggested, that there should be a payment out of the treasury. It was a question of Northwest lands or nothing.

Mr. FOWLER. It is not necessarily a question of Northwest lands or nothing. There is no reason why some minister should not have brought down a Bill providing that a money grant should be given to the South African veterans.

Mr. LANCASTER. According to the wording of this section, there might be more than one substitute, and the question is, which one would require to be a British subject. The first substitute might dispose of his interest and go to the United States or anywhere else, and the last one who took the land would be the poor, downtrodden British subject who would have to fulfil the settlement duties. As the Bill stands, there can be one or any number of substitutes.

Mr. OLIVER. I would not wish to set up my knowledge of the law against that of the hon. gentleman ; but it is as plain as the English language can make it, that there is provision for an assignment to one substitute.

Mr. LANCASTER. That does not limit it to one substitute. I do not think any lawyer will deny that the provision for a substitute must be taken as meaning any number of substitutes. If the section said 'one substitute,' that might limit it, but as it is it means his substitute for the time being. To my mind the section is all right unamended.

Mr. CARVELL. It seems to me that it would be a mistake to curtail the number of persons to whom those lands could be assigned ; because the man in the east cannot go and cultivate them, and any curtailment you put upon his right to dispose of them makes them of that much less value to him and therefore only weakens the object of them. I would allow as many substitutes as are allowed in the case of any commercial commodity. If this is not allowed, it would be better, as the hon. member for Kings and Albert suggests, that you should give these men a money grant. But I have not heard any such proposition before. Ever since I have been here, in every session, the proposition has been to make grants of land to these South African veterans, and the powers that be have decided to give them lands. If you couple with the grant the condition that the grantee must go and settle on the land it will be absolutely useless to one-half or three-fourths of the men who went to South Africa.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. I move that the words 'twenty-one' be struck out of the second line and the word 'eighteen' be substituted therefor.

Amendment of Mr. Jackson agreed to.

On section 6—scrip may be granted instead of land.

Mr. OLIVER. I desire to move that in the last line the word 'nine' be struck out and the word 'ten' be substituted therefor.

Mr. MILLER. If this Bill does not make it clear whether the substitute or the grantee has the right to assign, ought it not to be made clear ?

Mr. OLIVER. In regard to the question of an assignment by one substitute to another, I can only say that, so far as I can read English, this provides for an assignment from the volunteers to a substitute, and the substitute must perform the duties. If the English language does not mean what it says, then an amendment would be necessary ; but that is the intent of the Act.

Mr. MILLER. I quite agree with the hon. minister that if the English language is as he understands it and as I understand it, then an amendment is not necessary ; but there are a number of lawyers in the House who claim that the language means what it does not appear to mean, and I would like to hear from them.

Mr. HERRON. I moved that the following be inserted as section 6a :

Any person entitled to a grant of land under the foregoing provisions may in lieu thereof if he so chooses, receive a free grant of one quarter-section without residence duties or homestead regulations, provided that he notifies the Minister of the Interior of his choice before December 31, 1910.

The object I have in view in moving this amendment is this. Certain men may prefer to take 160 acres of land and get a patent for the same without residing on the land. A great many men in the west who will be entitled to lands under this Act are in mercantile business, in stores, or in various occupations in town. Many more are ranchers or are engaged in some other occupation which they followed before the war broke out. Many of them would think it a great favour to be allowed to select a quarter-section of land and obtain the patent without further conditions. I would not suggest this as taking away from the rights of those who choose the 320 acres but merely

to provide for the man who wishes to take 160 acres without condition.

Amendment (Mr. Herron) negatived.

Mr. LAKE moved :

That the following be inserted as clause 6a: Any person entitled to a grant of land under the foregoing provisions may, in lieu thereof, if he so choose, receive a free grant of one-quarter-section without residence or cultivation duties, provided that at the time of his enlistment he was resident or domiciled in the province of Manitoba or in the provisional district of Saskatchewan, Alberta or Assiniboia, and provided further that he notifies the Minister of the Interior of his choice before December 31, 1910.

He said : The reason for the proposed amendment is that there should be some provision, as the original Bill proposed, for granting to the residents of these provinces some special consideration for their services from the lands of the Northwest. The reason for proposing that this should be restricted to those who were resident in the west at the time of enlistment is that the grant is being taken from the lands of the Northwest, and the request which was laid before the House by the legislative assemly of the Northwest Territories was that the grant should be made to those men who had volunteered from the Northwest Territories as they were then. Of course, I consider that the province of Manitoba and the Yukon Territory should also be included in this request. As Mr. Herron has pointed out, there are many men who are resident in that country who have moved into the towns and are engaged in other lines of business, to whom it would be a great benefit to receive this unconditional grant of land. I am in favour of the provisions of the Bill as they have been set forth. The grant of the 320 acres with residence duties meets with my approval. The provision that a man may assign his land to a substitute I also approve. The man resident in eastern Canada who transfers his rights is sending a new settler to the Northwest. He will not sell for less than $140 or $150, because he can get that much for the scrip, and the man who has paid $140 for the right intends to reside there, so I would withhold this privilege from the volunteer who enlisted in the east, because it would not be bringing in further settlers to grant him free land. I think it is a small point for this parliament to make such a grant as I have proposed to meet the wishes of the people of these provinces, who would themselves undoubtedly grant this land if their public lands had not been taken from them.

Amendment (Mr. Lake) negatived.

Mr. HERRON. In reference to the provision that any transaction occurring before the issue of the scrip would be void, is the minister prepared immediately to issue this scrip, or will that only come into effect after a certain date?

Mr. OLIVER. The Bill will be in effect as soon as it is assented to.

Mr. T. CHISHOLM. When can application for warrants be made to the Minister of Militia?

Mr. OLIVER. As soon as the Bill is assented to.

Mr. FOWLER. When can the speculator begin to get in his work?

Mr. OLIVER. Not until the certificate has been issued to the volunteer.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The scrip must be issued on the application of the volunteer, not of the substitute?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Has the minister made an estimate of the number who will be likely to accept grants?

Mr. OLIVER. The number who would be entitled according to the present drafting of section 2 would be a little over 7,000, but if all the suggestions that have been made are followed the number will be very largely increased. I would be glad to have any further suggestions in regard to the provisions of section 2 before the committee rises. I would like to have the views of the committee with regard to the different classes of people who should be provided for. If we make the provisions of section 2 so wide and so general as to cover all the cases that have been suggested to the House, we are liable to have our Act subjected to abuses in administration that will probably defeat the object aimed at. If we made the Bill fairly restrictive, or did not widen it so much that it would be difficult to operate, the understanding being that special cases might be dealt with in a special Act, I think that would be a safer plan in the public interest than to undertake to cover all cases by a general provision.

Progress reported.

PATENT AND PROPRIETARY MEDICINES.

House in committee on Bill (No. 146) respecting proprietary medicines.—Mr. Templeman.

On section 2—definitions.

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue). There is a custom in the trade that medicines are manufactured under contract for the proprietor. To meet that, I move to add the following as subsection (d) :

Where the manufacturer of a proprietary or patent medicine is not the proprietor

thereof, the proprietor who procures the same to be manufactured shall be deemed to be the manufacturer within the meaning of this Act.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. G. H. McINTYRE. Has the minister any further views with regard to the use of that word 'internal.' It was contended before the committee that it meant only what was introduced by the mouth, that anything taken through the nose, or a hypodermic injection of cocaine through the skin, might not come under it.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I do not know that the doctors would agree upon what 'internal' means. I was surprised to be told that an injection by the nose was not considered an internal remedy. This Bill proposes to deal only with medicines taken internally.

On section 7—prohibited medicines.

Mr. G. H. McINTYRE. I would like to ask the minister if he proposes to introduce a section which will make provision for the sale of such stock as druggists may have on hand at the time of the passing of this Act ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. That is a point I gave some consideration to and, in discussing the matter with others, it was thought that under clause 17, where power is given to the Governor in Council to 'make such regulations for giving effect to any of the provisions of this Act and declaring the true intent thereof, in any case of doubt, as to him seems meet,' we may make regulations governing the sale of those medicines that may be in stock at the time this Act comes into force which would not be labelled in accordance with the Act. It is not at all probable that this Act will be brought into force before the first of the year, which will give dealers six months to prepare their labels in conformity with the Act and to dispose of their present stock. We do not contemplate to cause the trade any trouble in changing from the old to the new system. That point can be guarded against by regulation.

Mr. T. CHISHOLM. The minister has perhaps not thought of the fact that in a a great many cases druggists do not know the contents of their patent medicines, and it will be impossible to get rid of their stock at the expiration of the time mentioned by him. I think there should be some special provision to allow them to dispose of all the patent medicines that are on their hands at the time the Act is put into force. They might be compelled to put a date upon the bottle to show that it was manufactured before the Act passed.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. A special label ?

Mr. T. CHISHOLM. Yes, a special label. It would be impossible to put labels on the stock that they have in their drug stores to indicate what the actual contents of the bottles are, because druggists would not know what these were themselves.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I am of opinion that I have authority to require them to put a special label on the quantity that may be in stock at the present time, or to label it as nearly as possible in conformity with this Act.

Mr. T. CHISHOLM. If you could compel them to put some special label on to show that the stock was manufactured before the Act came into force it would save them from losing their stock. We would not wish to do any injury to those who have laid in a large stock. Frequently druggists buy a large stock of a particular kind of patent medicine which is used in their neighbourhood. They get a discount if they take a large amount, and if some provision were not made such as I suggest an injury might be done to local druggists throughout the country.

Mr. BARR. Many drug stores have these patent medicines on their shelves for probably two or three years. Giving them until next January would afford them no opportunity whatever to dispose of their stock. I think it is a question that should be carefully guarded. It is absolutely necessary that a restriction should be imposed which would prevent them from selling year after year or from buying more stock and selling it under the pretence that it was the stock which they originally had on hand. A great injustice might be done to the druggists who have a stock of patent medicines on hand unless provision is made which will enable them to dispose of it.

On section 9—distribution from door to door.

Mr. DANIEL. I would like to call the attention of the minister to the fact that in schedule (a) there are three or perhaps more coal tar products mentioned, but there are several others that might as well be included.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The schedule was prepared by the chemist of the department but it may not be complete. Under clause 17 it will be seen that we can add to or remove from schedule 'A' any poisonous or patent drugs as from time to time may be deemed expedient. One of the first things that would be done after this became law would be to complete that schedule and issue a circular.

Mr. DANIEL. I think this schedule would be more satisfactory if instead of mentioning a few of these coal tar products it should include all coal tar products. Why should a acetanilide be included in the schedule and antipyrine left out. If you are going to include any of these coal tar products you should include them all.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Are all coal tar products poisonous ?

Mr. DANIEL. One is perhaps not so bad as another but they are all of the same character and have the same effect. The Bill at present really puts a ban on these mentioned and gives an advertisement to those that are not mentioned.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. What are they ?

Mr. DANIEL. As it happens those that are not mentioned are largely proprietary. For instance, antikamnia which is said to be an extract of acetanilide and bicarbonate of soda but the basis of it is acetanalide. It is sold under the trade name of antikamnia and would not come under this Bill. It is the same with antipyrine which I believe is made in Germany and which is also proprietary. It is a coal tar product just the same as acetanalide and phenacetine. Those that are not mentioned by name in the Bill are in the same category as those which are, and they should only be taken under advice.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Would you suggest that the Bill should say : Acetanalide and other coal tar products ?

Mr. DANIEL. I would put it in that way.

Mr. CHISHOLM. These coal tar products all affect the heart and are exceedingly dangerous medicine.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Before putting the Bill in force I presume this matter would be submitted to the proper authorities. It is my intention that it should be submitted to some eminent medical man so that we might get a complete list, and in the meantime we can insert the words : 'and other coal tar products.'

Mr. DANIEL. The trouble about inserting a complete list in a statute is that they are constantly getting out new coal tar products and describing them by some trade name. The minister in the schedule puts a ban on certain preparations and at the same time gives an immense advertisement to other preparations which are largely proprietary, such as antipyrine and antikamnia, to which exactly the same objections apply. I think it would be only fair and right, both to the public and to the people dealing in these things, that the general term should be used instead of these individual terms, unless you see the individual names of all the preparations.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are there not coal tar products which are not of a medicinal character? If so, would it not be wise to say 'and all other coal tar products used for medicinal purposes' ? Otherwise you would make it too comprehensive.

Mr. G. H. McINTYRE. That would not be necessary as the Bill applies only to preparations used as medicines.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I move that the words 'and other coal tar products' be added to the schedule.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. G. H. McINTYRE. I would like to ask the minister if he has been able to devise any plan for putting a limit to certain advertisements of medicines or remedies that are not at all reputable? I think I need not enter more particularly into a description of them ; they will suggest themselves. These advertisements have appeared from time to time in some newspapers which are not over particular, and it would be well, if possible, to put some limit upon them.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. That is a point which has been considered. The practice of publishing advertisements of patent medicines that are not of a creditable character has been, I was going to say, universal ; but in recent years, I am bound to say, there has been a great improvement in that regard. Public opinion has put a ban on that class of advertising, and it is not nearly so commonly in vogue now as it was formerly. I had an amendment drafted prohibiting obscene advertising, but I recognized the difficulty and also the danger of trying to exercise a censorship over advertising of any kind. I did ask the Department of Justice some days ago how far we could go in prohibiting obscene or objectionable advertising of patent medicines, but the Department of Justice, up to the present time, has not helped me out. So I thought it better to let this Bill become law without referring to advertising at all. As I have said, the evil is not nearly so great as it used to be. The press of Canada has refused to carry in its columns advertising of that character, and I do not know that it would be wise to attempt to legislate on the subject in this Bill. I am afraid that we might have some difficulty in enforcing such legislation, and I am not prepared to draw the line between what should and what should not be published. I think that this measure, which is not very drastic, is along the right lines, and after we give it a fair trial for a year or two, we can perhaps devise a clause to regulate such advertising.

Mr. THOS. CHISHOLM. The minister has in the schedule a basis for regulating all such matters. By enlarging the schedule he can overcome to a great extent the evil complained of.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I observe that the minister, in section 14, subsection 2, appears to contemplate some kind of third party procedure. I am not quite sure that will work

out satisfactorily. What is contemplated exactly by subsection 2 of section 14 ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. In the Bill as first printed we had incorporated a warranty clause, requiring the giving of a warranty by the manufacturer to the vendor. We thought it would be very cumbersome to have that warranty accompanying every sale of goods, and we substituted clause 14, which is an entirely new clause, approved of by the special committee. If my hon. friend will look at the latter part of section 14 he will see that the manufacturer's name and number must be given on the label and that is sufficient identification of the manufacturer for the purposes of the section, and he can be brought in as the defendant in a prosecution. The action will then be brought against the manufacturer and the court will find, if the offence be proved, against the manufacturer.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There may be some provision in the Summary Conviction Act which provides that the defendant can obtain a summons to bring a third person before the court, but unless there is, this subsection could not be worked out. Can the minister tell me if there is any such provision ? The subsection reads :

2. If the person who gives notice of such defence, or the prosecutor, obtains a summons to bring such third party before the court, the court shall at the same time hear all the parties and decide upon the entire merits of the case, not only as regards the person originally accused but also as regards the third party so brought before the court.

Mr. CLARKE. I do not think there is any such provision in the sense the hon. gentleman refers to. There is in civil proceedings. What I should judge this to mean is that the defendant, in order to exonerate himself, must institute a new proceeding against the third party, which would really be a separate prosecution. If he wants to clear himself, he should lay information against the party responsible and prove his charge.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In some provinces there is a provision for bringing in a third party in civil cases, in others there is not, and this applies to the whole of Canada. Even if this were intended to apply to civil proceedings alone, I do not think it would work out very satisfactorily. But in a criminal proceeding, I do not see how you could work it out at all. There will be two different prosecutions, and the bald statement that 'the court shall at the same time hear all the parties and decide upon the entire merits of the case,' would be a little too general to enable the provisions of this section to be worked out at all. Is it contemplated, for example, that the magistrate would give the one judgment in the two cases and that this section will be sufficient for that to be done ? I would hardly think so

Mr. CLARKE. There is another way in which it could be done. The proceedings could be amended by making the manufacturer a defendant along with the other party. It is, of course open to some objection.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. We have not the time to work it out and it is not of sufficient importance to insist upon. No doubt the Bill will have to be amended.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY—HARMONY TO ELMIRA BRANCH.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved second reading of Bill (No. 202) to authorize the construction of a branch line of the Prince Edward Island Railway from Harmony, on the Souris branch, to Elmira. He said : This is for the purpose of taking authority, if the government so desire, to build a line, a little over thirteen miles long, from Harmony, on the Souris branch, to Elmira. It will serve a very important country, where there are several sections thickly settled which are without railway communication. The road will cost probably in the vicinity of $400,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Might I ask whether or not there were some other proposed branches which seem to have been agitated for in Prince Edward Island for a number of years? When I visited the island three or four years ago, I heard of several of these branches which seemed to be on much the same basis as regards their claims on the exchequer. Why has this particular branch been selected and the others put to one side ?

Mr. GRAHAM. The government is of the opinion that this is all we can undertake this year. Some branch had to be selected, and I suppose the same question would be asked of any branch. Two branches were asked for in this vicinity. The Prince Edward Island legislature passed a resolution in which they named several branches and this was one.

Mr. J. D. REID. In whose county is it ?

Mr. GRAHAM. It does not say in my brief which county it is in. The resolution passed by the legislature of Prince Edward Island referred to many branch lines.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.). Has the minister that resolution with him ?

Mr. GRAHAM. No.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.). He will find it includes many lines in addition to the little bit of a paltry spur line he proposes.

Mr. EMMERSON. I wish to again refer to the whole question of branch lines in connection with the government system of railways in Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island.

Mr. SPEAKER. Would that not be an irrelevant matter?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think it is germane to this Bill. It is a branch line being constructed by the government, the others are branch lines connected with the government system and the one question is involved in the other. It seems to me that the government, before constructing new branch lines in Prince Edward Island or any other province should consider and deal with the branch lines already in existence connecting with the government system. The Dominion has expended in connection with the several branch lines throughout the provinces traversed by the Intercolonial Railway nearly $7,000,000. The provinces have contributed to the same end about $5,000,000. The branch lines thus added by this parliament are all designed for one purpose, evidently we must assume that they are for the purpose of promoting the interests of the several communities traversed by them.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I do not like to raise a point of order, but I am forced to. I do not see the bearing of branch lines in other provinces on the Bill under discussion.

Mr. EMMERSON. I submit I am in order; I am arguing that before such a Bill is proceeded with the government should deal with the question of branch lines already constructed.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am rather inclined to think that a general discussion of branch lines in other provinces is hardly relative to a motion for the second reading of a particular Bill which deals with a particular branch line in one province. Beyond that the hon. member will see he is reviving a discussion which has already taken place in this House in this session at his own instance on the same question.

Mr. EMMERSON. Of course I submit with all deference to the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think a discussion as to whether or not this branch line should be constructed is germane, but not a discussion of other branch lines in other provinces.

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not propose to deal with other branch lines in other provinces, but I do propose to show reasons why the government should not deal with this particular branch line at this stage. Parliament, before committing itself to an expenditure of $400,000 or $500,000, should inquire into the question of whether the expenditure already made in the past in connection with branch lines has been effectually made and has been made to accomplish the object which parliament evidently had in view, that is the benefit of the communities traversed by other branch lines.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The hon. member has paid no attention to your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think thus far the hon. member is paying attention to the ruling.

Mr. TAYLOR. They are only building this on paper for election purposes.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am dealing with this on principle. There is no narrow pent-up Utica of partisanship that will confine my views at this time. When this Bill has passed both Houses and has received the assent of His Excellency the responsibility will be on the government, but at present it is on parliament. The question is: Should parliament authorize the government of Canada to construct even a small branch line like this of only thirteen miles until parliament has dealt with the wider and greater question with respect to branch lines already in existence?

I have no particular objection to this branch line. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways has referred to the fact that the legislature of Prince Edward Island has passed a resolution, unanimously I assume, in favour of the construction of this particular line, and other lines, and that resolution no doubt called upon this parliament to authorize the construction of this particular branch line as well as others mentioned in that resolution. In considering that request, it seems to me to be the bounden duty of parliament to inquire whether this authority should be given until this parliament has dealt with the branch lines already existing in a way that would make them fulfil the respective missions which it was expected they would fulfil when parliament authorized their construction. The same question would arise if we were asked to subsidize an additional branch line in connection with the government system of railways on the main line of the Intercolonial Railway. This, I understand, to be an extension of the government system, and you cannot separate it. Because it happens to be in the province of Prince Edward Island is no reason why it should be separated from the whole system of the government railways of the Dominion. Should that be extended, should there be a draft made upon the revenues of Canada to create additional lines to the system until that system is placed in a position whereby it would fulfil the aspirations and hopes of the people when that system was constructed? I submit I am in order. I bow to your ruling, but I do not think I am departing from your ruling. I submit that the Minister of Railways, who of course spoke for the government with respect to their policy in that regard, should give some idea as re-

gards the course to be pursued in connection with branch lines already existing before asking us to deal with the proposition involved in the Bill now before the House. I hope I have made myself clear, and I hope the Minister of Railways will see the point of the objection I take to the Bill at this moment.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee on the Bill.

On section 1,

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.). About three weeks ago the minister gave notice of the introduction of a Bill to construct branch lines in the province of Prince Edward Island, one being the branch line mentioned in the Bill, and the other a branch line from Montague bridge to connect with the Murray Harbour Railway. I would like to know what change has come over the spirit of the minister in leaving the second branch out.

Mr. GRAHAM. No matter how willing the government might be to do things, it cannot do everything at once, even if it were inclined. This branch, I find on investigation, has been surveyed and decided on some years ago; the other one had never been surveyed except possibly by a preliminary survey. I want to know, as near as possible, what a thing is going to cost before I ask parliament to commit itself to the construction. I was not in a position to do that with the second line. I may say, without speaking from any great knowledge, because I have been but a short time in parliament, that Prince Edward Island possibly is in a different position to other parts of Canada, in many respects. I have no idea whatever that building a branch line in Prince Edward Island is for the purposes of making money for the government.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Was the minister ever in Prince Edward Island?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have not been in Prince Edward Island, I am sorry to say, but I hope to visit it before another session of parliament. We have selected this branch line because it seemed to be needed, and that is all we feel in a position to ask parliament to authorize this year.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.). I think that is a very lame excuse, it is the lamest excuse I ever heard this minister make. These are hardly branch lines, they are only spurs. I do not think the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) need be alarmed unless they build it in the way they constructed the Hillsborough bridge at a cost of three prices. I am a little alarmed at anything undertaken by this government from what I have known of them in the past. This railway is only thirteen miles in length and if they proceed upon the same lines as they have in the past it will cost a great deal more than it should.

Mr. EMMERSON

Mr. EMMERSON. Move the six months' hoist.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.). The Minister of Railways and Canals says that he would not undertake that branch that he had in his proposed Bill because it was not surveyed. The minister must be asleep, or he did not know that parliament was meeting. I know that previous to the election of 1904 there was not only a survey but two or three different surveys. There were surveying parties in every section of the country to see which way the road would take. I believe that there were as many surveys there as have been made for the road which he proposes now to construct and if there is anything in his argument why not proceed with the New London branch? How many surveys had they previous to 1904 of the New London branch?

Mr. GRAHAM. There have been several surveys made of the New London branch, but of the routes surveyed not one was satisfactory to the people, we have complaints that every one of the surveys which is made will not serve the people.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Why did not the minister give us the report of these surveys? He has refused to give it to us.

Mr. GRAHAM. I may be dense and I may be stubborn, but I do not propose to ask parliament to vote money for a railway until I know something about it. With reference to this line that we now propose to construct, a survey has been made, it is satisfactory to the people and we are going to build this branch this year. If hon. gentlemen from Prince Edward Island do not want it we will not force it upon them. It is going to cost a lot of money for a short line. This is all that we can see our way clear to do this year.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.). The minister is not well posted as to what has taken place in that province. Is not the minister aware that the people came to an agreement, of which I have a copy, and which agreement was submitted to the hon. Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) a few years ago when he was in Prince Edward Island with the tariff commission. I do not think the minister has any right to say that they do not proceed with the building of that branch line because the people have disagreed about the route. Here is the agreement and I will read it to the minister. It is signed by Mr. A. B. Warburton who is my opponent in the next election.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I hope the agreement is not too long because it is out of order. The question is whether this line should be built and no other.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.). This bears on the question that the minister took

up and surely I should have an opportunity of replying.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Allusion can be made to it but it is not the question before the chair.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.). There is the agreement.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The question before the chair has reference to the construction of the Elmira branch.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.). I hope I am in order. The minister says they do not want to proceed with the New London branch because there is a disagreement about routes. Here is the agreement that they entered into, signed by representatives of the different sections, and it shows that there was a perfect unanimity. I believe that we are going to have an exhibition of the same character as that which we had previous to the election of 1904. We are now in the last session of parliament, I presume, and the Bill is introduced to construct a few miles of railway in Kings county for the benefit of the hon. member for Kings (Mr. Hughes). I believe it is only on paper.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. Your belief is very active.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.). Yes, very active. In 1904 they pursued a different course. They began surveys all over the province. They began to survey this very railway and the minister says there is a disagreement about the New London branch. If there is a disagreement about the route, of the New London branch there is also a disagreement about this one. I know something of the history of these railways and there was a pretty free fight with regard to the proposed route of the Elmira branch. Here is a statement about the surveys we had in 1904—in 1904 and it is 1908, four years ago. I made the statement in the early part of the session that the hon. member for Kings had said that unless this branch was built within a year he would resign his seat. He contradicted me, he said the statement was not true. I believe he said two years in place of one. But, four years have gone and it is safe enough to come in with a Bill now at the end of a term of parliament and say that they are going to proceed with that line. This is a different procedure from that of 1904. Here is a return which I asked for and which will be given an idea to the House of how they spend money in order to carry elections and for the people of Prince Edward Island. There is the survey of this Elmira branch costing $1,500; there is the survey of the New London branch, costing $1,500; there is the survey of the main line to the west shore near O'Leary costing $1,500. That is the way the money goes. What do they give to the people of Prince Edward Island for all this expenditure? The minister says that they cannot proceed with the New London branch. I wanted to quote the agreement that was entered into but the chairman ruled me out of order. I bow to the decision of the chairman.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understood the hon. gentleman was going into details about the New London branch.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.). If this Bill on paper is going to help the return of my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes) I do not think I should oppose it, but I must say it comes far short of what Prince Edward Island requires. The Minister of Railways laid great emphasis on a petition from the legislature of Prince Edward Island, and that legislature is of the same political stripe as the Minister of Railways, and if he had so much confidence in that petition as he pretends to have, I rather think he would carry out the prayer of the whole petition and not simply a small part of it. The Conservative government, in 1896, prepared a comprehensive Bill which would satisfy the province of Prince Edward Island in regard to branch railways. In consideration of the fact that the original railway on Prince Edward Island was paid for by the province the Conservative government decided in 1896 that 106 miles of branch railways should be built; and, mind you, they came to that conclusion when the revenue of Canada was only $40,000,000, while now the expenditure is $126,000,000. Why, this Liberal government spent as much money on the few miles of railway they have built in Prince Edward Island as would have equipped the whole province with every mile of railway the people want if the money were wisely expended. The Conservative government, in 1896, knew that the people of Prince Edward Island were coming to the government year after year for a branch railway, and they asked the people to state exactly what the province required, and the people of Prince Edward Island came to an understanding as to what was required, and the government embodied it in a resolution submitted to this parliament. The resolution moved by Mr. Haggart in 1896 was as follows:

Mr. Haggart moved that the House resolve itself into committee to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to build and operate as part of the Prince Edward Island Railway the following lines of railway, that is to say:

(a) From Southport to Murray harbour south with cross line connecting with the Prince Edward Island Railway between New Perth and Cardigan stations touching at or near Montague bridge.

That is the only line this government has undertaken, and it is not completed yet.

(b) From Souris or Harmony station to Elmira.

(c) From a point beween Loyalty junction and York station to Cove head, and thence to Oyster bed bridge.

That is one of the finest sections of country in the province, and the railway would reach the best fishing grounds and would afford the very best feeder for the main line. The branch this government did build is making money, and in consequence of it the deficit on the Prince Edward Island Railway is decreasing year by year. If you extend it to Rustico and New London, as the Conservative party proposed to do in 1896, I believe that in a few years the deficit on the Prince Edward Island Railway would be entirely wiped out.

(d) From Emerald junction to Stanley bridge touching at or near Clifton.

(e) From Summerside to Richmond bay.

(f) From some point at or near O'Leary's station to some point on the western coast between Brae and Cape Wolfe.

(g) From Wiltshire to Victoria.

All those branches would only amount to about 106 miles, and it was estimated at the time that their cost would be $1,088,000.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. That is on paper.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.). Your Bill is on paper too and you may be on paper yourself pretty soon. Now, these 106 miles could be built for something over $1,000,000, and yet this government built about 60 miles which cost them nearly $2,00,000.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. That is simply incorrect.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.). Do you know how much it cost ?

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. I do.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.). You do not know anything about it.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. Yes, I do.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.). That was a comprehensive Bill which would have settled the whole trouble in Prince Edward Island. As I said before, a huge mistake was made for the province when the original cost of the railway was charged in its debt account with Canada. The Conservative party said that in consideration of that large sum of money, three and one-quarter millions, being charged against the province, the best way to expend it would be to give the province railway accommodation, and if the Conservative party had been returned to carry out that policy, I believe that all these branches would have been built to-day at no greater expense than the few lines that have been completed.

Mr. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.)

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Some time ago I put some questions on the Order Paper with reference to the New London branch of this railway, and they were answered by the Minister of Railways. In the year 1904 a survey was made of the New London branch and the hon. Finance Minister, when acting as Minister of Railways, promised to do everything in his power to build that branch.

Mr. FIELDING. No. My hon. friend is not serious when he talks of the Minister of Finance promising to build railways.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I will just read a copy of a return dated 1904, and I think the Finance Minister will change his mind.

Mr. FIELDING. No, I did not promise anything.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I believe the present government will promise anything, especially when an election is coming on. Here is a letter dated Moncton, N.B., the 1st of August, 1904, and signed by D. Pottinger, an officer of the government, with reference to the New London branch, the Elmira branch and the O'Leary branch. This letter states that $1,500 would be the cost of a survey of each of these branches, and at the end it reads as follows :

All these amounts will have to be expended before the 30th June next, so it is important that the works should be got ready for tendering as soon as possible.

Why did they want these works to be tendered for before the 30th of June, 1904? Because they intended to issue the writs for an election, and wanted these tenders to be out to deceive the people. They did not intend to go on with any of these works, and they do not intend to-day to have any contract for the Elmira branch any more than they did for these three branch lines. This letter goes on to say :

If you require any more people to attend to this, please let me know, and I will ask Mr. Schreiber to give me the names of some that he says he has on his lists here.

He wanted some men to go out and tell the people that the government were going to build these branches, but there were never any contracts issued for that purpose. In March, 1908, I asked the Minister of Railways this question :

1. Did the government receive petitions from inhabitants of Clifton, Stanley and Hope River, Prince Edward Island, praying for extension of railway from the main line of the Prince Edward Island Railway to Stanley Bridge or vicinity, and for the placing of a sum sufficient for the purpose in this year's estimates?

The answer was : 'Yes.' He received those petitions, and he received petitions also in 1904, and the Minister of Finance

said in 1906 that he would appoint a competent engineer, an independent man, to go and make a survey of these branch lines, but no survey has been made up to the present day. The next question was:

Is it the intention of the government to grant the prayer of the petitions?

The answer was: 'The government has not so decided.' The third question I asked was:

Is it the intention of the government to make surveys this year with a view to extend the railway system along the north shore of Prince Edward Island?

The answer was: 'No decision has been reached.' Although the Minister of Railways gave this answer in March last, I presume that he has not considered the matter even up to the present time. I would ask him now if he has reached a decision with reference to the construction of a railway on the north shore of Prince Edward Island?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend has named several railways. What railway does he now refer to?

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. The New London branch.

Mr. GRAHAM. The hon. gentleman was complaining that no independent engineer has been sent to fulfil the promise of the Finance Minister to make a survey of that branch up to the present time. If he looks at the supplementary estimates he will see that there is an amount for that work.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Will the minister say that work has been done yet?

Mr. GRAHAM. The hon. gentleman was asking me if it had been considered. I was replying to his question.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. The question is this:

Is it the intention of the government to make surveys this year with a view to extend the railway system along the north shore of Prince Edward Island?

Will the minister answer that question now?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes. It is the intention of the government to comply with the request of my hon. friend and to meet his complaint that no independent survey has been made of what is known as the new London branch. Whether it will be built or not is a matter for future consideration, because I will not build any railway until I am satisfied that it is in the interest of the public and ought to be constructed.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Then I will ask the minister if he has read the report of the engineers who made the survey of the New London branch line in 1904?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have not.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I do not think the minister takes very much interest in the construction of this railway. The railways which he now contemplates building are simply political railways. I do not object to the building of a railway from the main line of the Prince Edward Island Railway to Elmira. I think it is necessary in the interest of the people that that railway should be built, but I think there is a railway which should be built in preference to that, namely, the railway along the north shore of the island. The people there last year, as I have stated before in this House, on account of the weather which existed in the province, were unable to ship any of their produce until after the winter season came, and as a result they were put to great inconvenience and loss. If there had been a railway on the north shore, they would have been able to sell their grain and other produce like other people in the province. You are building the Grand Trunk Pacific at a cost of $250,000,000, and you contemplate building the Georgian Bay canal at a cost of $90,000,000 and the Hudson Bay Railway at a cost of $90,000,000 or $100,000,000 where there is not one workman living, while in Prince Edward Island and in the settled portions of Nova Scotia there are people living who have been for a hundred years without any railways at all. Why does this state of affairs exist?

You go up here 150 miles north of the Ottawa, in some cases 200 miles, where there is not a man living, and you build a railway at the expense of the people where there will not be a white man living for the next ten or twenty years, and where no railway can get any traffic. Why do you build these lines? That is the question asked by every man in Canada and the government cannot give any answer. These places will never be settled except in some spots where the lands are good, but where we have land settled, on which people have been living over a hundred years—places which are the most thickly settled portions of Canada to-day, with fifty-five people to the mile—you will not give us any railway. Our sons go out to the Northwest. Why? Because they have not got the railway communication they should have at home. But when they go out to the northwest, they settle near a railway, and they will be very apt to go near where there is a railway, because they know the government are spending money for the few people living in the west in order that they may get their votes. At the next general elections however the government will be disappointed at the result of their policy, for our people are sufficiently intelligent and patriotic to know that their own homes should be provided with railway communication by the government and let those people who go out west take pot luck the same as those in the east have had to do up to the present. We are spending millions of dollars on Russians and Galicians

out in the Northwest and are leaving the Scotch and the Irish and the English to get along as best they can in the east without government assistance. Our people in the east have to haul their produce some twenty five or thirty miles to market, and in many sections in Prince Edward Island they have no markets in which to sell their produce at all which they can reach with any convenience. The policy of the government is unfair to the people of the east. The east is neglected in favour of the west. The west is getting it all. What has been the condition of affairs in this House during this session? Two-thirds of our time has been taken up with the affairs of the Northwest and of Ontario, and millions of dollars have been spent in the west compared with only thousands in the east. It is true that we have one hundred and seventy-eight items to-day in the estimates for Nova Scotia, but that does not amount to very much. That is only an election dodge. We have only a few items for Prince Edward Island, and the time will soon come when the First Minister will regret the stand he has taken with reference to the east. It is time for him to look to the east and leave the west alone. They have enough. Millions of dollars have been spent and mis-spent in the west, some of which should have gone to the east, and it is time the government realized that fact. It is time the government should take in the branch lines which the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) is interested in. I believe that probably we shall take in those branch lines, but we should build some railways for the people who have built up Canada. We should not concede everything that the people of the west ask for.

Mr. FIELDING. I am much obliged to my hon. friend for the testimony he has given of what the government are doing in the west, and no doubt in the west he includes the middle country, the great province of Ontario. Altogether too much of our time is taken up in debating these matters from a sectional point of view. Hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that the maritime provinces are getting too much and their press circulates the story that this government is favouring the maritime provinces. The speech of the hon. gentleman is a good answer to that charge and no doubt will be made use of.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.) The hon. members for Queens, P.E.I., appear very anxious to get the people of Prince Edward Island to think that the construction of the branch line from Harmony to Elmira will only be on paper and that the government is not sincere. Well, this government has shown its sincerity by its action in the building of railways in Prince Edward Island and other improvements in that province. The senior member from Queens County (Mr. Alex. Martin) condemned the government because it only built sixty miles of railway in that province the last few years, but that is far more than the previous government did. The late government brought in a resolution on April 21, 1906, when parliament was about to expire by efflux of time on the 23rd of that month, to build seven or eight branches of railway on the island, and parliament had only two days in which to consider that and many other matters, and the subject was never mentioned again. But this government proceeds in another and different way. It brings in its Bills to build railways, passes them through the committee stage and makes them the law of the land, and puts the money in the estimates. That is what has been done in this case and in addition we have the word of the Minister of Railways that this branch will be proceeded with this summer.

Now let me say a word or two with regard to the senior member for Queens county, who seems to take special delight in overstating the cost of the Murray harbour branch. Why he does this, I cannot imagine except that he wishes to prejudice the construction of railways in our province in the minds of members from the other provinces. I can know of no other reason. He has repeatedly made the statement this session, which is absolutely incorrect, that the Murray Harbour branch cost over $31,000 a mile or $2,000,000. When I denied that, he asked me if I could give him the figures, and I am now in a position to give them. The total cost of that branch line, including rolling stock, stations, sidings and everything else, was $1,255,495.59 or $23,782.83 per mile, which is about one-third less than the statement made by him. But that is about as near the facts as he generally gets.

My hon. friend the senior member for Queens (Mr. Martin) professes great anxiety for the extension of the Montague branch until it would connect with the Murray Harbour line. I have just to remind him that some two years ago, when I was pressing that matter on the attention of the government, he was the very man who came in with the interruption that I was asking for too much.

Mr. A. MARTIN. You were going to Murray river at that time.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. I was stating that the connection should be made with the line to Murray Harbour.

Mr. A. MARTIN. You said Murray river.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. That statement is about as near the facts as my hon. friend manages to get. That is all I have to say with regard to this matter. This project of an extension of the railway from Harmony to Elmira is bona fide. The line will be constructed. The present government and Minister of Railways are the men to do what they say, and my hon. friend can possess his soul in patience.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.). This is a death-bed repentance on the part of the government with regard to this branch line to Elmira. I do not think it will go down very much with the people, but he thinks he will get a few votes on the head of it.

The Murray Harbour Railway seems to be troubling him. I said it cost nearly $2,000,000 and he questioned that. I asked him what it did cost and he could not tell me, but said it cost $1,200,000, rolling stock and all. From the figures in the Auditor General's Report, it appears that without the rolling stock it cost more than that amount, and with the rolling stock my figures will be nearer correct than his. What petitions has the minister for a branch line from Victoria to North Wiltshire?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not know.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.). Has the minister received any petitions for the extension of the railway from Montague bridge to Eldon ?

Mr. GRAHAM. We have received petitions for the building of several branch lines, but I cannot answer the question. I agree that the people who live where there is no railway are very anxious to have branches.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.). I have a return here and I have also correspondence referring to petitions which have been sent to the department which are not included in this return. I know that petitions were sent for lines from Montague bridge to Eldon and from Victoria to North Wiltshire, but they are not mentioned in this return. What rates will the minister charge on this line when it is built?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is something I am not prepared to say.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.). I told the minister that if he had any feeling of kindness, any milk of human kindness in his breast, he would try and reduce the rates on the railways in that province.

I have here an address by Dr. Andrew McPhail, Principal of McGill, editor of the University Magazine, who lectured a few days ago before the Canadian Club at Charlottetown. Dr. McPhail is well known all through Canada and the United States, one of the prominent men of this continent, a native of Prince Edward Island, of whom that province is justly proud. Dr. McPhail says :

I see that you do not take yourself seriously.

He was talking to the people of Prince Edward Island.

The Dominion provides your railway and the trains run twelve miles an hour.

I hope the minister will hear that—12 miles an hour. Professor McPhail happens to live on a branch line ; if he lived on the main line, he could not say that the Dominion paid for the railway, because the people of Prince Edward Island built the main line.

The Dominion provides your railway and the trains run twelve miles an hour. It is incredible that you will endure it. You pay your share for trains that run at forty miles an hour in the rest of Canada. It only cost me $4 to come half the way from Montreal to Prince Edward Island—it cost me $17 to come the whole way.

What is the matter with your railway system? I presume he travelled on your railway, and he paid $4 for one half the journey and $13 for the other half.

Mr. EMMERSON. Where is the halfway?

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.). You live nearer to it than I do.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Down about Tatamagouche.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.). Where you were born.

Mr. STANFIELD. I object to the hon. member speaking like that.

Mr. FIELDING. The member for Tatamagouche objects.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I did not know he was the member.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.). (reading) :

It cost me 11 cents to go an equal distance from Montreal, it cost me 60 cents to go an equal distance in Prince Edward Island.

He knows what he is talking about ; he can go 20 miles from Montreal for 11 cents, but it cost him in Prince Edward Island, at a 12-knot rate, 60 cents to go an equal distance. I hope the minister is ashamed of himself.

I have something else to refresh his memory. I think this will be the last straw that will break the camel's back.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is nearly broken now.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I have in my possession a letter written to me by a prominent farmer in Prince Edward Island, and he encloses a bill from a condensed milk factory in Charlottetown. This farmer ships every few days milk to that factory. He lives twenty miles away. Here is the memo. of milk received from Mr. J. F. McLeod for the month of May, 1908 :

May, 1908—	Pounds.
4	85
6	88
9	119
11	100
13	106
15	122
18	100
19	108
21	119
22	121
23	94
25	200
26	97
27	112
28	98
29	106
30	117

Now here is the account that the factory sends him :

By 1,892 pounds of milk at $1.20 a hundred, $22.70; freight, $4.25; cheque, $18.45.

The rate, you will see, is 22½ cents per 100 pounds. Now, I hope this case will make a deep impression upon the minister. But I am afraid that all my arguments will prove fruitless. These gentlemen are here only to do something for their friends. They look well after their friends, indeed they give them too much of this country's wealth, and they are sapping the country in every way. I suppose it is useless for me to plead for the sections of country that I have mentioned. The government are squandering the public money on their friends. They squander it in the Northwest, they have sunk enough in the Quebec bridge to build all the railway accommodation Prince Edward Island will require for the next hundred years. The Minister of Railways is getting hardened. He came in with a very good record, but he seems to be getting inoculated with the spirit which animates the government of which he is a member.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES. My hon. friend from Queens (Mr. Martin) persists in overstating the cost of the Murray Harbour Railway. I gave him the full cost of the rolling stock, and he declared that I did not include the rolling stock. I gave him the figures, and I will give them again. The cost of the railway, exclusive of rolling stock, was $1,067,695 ; cost of the rolling stock, $185,407, or in all, $1,253,098, or $23,782 per mile. The hon. gentleman is entirely incorrect in his statement. The only object he can have in view is to prejudice in the minds of the members of this House the claims for the increase of railways in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Your statement is incorrect.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

Mr. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.)

BOUNTIES ON CRUDE PETROLEUM.

Bill (No. 192) to provide for the payment of bounties on crude petroleum—Mr. Fielding—read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 4,

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask the Finance Minister how much it is expected will be paid out of the treasury under the terms of this Bill ?

Mr. FIELDING. I should think not much. There is an enterprise in the province of New Brunswick to which its friends attach some importance and they are hopeful that it will be developed to a considerable extent. I should be very much pleased if their expectations are realized and if we have to pay a liberal sum, but, at all events, we should give them an opportunity of sharing in the bounty in the same manner as they do elsewhere.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 200) respecting the salary of the superintendent of insurance.—Mr. Fielding.

CANADIAN ASSOCIATED PRESS.

Mr. FIELDING moved the second reading of Bill (No. 201) to assist in maintaining an independent and efficient service of telegraphic news from Great Britain for publication in the Canadian press.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understand the minister to say that this was to extend the existing arrangement for two years.

Mr. FIELDING. Except that the existing arrangement is on a sliding scale which averages $12,000 a year ; so that we propose to give them the average for two years.

Mr. TAYLOR. I heard my hon. friend the leader of the opposition saying that he had some correspondence with respect to this Bill and perhaps it would be as well to let it stand.

Mr. FIELDING. I thank my hon. friend for the suggestion. We will let it stand.

Motion withdrawn.

THE AUDITOR GENERAL.

House in committee to consider the following proposed resolution :

Resolved, that it is expedient to provide that the Auditor General be paid a salary of $5,000 per annum.

Resolution reported, read the second time and agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 208) respecting the office of Auditor General.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first and second times and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. FIELDING. In this Bill we change the salary and we insert a section for the purpose of preserving to the Auditor General the right of promotion which, under the existing law, belongs to him now, so that there may be no change in that respect. The Governor in Council makes the appointments, but promotions have always been within the authority of the Auditor General, and as it seems that under the new Civil Service Act there may be some doubt in that respect, we are making it clear.

Mr. DANIEL. Is that the right of promotion personally or the promotion of the clerks in his office ?

Mr. FIELDING. The promotion of his clerks. The office of the Auditor General, being regarded as somewhat different from an ordinary departmental office, the practice in the past has been that he should be allowed to make promotions. It would come as my duty to report these promotions to council, but I have no voice in making them. We preserve that right to him because he is an officer of parliament and not an ordinary departmental officer. This is the law now and, as the civil service law might interfere with it, we preserve the right of promotion.

Mr. BLAIN. Who fixes the salaries of the clerks ?

Mr. FIELDING. The salaries will be fixed as required by the Civil Service Act, but promotions will be made by the Auditor General himself.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT AMENDMENT.

House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution :

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Canada Shipping Act, chapter 113, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, by repealing section 958 and substituting therefor—

958. The Governor in Council may from time to time,

(a) by order in council declare that the foregoing provisions of this part shall not, while such order in council is in force, apply, either throughout Canada or in any specified waters of Canada, to the ships or vessels, or to any specified ascertained or ascertainable class or number of the ships or vessels of any foreign country in which British ships are admitted to the coasting trade of such country, and to carry goods or passengers from one port to another in such country; and

(b) revoke or vary such order in council.

2. That the Act founded on this resolution shall not come into force until His Majesty's pleasure thereon has been signified by publication in the 'Canada Gazette.'—Mr. Fielding.

Mr. TAYLOR. We will take the resolution now and the discussion can take place upon the Bill.

Mr. FIELDING. Quite so.

Mr. EMMERSON. What is the explanation of this ?

Mr. FIELDING. The purpose of the Bill may be briefly stated. We have been granting coasting privileges to the ships of a number of foreign nations which in return have given us the privilege of coasting in their own land. There is nothing in this Bill about American vessels because the United States do not give us coasting privileges. However, in the case of Norway for instance, we have no coasting trade there and the privilege they give is no advantage to us. Norway, on the other hand, has been making much use of our coasting trade and the complaint is that our native vessels are placed at a disadvantage in that respect. An order in council some months ago provided that on the 1st of January next the privileges granted to these various countries, including Norway, should be cancelled and that thereafter their vessels should not be entitled to our coasting trade. We will probably all agree that is a desirable policy. But it has been represented to us by the coal companies that this would be a hardship upon them. They say the Norwegians have been supplying vessels of a special class intended for the coal trade and that if we should suddenly determine that these vessels are to be shut out of the coasting trade it will not be possible for them in the short time allowed to find either Canadian vessels or British vessels to do the work. They also say they have a number of vessels which have been chartered for several years, and the cancellation of these charters would be a very serious loss to them. It has been suggested that we might meet their views by giving them the privilege of employing vessels of a certain class which do not come into competition with Canadian vessels. We have discovered that under the existing law, while we have the power to shut out foreign vessels altogether, we have not the power to say that a particular class of these vessels shall be admitted. What we propose by this legislation is to give the government the power not only to exclude them altogether, but to discriminate and to say that we may admit vessels of a certain class, these being the vessels which do not come into competition with Canadian vessels. We might allow them the coasting trade for a limited time until arrangements can be made to supply their places with British vessels. We could not even say un-

der the present law that we would admit a vessel to the coasting trade of the Atlantic but not to the coasting trade of the Pacific, or the great lakes, and so on. This legislation proposes that there should be elasticity to enable the government to meet the particular conditions as they arise. The general policy of the government is to exclude these vessels from the coasting trade, but under this amendment, which cannot take effect until authorized by the imperial authorities, we would have the power to make exceptions for a limited time if we so desire in such cases as I have mentioned.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the class of vessels be decided on by the tonnage?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. DANIEL. Either steam or sail?

Mr. FIELDING. There is no distinction in the law as respects steam or sail.

Mr. DANIEL. Under this the government would be able to allow Norwegian vessels of a certain tonnage to engage in the coasting trade.

Mr. FIELDING. And exclude these of a smaller tonnage.

Mr. DANIEL. I presume we have no Canadian vessels to do the trade?

Mr. FIELDING. Not in the case of the larger vessels, certainly.

Mr. EMMERSON. Is it a fact that these vessels are manned by Norwegians?

Mr. FIELDING. I should think so.

Mr. EMMERSON. Is it a fact that year in and year out they do a Canadian coasting business ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, the coal trade is largely handled by them. In some cases they are of English build for Norwegian account, owned and manned by Norwegians and under the Norwegian flag ; sometimes they are owned by Englishmen but sail under the Norwegian flag and so are treated as foreigners.

Mr. STANFIELD. I notice in the newspapers that these foreign steamers are given a preference over Canadian ships in loading at the coal mines. Could not we protect those Canadian vessels in this legislation ?

Mr. FIELDING. That is a different question from the one dealt with by this Bill. The complaint there is that steamers are given preference over sailing ships and the steamers would be given preference whether they were British or Norwegians. I believe there was considerable trouble about that matter, but I am advised it is all adjusted now and that there is no complaint.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have a long letter from a sea captain resident in Westmoreland who sails a British vessel and his great complaint is that his vessel was discriminated against in favour of the Norwegian steamers. In that way, if this permission is given, there is some ground for the exception taken. I am not familiar with the circumstances myself, but it seemed to be a matter for the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and I submitted the complaint to that department.

Mr. FIELDING. I think it is not a question of discrimination between the Canadian vessel and the Norwegian vessel, but a question between the sailing vessel and the steamer. However, while there was some cause of complaint in the past, I understand that it has been largely, if not wholly, removed.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. The Minister of Finance states that Norwegian vessels have been chartered for the coal trade for several years. I want to know whether that is the reason for the passing of this Act, because I think that these Norwegians should not control the shipping trade of the maritime provinces as they do to-day.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Nonsense.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I know that is correct. I do not care whether it is Sydney, or Inverness, or Pictou ; and I tell the Minister of Finance that he should not take the opinion of men who are interested in one particular locality. He knows that the men engaged in this business cannot get a cargo if a Norwegian vessel intervenes, whether it is half loaded or fully loaded.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I rise for the purpose of letting my hon. friend know that his information is entirely incorrect, for this reason, that having been in my county within the last two weeks and knowing that my hon. friend and some other gentlemen here had been complaining of the difficulty of schooners from Prince Edward Island and elsewhere getting coal expeditiously, the managers of both mining companies informed me that there had not been the slightest delay in the shipments of coal from any of the piers by any schooners that came there so far this summer. In fact, they were anxious to get the trade and to deal expeditiously with any schooners that came there. We have two large piers capable of supplying more coal per day than all the schooners of Prince Edward Island could possibly engage in carrying. If my hon. friend will give me a bona fide case of any schooner from Prince Edward Island which has been delayed with a shipment of coal in my county, I will undertake to see that there is a remedy. I can assure him that all the complaints in that regard, so far as Pictou is concerned, are entirely incorrect. There was some difficulty in regard to shipments from the

Inverness Coal Company, and an agitation was worked up on that account; but any complaints with regard to the shipment of coal from the Dominion Coal Company, or from the county of Pictou, are not well founded.

Resolution reported, read the first and the second time, and agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 208) to amend the Canadian Shipping Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 207) respecting certain patents of the Metal Shingle and Siding Company.—Mr. Johnston.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. TAYLOR. What is the business for to-morrow?

Mr. FIELDING. We may take one or two Bills; but I think it more likely that we shall go into Supply and take up the remaining items of the main estimates and then proceed with the supplementary estimates, beginning with civil government and continuing somewhat in the order in which they stand.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1.13 a.m., Saturday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SATURDAY, July 11, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

METAL SHINGLE AND SIDING COMPANY.

Mr. GALLIHER moved that Bill (No. 207) respecting certain patents of the Metal Shingle and Siding Company, Limited, be placed on the Order Paper for the second reading this day be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. GALLIHER moved that in view of the late period of the session Bill (No. 207) respecting certain patents of the Metal Shingle and Siding Company, Limited, be now read the second time and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills. He said: The reason for this motion is that Monday will be the last day of the Private Bills Committee. The Bill has passed the Senate. Its purpose is to allow the company holding the patents to pay now the amount they should have paid some little time prior to this. It was owing to a mistake of the people in their office that the money was not paid when due. The holders of the patent are a Canadian company who have manufacturing establishments at Prescott and Montreal and it was only through inadvertance that the money was not paid in time to the patent office. They have paid all the necessary fees and have been taxed $500 up to the present in fines.

Motion agreed to.

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 210) to amend the Northwest Territories Act. He said: The purpose is to provide means for better trial of causes of action which may arise in the Territories. The proposition is to confer jurisdiction on the courts of the adjoining provinces, Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia, leaving the choice to the plaintiff, but conferring on the courts in each province the power to refuse to entertain the action unless it appears that it can be more conveniently tried by the courts of that particular province than of any other.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

COTE, BOIVIN & COMPANY.

Mr. BERGERON—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. What are the amounts of money paid by the government for each year from 1897 to Coté, Boivin & Cie, merchants at Chicoutimi?
2. During that period were there any amounts paid to Elzear Boivin, surveyor and trader, of Chicoutimi? If so, when, and what amounts?

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

1897-8	
1898-9	$ 52 08
1899-1900	199 00
1900-1	152 26
1901-2	411 74
1902-3	2,076 42
1903 4	2,456 23
1904-5	10,163 00
1905-6	6,981 65
1906-7	6,050 79
1907-8	1,596 23
	$30,139 40

2. Nothing by this department.

The following answer has been given me by my hon. colleague the Minister of Marine and Fisheries :

1. The Department of Marine and Fisheries paid as follows :

1897	Nil.
1898	Nil.
1899	Nil.
1900	Nil.
1901-2	Nil.
1902-3	Nil.
1903-4	Nil.
1904-5	$479 82
1905-6	Nil.
1906-7	Nil.
1907-8	63 25

2. Nothing was paid to Elzear Boivin during the period referred to.

FRENCH TREATY OF 1907.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. How much has actually been spent by Canada in defraying the cost of negotiating the proposed French treaty of 1907, including travelling expenses of ministers and all others connected with said negotiation, including all incidental expenses?

2. Is there still anything unpaid in connection with the expense of negotiating said treaty? If so, what is the amount?

3. What steps has the government taken to ascertain the cause of the non-ratification of the said treaty up to the present date?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) :

1. $9,826.51.

2. No.

3. The government is aware that non-approval by the French Senate of the convention of 1907 is due to opposition of French interests which have thought that the advantages accorded to Canada under the convention were greater than the benefits to France.

DREDGE 'CHALLENGE.'

Mr. BOYER—by Mr. Alexander Johnston—asked :

1. How many yards of material have been taken out last year by the dredge 'Challenge'; and at what place?

2. How many yards of material have been taken out in front of or in the neighbourhood of the G.T.R. Boating Club, on the St. Lawrence river, during last season and by what dredge?

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

1. 38,900 cubic yards at Dorval ; 4,425 cubic yards at Ottawa.

2. (a) 300 cubic yards. (b) Dredge 'St. Louis.'

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY STATION, LAC SAUMON.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. What amount was voted for the Intercolonial Railway station construction in 1904 at Lac Saumon?

2. What was the amount actually expended in the construction of the said station?

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

1. Amount voted in 1903-4 for construction of station and freight shed at Salmon lake, $2,700.

2. Amount actually expended in construction of station, $2,755.

COLCHESTER POINT, - ESSEX.

Mr. CLEMENTS asked :

1. What amount of money to date has the government spent on the stone pier built or being built at Colchester point, Essex county?

2. If not yet completed, what is the estimated cost for completion?

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

1. $7,150.59.

2. Resident engineer reported December 14, 1907, that wharf at Colchester had been completed. Total cost $7,150.59.

FREDERICK FOSTER, KINGSVILLE, ONTARIO.

Mr. CLEMENTS asked :

1. Is one Frederick Foster, recently in charge of the harbour at Kingsville, Ontario, in the employ of the Dominion government?

2. If so, what are his duties, and his salary and expenses, say for the last twelve months?

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

1 and 2. Frederick Foster was employed as foreman of men repairing pier at Kingsville, Ont., March 2 to 14, 1908, twelve days at $3, $36.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—STATION AT RIVIERE TROIS-PISTOLES.

Mr. GAUVREAU—by Mr. Johnston—asked :

Does the government propose constructing a station on the Intercolonial Railway at Rivière Trois-Pistoles during the present fiscal year? If so, when will tenders be asked for?

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). Yes, plans and specifications are now being prepared and as soon as they are completed, tenders will be invited.

MAIL CARRIAGE BETWEEN ANNAPOLIS AND DIGBY.

Mr. LANCTOT—by Mr. Johnston—asked :

1. Was an arrangement made by the government with Geo. E. Corbett for carrying the mails between Annapolis and Digby, Nova Scotia, between 1884 and 1893? If so, was such an arrangement made yearly by tender and contract, or by private agreement with the Post Office Department?

2. What amounts, if any, were paid Mr. Corbett for the years ending June, 1885, 1886, 1887, 1888, 1889, 1890, 1891, 1892, 1893?

3. When did this arrangement, if such existed, cease?

4. Was this mail service undertaken by the Digby and Annapolis Railway? If so, at what date?

5. Is the George E. Corbett, above referred to, the same George E. Corbett who is stated to be the Liberal-Conservative candidate for Annapolis county, Nova Scotia, at the next general federal elections?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

1. (a) Geo. E. Corbett performed mail service by steamer between Annapolis and Digby from August 1, 1883 to July 26, 1891. (b) From August 1, 1884 to December 31, 1886, under temporary agreement. From January 1, 1887 to termination of service under a five years contract.

2.

Year ended June 30,	1885	.. ..	$2,260
" "	1886	....	3,130
" "	1887	....	3,690
" "	1888	....	4,270
" "	1889	....	5,500
" "	1890	....	6,260
" "	1891	....	6,260
" "	1892	....	2,020
" "	1893	.. ..	....

3. July 26, 1891.

4. Yes. July 27, 1891.

5. The department has no information in regard to this matter.

CANADIAN MAILS TO AND FROM EUROPE.

Mr. STANFIELD asked :

1. What quantity of mail matter, destined either for Canada or other countries, arrived via Canadian ports from Europe for the year ending March 31 last?

2. What quantity of mail matter from Europe arrived via New York, Boston, Portland, or other United States ports for the same period, destined for Canada, or to be transmitted over Canadian routes to other countries?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General):

1. and 2. No yearly record is kept of the weight of the mails received in Canada from Europe or any other country. Under the Postal Union Regulations once every six years a census is taken of all mails coming to Canada from other countries, and of all mails going to other countries from Canada for a period of twenty-eight days, either in the month of November or of May, alternately.

The figures so obtained are used for all official purposes, and do away with the necessity of taking figures yearly.

LOAN NEGOTIATED IN LONDON.

Mr. FOSTER—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. What was the amount of the loan recently negotiated in London by the Finance Minister?

2. What were the conditions of issue as to rate of interest, date of redemption, privilege of exchange or extension, or in any other respect?

3. What amount of the issue was subscribed by the public and what underwritten, and how much in all was subscribed for?

4. Will the minister lay the prospectus of the loan on the table of the House?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance):

1. £5,000,000.

2. and 4. All the conditions of the issue are contained in the prospectus, a copy of which will be laid forthwith on the table of the House.

3. The whole of the loan was underwriten. Forty-four per cent of the amount was taken by the outside public and the balance 56 per cent by the underwriters.

TEMPORARY LOANS OR ADVANCES.

Mr. FOSTER—by Mr. Blain—asked :

What temporary loans or advances, at what bank, and at what interest were outstanding or running on May 31 and June 30, respectively?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). On the 31st May, 1908, the following temporary loans were running: £500,000, Bank of Montreal, London, at 4½ per cent, issued August, 1907; £1,000,000, Bank of Montreal, London, at 4¼ per cent, issued January, 1908; $1,000,000, Credit Foncier Franco-Canadien, at 4 per cent, issued February, 1908; $1,000,000, Banque de Paris et des Pays Bas, at 4 per cent, issued February, 1908.

On the 30th June, in addition to the above, the following temporary loans were running: £1,00,000, Bank of Montreal, London, at 3½ per cent, issued June, 1908; 10,000,000 francs, Banque de Paris et des Pays Bas, at 3¼ per cent, issued June, 1908; 10,000,000 francs, Credit Lyonnais, Paris, at 3¼ per cent, issued June 1908.

CUSTOMS RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES.

Mr. FOSTER—by Mr. Blain—asked :

1. What were the receipts from customs for the months of March, April, May and June, respectively, for the years 1907 and 1908?

2. What were the expenditures on capital and current account, respectively, for the same months of the same years?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs) :

1. The customs revenues for the months mentioned were as follows :

March.. ..	$5,744,211 52	$4,830,889 62
April.. ..	4,468,393 97	3,449,947 24
May... ...	5,333,253 63	3,568,691 56
June... ..	5,321,444 83	3,707,229 51

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) :

—	Expenditure Consolidated Fund.		Capital Expenditure, &c.	
	1907.	1908.	1907.	1908.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts
March	4,229,015 42	4,373,021 74	1,033,815 01	2,357,063 92
April	4,551,377 94	4,296,231 38	1,623,114 48	3,421,888 26
May	3,288,402 28	7,062,132 18	3,037,819 35	3,779,995 39
June	4,439,965 78	7,164,606 96	1,693,793 06	2,694,639 62

FRANCO-CANADIAN TREATY.

Mr. TALBOT—by Mr. Johnston—asked :

In view of the reported delay of approval by the French Senate of the new Franco-Canadian commercial treaty, will the government take steps to ask the imperial government to denounce the old treaty respecting trade between France and Canada?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). The non-approval of the convention is very embarrassing to all business interests between France and Canada, as well as in other respects, and creates conditions which, if continued, would probably render the denunciation of the old convention unavoidable. But we do not feel disposed to take action in that direction immediately. We are aware that the French government are loyally using their best efforts to secure approval of the new convention, and it is due to them that we should await for some time the results of their endeavours.

CUSTOMS OFFICERS, WINDSOR, ONT.

Mr. HERRON asked :

1. Is one J. A. Francis, formerly of the town of Essex, Essex county, Ontario, emlong room at Windsor, Ont.; age 40, salary, $700 a year.

Mr. FIELDING.

ployed in the customs at port of Windsor, Ontario ? If so, when was he appointed, what was his age at time of appointment, and what is his salary per year ?

2. Is one Gerald Mooney, of the township of Maidstone, or Sandwich South, in the county of Essex, Ontario, employed in the customs at the port of Windsor, Ontario ? If so, when was he appointed, what are his duties and what is his salary per year ?

3. Is one Ulrich Piché, of the town of Sandwich, county of Essex, Ontario, employed in the customs at the port of Windsor, Ontario ? If so, when was he appointed, what was his age at the time of appointment, what are his present duties, and what is his salary per year ?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs) :

1. J. A. Francis has been employed since July 4, 1908, as a clerk in the customs

2. Gerald Mooney is not employed in the customs at Windsor, Ontario.

3. Ulrich Piché has been employed as a customs preventive officer at Michigan Central Railway station, Windsor, Ont., since July 4, 1908; age, 36 years; salary, $700 a year.

REGULATIONS RE COAL LANDS, TIMBER, HOMESTEAD AND GRAZING AREAS.

Mr. LAKE asked:

1. At what dates were the regulations now in force sanctioned by the Minister of the Interior and put into force in respect of (a) coal lands, (b) timber, (c) homesteads, and (d) grazing areas ?

2. What were the dates of the several orders in council on which these regulations were based since the 1st of January, 1905 ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. (a) Coal lands :

General coal regulations came into force on the 15th day of June, 1907. Regulations for the leasing of coal mining lands in the Rocky Mountains Park of Canada came into force on the 25th day of January, 1908.

Regulations governing the issue of permits to mine coal for domestic purposes

came into force on the 20th day of March, 1897.

The present regulations for the issue of leases of school lands for coal mining purposes were authorized by order in council of December 20, 1907, and came into force on February 8, 1908.

(b) Timber lands :

February 13, 1908.

(c) Homesteads :

The regulations were published and became effective on the following dates:

1st edition—June 21, 1907.
2nd edition—October 1, 1907.
3rd edition—November 15, 1907.
4th edition—June 1, 1908.

(d) Grazing areas :

Saskatchewan and Alberta, October 14, 1905, railway belt, August 25, 1904; grazing regulations for the Yukon Territory came into force on the 2nd day of March, 1901.

2. Coal lands—Date of orders in council :

March 4, 1907.
May 9, 1907.
December 10, 1907.

Timber lands:

December 19, 1907.

Homesteads :

Regulations are based on Dominion Lands Act.

Grazing areas :

Saskatchewan and Aberta, July 27, 1905; March 15, 1907.

Railway belt, June 4, 1904; July 5, 1904.

School lands :

The issue of grazing leases of school lands in Manitoba was authorized by order in council of July 13, 1895, and the regulations came into force on August 17, 1895. The regulations for grazing leases of school lands in the Northwest Territories were authorized by order in council of March 16, 1894, and came into force on April 28, 1894.

The regulations for the issue of grazing permits on school lands for Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta were authorized by order in council of February 22, 1908, and came into force on March 28, 1908.

TECUMSEH PARK BREAKWATER.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Before the orders of the day are called I wish to direct the attention of the Minister of Public Works to a matter which though small is important.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is this for the purpose of asking a question ?

Mr. CLEMENTS. Yes. The breakwater at Tecumseh park has a face of about two feet in width and thousands of children have been playing there and quite recently drowning accidents were narrowly averted. I would ask the minister to have a railing erected.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member will see that is not a question.

AUDIT AND INSPECTION OF BANKS.

Mr. R. A. PRINGLE (Cornwall). I ask the Minister of Finance whether there is any possibility of legislation this session towards government inspection or an independent audit of banks. In view of the failures which have taken place lately in the province of Quebec and the rumours that some others are pending, and in view of the fact that the reports returned to the government have been shown to be absolutely unreliable, has the minister in view any amendment by which at least we can get from our banks such a report as is obtained in other countries, sworn to by an official of the bank so that the public may know these reports are correct, and that they are not as every failure has proven, absolutely incorrect ? It is important that some steps should be taken in that direction.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). With regard to independent audit, there is no need of any legislation respecting that. One of our large banks has now a system of independent audit carried out under the present Banking Act and there is no reason why any other bank may not avail itself of the same privilege if it regards it as important. As to bank inspection, I repeat what I said a few days ago : that it is a question of the utmost importance as to which I am willing to have an open mind, although I have rather the impression that it would not accomplish the purposes its advocates have in view. It is a very large and important question which may properly be considered in connection with the general revision of the Bank Act. I do not think there is sufficient information as to the value of bank inspection, as adapted to our Canadian system, to warrant us at this stage of the session introducing special legislation. The conditions in Canada, with its very many branch banks, are so different from the conditions in the United States where bank inspection exists, that even if it were successful in the United States it would not necessarily be successful in Canada, and there is a question as to whether it has been successful in the United States. I do not care to say more than that at present. I realize the importance of the subject and believe it is well worthy of consideration in connection with the general revision of the Bank Act which must be taken up at no distant day.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Even if we had nothing more in Canada than a head office inspection it might be very useful. It would be a task of very great difficulty to effectively and thoroughly inspect the enormous number of branches throughout Canada. The difficulties in the past have arisen in almost every case from the lack of any inspection at the head office of the bank.

Even if we eventually went so far only as inspection of the head office it might be a very great safeguard against the repetition of certain occurrences in the past.

Mr. FIELDING. There is much force in the suggestion and all these things are worthy of consideration. If we had a system of head office inspection, then if there was any crookedness it would not take place at the head office but at some other office.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps so, but I do not think it would quite work out in that way.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—HON. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). Mr. Speaker, in a pamphlet widely circulated throughout the country entitled 'Facts for the People,' I read at page 17 :

Ministers oppose exclusion.

Two remarkable statements were made on this question in the session of 1908 by Mr. Lemieux, Postmaster General, and Minister of Labour, recently government delegate to Japan, and by Mr. Fisher, Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Lemieux said:

The policy expressed by the leader of the opposition during his campaign in western Canada, last fall, was a policy of complete exclusion. He argued before the British Columbians that if he were in power he would have a white British Columbia, which I understand to mean the exclusion of oriental labour, and which applied to the case in hand, means the exclusion of the Japanese.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Might I ask the hon. minister whether his policy is not for a white British Columbia?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, Sir, (Hansard 1908, page 2145).

It is true I gave this answer but I explained that answer immediately afterwards as the leader of the opposition will see from the following quotation from 'Hansard':

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Might I ask the hon. minister whether his policy is not for a white British Columbia?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, sir.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is not?

Mr. LEMIEUX. My policy is to respect the treaty to which we have adhered unconditionally and unreservedly, relying, as regards immigration, on the assurances which have been given by the Japanese government. It is very easy for the hon. gentleman to provoke an answer, yea or nay, on the question whether there should be a white British Columbia or a yellow one, but the fact is staring us in the face that not only since this government has been in power but during the time of the previous Conservative government a large influx of yellow labour has gradually settled in that province. The policy of this government is for the restriction of oriental labour into British Columbia.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

So you see, Mr. Speaker, my answer was a qualified answer and when quoted only in part as in this pamphlet it does not convey my meaning or give correctly the impression which I sought to leave on the House at the time.

TECHNICAL SCHOOLS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I presume it is too late to expect any legislation this session with regard to the subject of technical schools or industrial education. I would like to inquire whether or not the government intend to take any action along that line in the near future by inquiry through commission or otherwise.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is not proposed to do anything further this session.

OLD AGE PENSIONS.

Mr. PRINGLE. I wish to ask the Postmaster General who is chairman of the Old Age Pension Committee, whether there is any possibility of that committee making progress before the session closes? I fully recognize that the business of the House has been very pressing, but I would like to know if there is any possibility at all of further progress being made this session.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). We had three sittings of the Old Age Pension Committee when the morning sessions of the House began, and the business became so strenuous that it was found impossible to reconvene the committee. I have arranged with Mr. Blue, Dominion Statistician, Professor Shortt, Mr. Acland and Mr. Mackenzie King (who unfortunately was absent when the committee sat) to prepare some evidence which would be valuable, but I hardly believe that the committee can meet this session. The work of the committee might well be resumed next session of parliament when we might perhaps make favourable progress.

ACCIDENT TO CORNWALL CANAL.

Mr. PRINGLE. I had understood that the Cornwall canal was open to navigation, but I have been informed this morning that some difficulty was being encountered through their not being able to remove some rocks.

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). I have not heard of that. I received a message from the engineer in charge this morning and he did not make any reference to it. I had a message yesterday that the boats had started to lock through, and it was expected that everything would be fully completed last evening at six o'clock.

Mr. PRINGLE. I heard from Cornwall this morning that there was some difficulty.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have not heard of it.

PURCHASE OF SEED OATS.

Mr. BLAIN. When may I expect an answer to the question I put yesterday with regard to the purchase of seed oats?

Mr. OLIVER. On Monday.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—PICTOU BRANCH.

Mr. STANFIELD. When may I expect an answer to question No. 1 which has been standing on the Order Paper since June 25?

Mr. GRAHAM. These questions which involve details have to be sent to Moncton to get the information. I asked by wire yesterday for a reply as quickly as possible.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When will the Minister of Public Works lay on the table the return I moved for early in the session as to the cost of buildings?

Mr. PUGSLEY. On Monday.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—RIGHT OF WAY IN MADAWASKA.

Mr. PIUS MICHAUD (Victoria, N.B.). I would ask the Minister of Justice if any claims for payment of compensation for right of way in connection with the construction of the Transcontinental Railway through the county of Madawaska, N.B., have been placed in his hands to be settled? If so, how many, and what is the intention of the minister in respect to these claims? There are numbers of these claims in the hands of local solicitors, and my advice to the Minister of Justice would be to settle them as soon as possible.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). The matter is in the hands of the Department of Justice for arrangement. Some 30 claims for payment to land owners through whose properties the line of the Transcontinental Railway in the county of Madawaska passes have been sent to the Department of Justice by the commissioners with instructions to arrange for fixing the true amount of the compensation to be paid. Some of these have already been settled by consent arrangement between the department and the land owners interested, and all that have not been so settled will be placed in the Exchequer Court at once for settlement of the amount to be paid in ordinary course.

SUPPLY—COST OF THE NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways). A few evenings ago the leader of the opposition made a statement concerning the cost of the great transcontinental highway from Prince Rupert to Moncton which has received wide publicity, and which I am bound to say has been given a publicity that is not fair to the House, to the government, to the leader of the opposition nor to the country. Might I make a very brief personal allusion; I find that some of my friends of the press misstated my own position on the occasion when the leader of the opposition delivered his speech, and intimated that for some dark reason either of ignorance or discourtesy I neglected to reply to my hon. friend. As a matter of fact, at the request of the member for North Toronto, made a short time previously—made across the floor of the House openly—I had agreed that I would not make my statement that evening, and while at that time I had no idea the leader of the opposition was going to make his statement, still I thought it better to take the risk of being placed in an embarrassing position than to break faith with the member for North Toronto. In order that time may be saved when we get into committee I shall give a few facts concerning the present position of the Transcontinental Railway including the Grand Trunk Pacific or western branch and the eastern division from Winnipeg to Moncton owned and being constructed by the government. The following memorandum is prepared by Mr. Schreiber chief engineer of the western division, and is dated May 31, 1908, so that it will contain the information up to a recent date:

Total length of western division:

	Miles.
Prairie section..	916
Mountain section..	839
	1,755

Contractors for grading, &c.

	Miles.	Amount.
Treat & Johnston, Winnipeg to Portage la Prairie..	53	$ 200,000
McDonald, McMillan & Company, Portage la Prairie for 275 miles..	275	1,672,000
Treat & Johnston, Qu'Appelle valley (covered by above)..		298,400
Canadian White Company, 275th mile to 2 miles west of South Saskatchewan river ..	144	770,000
Foley Brothers, Larson & Company, 2 miles west South Saskatchewan river to North Saskatchewan river..	318	2,500,000

	Miles.	Amount.
Canadian White Company, North Saskatchewan river to half a mile west thereof..	½	$ 29,000
Foley, Welch & Stewart, 6 miles east of Edmonton to Wolfe creek..	125½	1,200,000
Foley, Welch & Stewart, 100 miles east of Prince Rupert	100	3,200,000
Total miles grading under contract..	1,016	$9,869,400
Contractors for steel bridges.. ..		$ 1,463,400
Total approximate cost..		11,332,800

From Winnipeg to Battle river the grading and bridging is practically completed, being a distance of 675 miles. From Battle river to Edmonton about 54 miles of grading, &c., is completed.

The work of fencing, tracklaying, ballasting and telegraph line is being done by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway by days labour; there are only 55 miles of fence built; the track is laid from a point about 30 miles west of Winnipeg for a distance of 520 miles; the line is practically ballasted for a distance of 160 miles and 271 miles of telegraph line is erected.

I want to call the attention of hon. gentlemen to the fact that this report rather confirms my statement often made that large companies do not always have their work done by contract; and members who insist on calling for tenders and giving contracts as a panacea for all the evils that may exist in a public or a private work in my opinion are wrong. This great company is doing a large portion of this work by day labour.

Mr. HAGGART. That is only ballasting and track laying.

Mr. GRAHAM. The work of fencing, track laying, ballasting and building telegraph lines.

Mr. HAGGART. Those are always done by day labour.

Mr. GRAHAM. If they are always done by day labour, it must be right; consequently it bears out exactly what I state. Now, the length of the Transcontinental line from Moncton to Winnipeg is 1,803·55 miles, or, if we include the Quebec bridge, 1,804·66 miles. The length of the Quebec bridge is merely added to the distance, as it is not a part of the Transcontinental Railway proper. The estimated cost of the 1,803·55 miles is $63,427 a mile, or a total of $114,393,765.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In the first return brought down the cost per mile is estimated at $63,427, which I presume is correct. In the second return the cost is sometimes referred to as $63,437, which I presume is a clerical error.

Mr. GRAHAM. My own opinion is that $63,427 was the original figure. In my memorandum '2' is used in one place and '3' in another. The estimate of $63,427 a mile does not include any allowance for interest; nor for shops at Moncton; nor for the branch line at the Quebec bridge to the terminals at Quebec, though it does include the divisional yard at the northerly end of the bridge; nor for terminals at Winnipeg; nor for shops east of Winnipeg. For terminals at Moncton the sum of $97,000 is included for a terminal yard. With regard to shop accommodation, it is presumed that an arrangement will be made for the joint use of the new shops of the Intercolonial Railway. If so, the Transcontinental share of the capital expenditure on them is estimated at $750,000, or, at 4 per cent interest, $30,000 a year. The terminals at Quebec will include the cost of the line from the Quebec bridge to Champlain market, Quebec, say six miles, and terminals at the market at an estimated cost of $2,000,000. For the shops east of Winnipeg the estimate is $1,500,000. With regard to terminals at Winnipeg by agreement of the 1st of March, 1907, confirmed by the Act, chapter 52 of that year, between the Canadian Northern, the Grand Trunk Pacific and the government, an arrangement is made to which I shall refer in a moment. The whole of the lands of the Canadian Northern Railway on the Winnipeg side of the Red river, together with the buildings, fixtures, improvements, tracks and facilities, will be jointly used by the Canadian Northern, the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Transcontinental Railways, with equal rights for passenger and local freight business. The chief engineer of the Transcontinental Railway states that the area of these terminal lands is: For the yard, 76·46 acres; for right of way of transfer railway, 2·72 acres; total 79·18 acres.

As to the question of the probable date for the completion of the railway between Moncton and Winnipeg, the department is advised by the chief engineer of the Transcontinental Railway that in his opinion, if contracts for the remaining portions of the line are awarded before the middle of September next, and the labour market remains anything like what it is at present, there should be no difficulty in fully completing the line by the 1st of December, 1911.

At the risk of being tedious I want to lay before the House a statement of the contracts which have been let on the eastern division between Winnipeg and Moncton. The number of miles under contract is 1,227·93, made up as follows:

Location	Miles let.	Estimated Cost per mile.
Moncton to near Chipman.....	50.00	$ 41,995
At Chipman..	8.55	83,570
Chipman to Intercolonial railway crossing..	39.05	32,573
Intercolonial railway crossing to mile 164..	66.40	45,341
Mile 164 to Grand Falls..	31.80	110,172

	Miles	Estimated cost per let. mile.
Grand Falls to New Brunswick boundary..	60.88	51,130
New Brunswick Boundary to 150 miles east of Quebec bridge..	53.06	65,771
From Quebec bridge 150 miles eastward..	148.89	
Quebec bridge link (not included in estimate)..	1.11	65,370
Quebec bridge, westerly..	196.33	104,589
Near Harricanaw river to junction with Toronto and Northern Ontario..	150.00	46,842
Junction Toronto and Northern Ontario railway for 100 miles west..	100.00	59,425
From 19½ miles west of Mud river, easterly 75 miles.. ..	75.00	46,454
Lake Superior junction to west bank Red river..	246.86	85,003

The number of miles yet to be contracted for is 576·73, for which the following is the estimate :

Weymontachene to near Harricanaw river..	221.68	$58,058
From 100 miles west of Junction of Temiskaming and North Ontario Railway to west end of district 'D'..	44.10	63:254
From west end of district 'D' westerly..	162.50	37,000
From 19½ miles west of Mud river to west end of district 'E'.:	20.41	33,480
From west end of district 'E' to Lake Superior junction..	128.04	55,943
Total..	576.73	

Average cost per mile, $63,427; for 1,803.55 miles, total, $114,393,765.

I might add to that the fact that on this eastern section there are 228 bridges, making something over 10 miles, which makes quite an addition to the cost of the railway over a railway that would not have this very expensive construction.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The cost of bridges is all included?

Mr. GRAHAM. The cost of bridges is included in the figures I have given, but I am pointing out the large number of bridges which helps to swell the cost. The total amount paid to the different contractors on the eastern division is as follows:

1906-7..	$ 3,160,954 11
1907-8..	13,190,985 54
1908-9..	2,591,750 73
Total..	$18,943,690 38

In order that hon. gentlemen may understand something that I will have to say a little later on, I will have to trespass upon the good nature of the House while I read a digest of the Winnipeg terminals agreement. It is as follows:

Partial digest of principal government privileges and liabilities under the Winnipeg terminals agreement of March 1, 1907, confirmed by the Act of 1907, chapter 52 (schedule).

Clause 48.—The agreement is valid for 999 years, dating from January 1, 1907.

Clause 3.—The government, the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Northern have the joint use and enjoyment of the 'joint terminals,' which are defined by section 1 as the lands, premises and facilities, including the transfer and industrial tracks and sidings shown on a certain identified plan; also any additional lands, premises and facilities thereafter acquired as extensions, and including freight sheds, warehouses, engine house, water tanks, turntables, coach tracks, car tracks, telegraph lines and all other buildings, improvements and facilities, furniture, equipment, locomotives and plant supplied in that connection.

Clause 12.—The value of the lands, exclusive of buildings, fixtures, tracks, improvements and facilities, is fixed at $2,625,000.

Clause 13.—On this sum the government and the Grand Trunk Pacific, pay, in equal shares, ½ of 4 per cent, until and whilst the Grand Trunk Pacific operates the eastern division as lessee; but if ceasing to so operate, then the Grand Trunk Pacific and the government, each, pay ⅓ of 4 per cent.

Clauses 5 and 13.—For the buildings, tracks, yards, structures and facilities shown on a certain identified plan, or on other plans, as may be agreed on, the Grand Trunk Pacific and the government pay in equal shares ½ of 4½ per cent, of the cost, or, if the Grand Trunk Pacific cease to operate the eastern division, one third each.

Clauses 8 and 13.—For additional buildings, improvements, or facilities, the necessity for which is agreed upon by the parties—or decided on by arbitration under clause 38—the Grand Trunk Pacific and the government pay, in equal shares, ½ of 4½ per cent, of the cost, or if the Grand Trunk Pacific cease to operate the eastern division, then each pays ⅓.

Clauses 10 and 13.—For temporary additional tracks and facilities required to be provided, pending the completion of those contemplated in clause 5, the Grand Trunk Pacific and the government pay in equal shares ½ of 4½ per cent on the cost; or, if the Grand Trunk Pacific cease to operate the 'eastern division,' one-third each.

Note. Clause 49.—For the first seven years of the lease of the eastern division to the Grand Trunk Pacific the compensation payable is to be borne wholly by the government, and, thereafter, for 43 years, the Grank Trunk Pacific repays, annually, to the government, by way of rental, the amount payable by it to the Canadian Northern.

Clauses 13 and 26.—The government, at its option, may become interested in a station hotel—and the expenditures and receipts in that connection are apportioned.

Clause 3.—The joint terminals will be managed by a board composed—while the Grand Trunk Pacific continues to operate the eastern division—of one representative of the Canadian Northern and one of the Grand Trunk Pacific; but if not so operating, then, if a board is deemed necessary, by representatives of the Canadian Northern, one of the Grand

Trunk Pacific and one of the government. The powers and jurisdiction of the board are defined in clauses 15 and 16, and certain subsequent clauses. These powers are to be exercised 'without unfair preference or discrimination.' Each representative will be paid by his own company, but the expenses of the board and its employees will be paid as part of the operation of the terminals.

Clause 17.—The monthly expenses of maintenance, repairs and operation of the terminals will be borne by the Canadian Northern and Grand Trunk Pacific, so long as it is lessee of the Eastern Division, and by the Canadian Northern, the Grand Trunk Pacific and the government, otherwise), 'companies,' in proportion to the number of vehicles and engines on their passenger trains, respectively (empties entering to take up, or leaving after discharging passengers not to be counted) the minimum charge to the Grand Trunk Pacific and the government together, to be, for the first five years, not less than 25 per cent and thereafter not less than 40 per cent of such expenses; and, as to freight, in proportion to the number of tons of freight handled for them, respectively, by the terminal staff. Insurance premiums will be borne by the companies in equal shares.

Clause 49.—The payments to be made by the government 'to the Canadian Northern or otherwise,' under this agreement are not to be included in the 'working expenditure' payable by or chargeable against the Grand-Trunk Pacific, under clauses 14 and 20 of the agreement of the 29th of July, 1903, (confirmed as a schedule to the Act of 1903, chapter 71), for the leasing to the Grand Trunk Pacific of the Eastern Division between Moncton and Winnipeg, when it becomes such lessee. (This clause 20 provided that, for the first seven years of the lease the company should operate the division, subject only to payment of 'working expenditure.'

With regard to the compensation payable by the Grand Trunk Pacific and the government 'in equal shares,' to the Canadian Northern, for the joint terminals (viz. ½ of 4 per cent on $2,625,000 and ½ of 4½ per cent on buildings, tracks and facilities under clauses 5, 8, 10 and 13 (a) and (b)—clause 49 goes on to provide that, prior to the execution of the lease of the Eastern Division to the Grand Trunk Pacific this compensation shall be paid by the Transcontinental Railway Commissioners, and form part of the 'cost of construction' of the Northern division, and for the first seven years of the lease such compensation shall be wholly borne by the government; the Grand Trunk Pacific, for the next 43 years, repaying annually to the government, by way of rental, the amount of the said compensation.

Clause 38.—Provision is made for settlement of disputes or differences, by arbitration.

Clause 49.—The government interest in the terminals, is made an integral part of the Eastern Division.

I call attention to that clause particularly because it shows that there is to be a deduction made from the amount stated by the hon. leader of the opposition as being chargeable to the Transcontinental Railway Commission. The amount paid in in interest by the Transcontinental Railway is afterwards returned by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When I computed that I made the capitalization out at $1,220,000. The minister pointed out at the time that there might be some deduction from that. Is he prepared to state just what the sum payable by the government with respect to these terminals will amount to?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am coming to that in a few moments as I have the figures. Now, I want to take up the figures of my hon. friend. I am free to admit that I did not get the impression from him that went to the country that the road from Moncton to Winnipeg would cost $250,000,000, but, in some unaccountable way his friends of the press have made my hon. friend say that all over Canada. I just pick up a paper, which is an independent paper published in the city of Ottawa, and I find this gross exaggeration:

STAGGERING COST OF THE TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Moncton-Winnipeg portion estimated by the government at $51,000,000 will cost the country $250,000,000.

That is the Ottawa 'Journal's' heading, and the same thing has appeared in several papers. In discussing these figures, I shall first point out the fallacy of the statement, so that the people may know that certain papers, in endeavouring to criticise the government have actually manufactured something a great deal stronger than even the estimate of the leader of the opposition. These statements, in justice to everybody, ought to be refuted. It will take some time for the correction to catch up, but I will try to make it strong enough so that it will have force to catch up when once started. Take the figures of my hon. friend to show what foundation there is for this heading:

Cost of construction from Moncton to Winnipeg, $114,393,765.

With that I have no quarrel. Then he goes on to estimate that, allowing five years for period of construction, the interest on the money paid will amount to $10,009,754.

With that I am not going to quarrel either. That makes a total of $124,403,219. I may say however that in estimating the amount of subsidy to be paid on any railway, the government never allows interest during construction to be added to the cost. We take the construction of the road without the interest, not as a matter of law but as a matter of policy. In the contract with the Grand Trunk Pacific, however, the interest on the cost of construction is to be added to the cost.

Then I come to the figure of $26,124,676 for the interest during seven years on the line from Moncton to Winnipeg during

which the Grand Trunk Pacific pay no rental. But in this connection I want to point out that the total amount of that interest will not be payable until 1918, and that if we are absolutely to compute it at present at its face value in ten years from now, we are giving the government and the country any disadvantage there might be in that computation. However that is a small matter, and I shall not deduct anything at present on that account, although if we make the computation at the moment, we will find that the amount of $26,124,676, which is to accumulate at simple interest in ten years from now, ought not to be chargeable at its full face value at present.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would recognize at once the force of my hon. friend's observation if I had been adding interest annually upon the annual amount of rental which is to remain unpaid, but I have not done that. I have not included one dollar of interest which might be charged and be considered as compound interest. My hon. friend's observation would be a perfectly proper one if I had been charging interest on these annual amounts, but I have not done so.

Mr. GRAHAM. I carefully considered that while my hon. friend was speaking; and while it is not a large amount he will agree that if you take $26,124,676 to-day and place it at interest, we would have quite a balance left after completing the last payment which holds due 10 years hence. Then my hon. friend added this item to his calculation:

Also interest at 3 per cent for three years additional during which no rent is collectable unless earnings are sufficient, $11,196,290.

I want to point out that if this be payable, it will not be payable until 1911. But I am going to strike out that item altogether. It must go out unless we are prepared to take the position that the Transcontinental, after the seven years during which no rent is collectable will not be able to pay its way. If we take that position we ought to put in the 3 per cent. Possibly I may be an optimist but I believe that optimists within reason are the best class of people for the country. Taking the history of the Dominion during the past few years, taking the rapid development of our western country and the rapid expansion on every hand, I believe that everything is in favour of my contention that at the end of seven years the Grand Trunk Pacific will be able to pay its way and we will not have to pay that 3 per cent. Discussing that point with an eminent railway man not many hours ago, he said: If at any time during that period or at the end of that period, the Grand Trunk Pacific should not want to go on with that arrangement, you will find no difficulty in getting one or two other railway companies ready to take over the contract. Therefore we must strike out the $11,196,290 in all fairness.

My hon. friend put in the cost of the Quebec bridge. Well, the Quebec bridge forms no part and never did, so far as the estimate of cost is concerned, of the Transcontinental Railway. That bridge was a project before there was any question of the Transcontinental Railway. It was decided that that bridge would have to be built for the other railways; and when it is constructed it will be used, not only by the Transcontinental Railway but by every other railway which wants to do business via Quebec. It will form not merely a link in the Transcontinental but in every other railway running from east to west. While the Transcontinental will use it, it was being built as a different proposition altogether, and would have to be built even if we had never undertaken to construct the Transcontinental. You have therefore to deduct from the cost of the Transcontinental this amount of $14,422,238 put in by my hon. friend as the cost of the Quebec bridge.

Now I come to another point in which I differ with my hon. friend. In his statement he gives this item:

Estimated cost of our share of terminal at Quebec, Winnipeg and Moncton and shops east of Winnipeg, $5,470,000.

He therefore added that, under the terms of the agreement which I have stated; but under that agreement a certain share of percentage is to be paid each by the government and Grand Trunk Pacific for the terminals in the city of Winnipeg, and I need not add anything further to prove that my hon. friend should not have taken into his calculation any such amount as this.

Let me take the cost of the terminals at Moncton and call attention to this fact. The terminals tracks at Moncton have had an amount of $97,000 placed for them but that is included in the cost per mile and in the larger figure of $114,393,765, so that cannot be again counted.

Then we come to the next point and my hon. friend was not unfair in that respect, but I want to point out that, while not unfair, as far as the country is concerned, his contention is impractical. The Intercolonial Railway is building at present large shops and terminals at Moncton which will cost a large amount of money. The Grand Trunk Pacific expect, and we expect, that the Transcontinental will use these terminals, so that while the amount chargeable direct to the Transcontinental of $750,000 may be considered as capital, every hon. gentleman will see that whatever the Transcontinental pays for the use of these terminals will be paid to the Intercolonial Railway which is building them, and this money which is going from the Transcontinental or the government will come back to the Intercolonial

Railway or practically to the government in another form. So that the country will not be out of pocket one dollar.

Mr. HAGGART. But the hon. gentleman says that the share of the Transcontinental Railway only at Moncton will be $750,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, and I have just said so. But that share, or the interest on it, will not be paid to any person else than the Intercolonial Railway, that is providing the terminus, and the Intercolonial being a government railway we get back the money paid on that account.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But the terminals will be at Moncton just the same as if they were not part of the Transcontinental.

Mr. GRAHAM. The terminals and shops at Moncton are being built by the Intercolonial, in other words by the government, with the object of accommodating the Transcontinental at Moncton. Although we have been criticised for spending a large amount of money at Moncton, it has always been the view that we will not have to spend that money with the Transcontinental. Now, we have to take out the amount my hon. friend would apportion to Moncton. I am putting in $2,000,000 as an estimate for the terminals at Quebec. Now I come to Winnipeg. As I have pointed out, it is improper to put in one farthing for the Winnipeg terminals, as every dollar the government will spend for the Winnipeg terminals has been provided for under the section of an agreement I have read, and this will go into cost of construction, and all that will be chargeable will not be an amount capitalized, as my hon. friend's large figures tended to show, but it will merely be the interest on the interest that the government has paid. That will be during the first seven years.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. During the first seven years the government will pay $48,750 per annum?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will they ever get that back?

Mr. GRAHAM. It all goes into cost of construction, and after seven years it will be repaid.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. After the first seven years they will get interest on it; is that not the case?

Mr. GRAHAM. No. As I said before, all we ought to be chargeable with is interest on the interest, because the total amount we pay in as interest will go into cost of construction, and for seven years we will pay interest on interest, but after that our payments will cease.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think there is a misunderstanding. The government is liable for the payment of $48,750 per annum; the government will pay that during the first seven years. The Grand Trunk Pacific will not be liable in respect of that. My hon. friend says that the government will be reimbursed for those seven payments of $48,750 each, they will receive it back at the end of seven years. He claims that they will receive it back in this way, that it will be then added to the cost of construction.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is correct.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And therefore, after the expiration of the seven years, they will receive interest on that sum at the rental of 3 per cent per annum. Is not that correct?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, I do not think it is.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then what is it?

Mr. GRAHAM. Let me read to my hon. friend the digest from the agreement itself —the last few words:

And for the first seven years of the lease such compensation shall be wholly borne by the government; the Grand Trunk Pacific for the next forty-three years repaying annually to the government, by way of rental, the amount of the said compensation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is exactly what I said. What that means is this—if my hon. friend will pardon me because I want him to understand me—during the first seven years the government pays that annual sum of $48,750. I understood my hon. friend to say that it then is to be added to the cost of construction. But the clause which he read just now does not bear that out; it may be in some other clause. Then for seven years the government continues to pay it; during the remaining forty-three years, in respect to those forty-three annual payments, they are to be reimbursed by the Grand Trunk Pacific. But they do not receive any reimbursement whatever in respect to the first seven payments made by the government, unless, as the hon. gentleman claims, interest thereon as part of the cost of construction. As to that I do not know.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend and I do not see it alike, and we will have to leave it at that. Now, I contend again that it would be a very small amount, if anything, that the country will ever have to pay on the terminals at Winnipeg, consequently I have taken that amount out. Whether my hon. friend is right or wrong, it will not make much difference in my conclusion. But we take the $2,000,000 for Quebec and we take $1,500,000 for the shops east of Winnipeg, and these will make $3,500,000 instead of the $5,470,000. There is another item my hon. friend puts in here and it is that perhaps which led the newspapers astray, the interest to be paid

by the government without recourse on the Moncton section. As we are not dealing with the Grand Trunk Pacific section at all, we must strike from my hon. friend's figures, or from the figures the newspapers published, another $11,304,300.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why does the hon. gentleman strike that out when he is dealing with liabilities?

Mr. GRAHAM. Because my hon. friend did not strike it out, the newspapers went away with the idea that from Moncton to Winnipeg the railway was going to cost us $250,000,000. I am stripping the government section from Moncton to Winnipeg of excessive figures and straightening out the difficulties the papers have got into on account of my hon. friend's statement. I want to get the Moncton to Winnipeg portion righted first, as that is the portion being built by the government.

I find these additions make $38,892,828 or $39,000,000 in round numbers. If I add to the amount the guarantee on the Mountain section and the Prairie section, $58,480,000, I find my hon. friend's newspapers, for some reason, are out just the small sum of $97,048,000 in their computation. Now, I want to ask if it is fair to spread that through the country, particularly when I was bound in honour not to make any reply to straighten out the figures. I think the press supporting the hon. gentleman owes him an apology. He did not make that statement, but they made it, and, so far as I have been able to find out, no person has attempted to correct that misleading and utterly and absolutely false statement. Now, I want to go a little further with this line from Moncton to Winnipeg. Take the interest for the first seven years. I want to make this statement now, that, unlike some bargains made with railways, for the money we spend we own the railway; for the money we spend we will own 1,800 miles of the best transcontinental railway on the continent of America, without one single exception. Large amounts have been given to railways, and we in this parliament give large amounts to railways. But the country must not be allowed to forget that while we spend a large amount of money on the one side, we have got our full value for the money in the railway on the other side of the account. I am prepared to say this to the country, that the Dominion of Canada, any time it desires, can get rid of that portion of the railway at what it will cost the country. The only burden that lies on this country for this railway from Moncton to Winnipeg is the amount that it will cost the country in the way of interest for the seven years, because after that the Grand Trunk Pacific pays the interest and Canada is under no burden whatever. Now, Sir, dealing with it from that point of view, I want to call the attention of the House to a very different situation, and to one in which the country will be interested. The burden of the country, as I said, is the amount it will cost the country in interest on the money invested in this railway, being the interest for seven years of the lease, after which the Grand Trunk Pacific carries the burden itself and Canada has no burden to bear. The interest for the first seven years will be $26,124,676. That includes interest during construction as well. The interest on the $3,500,000 I have estimated for the shops east of Winnipeg and for the terminals at Quebec would be $735,000 for the term, or a total of $26,859,676 of interest that will accumulate during the first seven years of the lease to the Grand Trunk Pacific. I am prepared to make the statement that, making allowance for possible minor inaccuracies in the calculation, broadly speaking, all the burden that is placed on the Dominion of Canada for 1,800 miles of railway is $26,859,676, or if we take the surplus as we had it last year it would wipe out all this interest in about a year and a half.

I wish to carry my hon. friend's conclusion a little further and do as he suggested, instead of leaving the $26,859,676 suppose we borrow the amount at 3 per cent, which would be a business proposition. Then for this 1,800 miles of railway and the benefits to be derived from it Canada would only be burdened $805,770 per year, or less than $1,000,000. Is there anything appalling in those figures? I say the government of Canada, if it had to do the same thing again would be derelict in their duty if they did not construct the railway at that cost.

I do not want to be unfair and at the suggestion of my hon. friend I am going to take in the Mountain division for a little inspection. So far as the government end is concerned, I have stated the burdens of the country. I propose to go into the Mountain section. I have faith in Canada and I am not going to suggest or admit (and I believe the circumstances will warrant me in my conclusion) that this country will ever be called on to buy one cent on the guarantee of bonds on the Grand Trunk Pacific. The development of Canada to-day is such that the country is warranted in believing and does believe, as every hon. member in this House believes, that we will never be called upon to pay one cent of guarantee on the bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific. If Canada is to be a failure, if our great western country has not before it the great future we believe it has, if the industry of the people is not such as we tell the world it is, if our development is not along the lines we all hope it should be, if our great

heritage is not of the abundant wealth we have believed, if the prospects which we hold out to our children about this great Canada of ours are not such as to give us confidence in it, let my hon. friend's figures be taken as correct. But if Canada is the country we believe it is, if the people are the people we think they are, if our development is only on the threshold and if, in the years to come, we expect further development, further progress, there is not the faintest chance or danger that this country will ever be called on to pay one cent on the guarantee of bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific.

I propose to take in the Mountain section and what we have to pay? Take the $26,859,676 interest on the eastern section and the terminals I have mentioned, add $11,304,300 interest without recourse that we have to pay during the first seven years of lease on the Mountain section and we have $38,263,976, for the benefits we receive for a through line from the Pacific ocean to Moncton. If I followed out the same line of argument which the hon. gentleman would say I am justified in following, if instead of taking the $38,263,976 out of revenue we borrowed it at 3 per cent, I find that for the great benefit we will receive this country will have to pay the sum of $1,144,919.28 per year.

Mr. LENNOX. It would be better to borrow again to pay the interest on that and after a while we would have to pay nothing at all.

Mr. GRAHAM. If the hon. member discusses this with railway men he will find they make their calculations just as I do.

Mr. LENNOX. The more they borrow the less they will owe?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend shows that he has not paid much attention to this question.

I have endeavoued to show what the burden of Canada will be for this railway. I now come to the increased cost of this railway. The increased cost is due chiefly to two reasons, first the greater cost of material and labour and second the improvement of the standard of the road over what was intended by the first estimate. I shall read an extract from a memorandum upon this subject given me by the chief engineer of the Transcontinental Railway Commission. In this memorandum he says:

The apparent high cost per mile is accounted for from the fact that heretofore no railway of such a length has, in the first instance, been constructed through a similar country with the low grades and curvatures used by us, viz., 0·4 per 100 feet adverse to eastbound and 0·6 per 100 feet adverse to westbound traffic, excepting at two points, with sharpest curvature 6° (955 feet radius) and permanent structures. I may also add that with very few exceptions all the structures provided for are permanent in character, culverts being of concrete and bridges of steel with concrete substructures.

What follows is very important, coming from the chief engineer:

Had we used grades of 1 per cent in either direction, curves of 10 per cent (573 feet radius) and a large number of timber structures, which has been a common practice heretofore in similar countries, the cost might have been reduced nearly a third, but the operating and maintenance expenses would have been enormously increased.

I have another memorandum made by the chief engineer of the western division giving some information as to increased cost. He says:

A question has arisen as to the estimated cost of construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway prepared in 1907 being so far in excess of the estimated cost made in 1903.

Explanation is simple; the reason is twofold—first, the general increase in cost of labour and materials; and, second, the superior character of the eastern section of the road as being constructed compared with its character as contemplated in 1903.

These are the words of the two chief engineers. The rate of wages for ordinary and skilled labour has increased at least 25 per cent, the cost of lumber, timber and ties has increased 35 per cent.

Mr. BENNETT. Was it ever contemplated that the construction of the road would be commenced in 1903, or was it not expected that the surveys would not be completed for two years and that consequently no work of construction could be commenced until about 1905?

Mr. GRAHAM. If we make an estimate to-day we make it on to-day's conditions and if the conditions change the estimate changes. You ask a man to give you an estimate of the cost of building a house and he cannot tell you what it will cost two years from now. The cost may be cheaper or it may be dearer. He will give you an estimate of what it will cost to-day and if you wait for two years you must take the chances. The cost may go up or it may come down.

The rate of wages for ordinary and skilled labour has increased 25 per cent. The cost of lumber, timber and ties has advanced fully 35 per cent, and the price of steel rails has gone up from $25 to $35 per gross ton, an advance of 40 per cent; there may be other materials, probably are, which enter into railway construction which have not advanced in the same ratio, but the above constitutes the leading and costly features.

The estimate of 1903 was based on a road with maximum grades and curves, and curves of 1,200 feet radius would be more favourable than some curves on the Intercolonial Railway. In fact, the estimate of cost prepared in 1903 was for a road of an ordinary character such as is being constructed elsewhere in Canada.

Again, the structures upon the eastern section (Moncton to Winnipeg) are being built practically all of steel and concrete, of a costly and permanent character, even in the most inaccessible sections of the road, whereas, it is well known that on roads constructed elsewhere in Canada, the structures are largely of timber, and such material was in view in the estimate of 1903.

Mr. FOWLER. Does the minister not know that one of the main reasons put forward for the cost, as given at that time of this work, was that it was to be of such a superior character and, if the minister does not know that, I would refer him to the speech of Mr. Charlton, the then hon. member for North Norfolk, who made the leading speech on the question of the Transcontinental Railway and who put forward, as the leading feature, that it would be a road of lower grades than any other road in Canada.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have just pointed out that the engineer says that, but even if that had been done and that only, it would not nearly have been the road that it is. There is not a road in Canada that runs out in that country that has not a one per cent grade on it.

Mr. FOWLER. If the minister will take Mr. Charlton's speech and take the road as it is to-day, even according to the report of the chief engineer, I will guarantee that the road falls considerably short of what it was stated in Mr. Charlton's speech that it was going to be.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. When Mr. Charlton was making that speech he was referring to a road of the kind that the Grand Trunk Pacific is building to-day, but, when the Grand Trunk Pacific entered into the contract with the government, a condition was that the road was to be equal to the main line of the Grand Trunk Railway. You will not require to find the condition that was agreed to, do more than look at the contract which was entered into.

Mr. FOWLER. What has that to do with it?

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. It has everything to do with it.

Mr. FOWLER. Would the hon. gentleman pardon me a moment?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. The road that was agreed upon was a road equal to the main line of the Grand Trunk Railway. But, when Mr. Charlton made his speech he made it upon a road that never was built in the Dominion of Canada. There is only one road in the United States that has one per cent grades.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Charlton made his speech before the contract was entered into.

Mr. CONMEE. Certainly, but what had Mr. Charlton's speech to do with the standard of the road? He was simply advocating the scheme.

Mr. GRAHAM. Now, kindly allow me to come back. This is the conclusion of the memorandum which I have.

The general result is, of course, a much increased initial cost of construction, though in the ultimate, the greatly extended life of these more stable structures, will compensate for the present expenditure.

If you will allow me to be so bold as to say it, I prefer to pin my faith to what two engineers say rather than to what any person else may say as to the conditions with respect to the extra cost of the road. My hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) insists upon my taking some person else's address. Would he want the country to get its impression of the cost of the work by head lines and reports of hon. gentleman's speeches.

Mr. FOWLER. Take 'Hansard.'

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend agrees that a cost of $250,000,000 is——

Mr. FOWLER. Take 'Hansard' report.

Mr. GRAHAM. I was not referring to 'Hansard.' I was talking about the newspapers .

Mr. FOWLER. I have not had as much experience as the minister has had with newspapers, but I have quite as much faith as he has in them.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have great faith in them if they are not led astray.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think my hon. friend has done the newspapers an injustice in what he has said. I find no discrepancy of $97,000,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. Will my hon. friend say that the statement is correct?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman says there is a discrepancy of $97,000,000 and I cannot find it.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is only a difference of a few millions?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not say that.

Mr. GRAHAM. I would ask my hon. friend if that headline is correct according to his statement?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it correct that he has admitted $114,393,765 for the eastern division, $10,009,454 for interest, $124,403,219 cost of eastern division at completion, $26,-124,676, seven years' interest and $11,196,290 three years' additional interest at 3 per cent?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend, I think, is not treating me fairly now.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am asking my hon. friend a question?

Mr. GRAHAM. The reporter who wrote that article did not write anything that would justify that heading.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am responsible for what I said in the House and not for newspaper head lines.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend was saying that I was unjust to the newspapers.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I still say so.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is only a question of opinion. The reporter who wrote that article did not write anything which would lead any person to put a headline of that kind over it as the article is fairly accurate and the heading altogether inaccurate. If my hon. friend will look at an authority which I might quote, but which I will not take the time of the House to read, he will find that one of the greatest difficulties with the railways on this continent and elsewhere is the fact that they were not properly constructed in the first instance and that while some railways were pushed through and rails laid at a comparatively cheap price, inside of ten or twenty years, these roads practically had to be rebuilt. Railroading in Canada has been so revolutionized during the last five or six years that the principal railways have abandoned in some instances mile after mile in order to get easier grades and better curves. One of the leading railways in the United States, and I refer my hon. friend to the Railway 'Gazette,' has abandoned 109 miles and is rebuilding altogether. I need only call the attention of those hon. members who come from the province of Ontario to the fact that between Montreal and Toronto the Grand Trunk Railway Company has abandoned mile after mile and built a new railway on a new right-of-way in order to get rid of some curves and some heavy grades, and I understand that it is now contemplating getting rid of its track east of Scarborough Heights and getting into Toronto around by the lake to avoid the grade. Why ? In order that the cost of transportation may be cheapened, and that longer trains and heavier loads may be carried, by each locomotive.

I am told that the Canadian Pacific itself, during the past few years, has spent in the reconstruction and the betterment of its grades and curves an amount equal to its entire original capitalization. We find that the Grand Trunk Pacific is now being constructed so that these large amounts of expenditure a few years hence will not have to be made, and as the engineer says, while the initial cost of construction is apparently heavy, the magnificent road bed, the easy grades, the easy curves and the steel structures with concrete foundations will enable this road to start out with a standard of road that some of the leading railroads of America have not yet attained and can only attain after years of running by the expenditure of millions.

I wish to point out just what the increase in the standard of the road means. From Winnipeg to Quebec by this route is 223 miles shorter than by any other, but leaving that out of consideration, suppose we take a standard of five trains each way each day. With the easy grades of 4-10 of 1 per cent against east bound traffic ten trains can carry as much as on an ordinary road could be carried in 20 trains. The saving in this way in one year's operation has been estimated by a competent authority at $2,986,802. This saving will more than counterbalance anything that can be said in reference to the extra cost of construction.

But it may be said that the saving will go to the Grand Trunk Pacific in the cost of operation. It will in a measure but, I want to ask the hon. gentleman, what we are building a road for ? Is it not to improve transportation ? Why do we want to improve transportation ? In order that the products of the people may be carried more quickly and more cheaply from the place of origin to the place of consumption. That being the case, every day means money, every extra car and ton that a railway can carry with the same amount of expenditure means a bigger price on the goods that are hauled, for the people who produce them. Arguing it on that line the people of Canada in the decreased cost of operation on this line, to say nothing of anything else, will reap a benefit far outweighing all the expenditure that Canada can ever be called upon to make on behalf of this country.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has the minister any calculation of the cost of operation of that road during autumn, winter and spring? It has been represented by some persons that it will be a very expensive road to operate on account of the severity of winter storms and the difficulty of getting in supplies, coal, for example.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have not gone into details of coal supply, &c., but have simply taken the difference in the cost of running a road of very superior standard and a road of ordinary standard.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The minister said that the cost of running five trains per day would be about half that of running 10 trains per day. That proportion would hardly hold.

Mr. GRAHAM. It would be approximately correct. So far as coal is concerned, the difficulties of procuring a supply would be the same whether the road were of ordinary standard or of superior standard except that perhaps on this road we could haul heavier loads of coal. The same applies to difficulties on account of weather and snowfall.

As to the cost exceeding the estimate, if hon. gentlemen consult the standard works on railways they will find that without exception the construction of every railway on this continent has exceeded the first estimate. That is also true of the English railways. If the hon. member goes to build a house he will find that it costs more than he estimated. If he had his plans made four years ago and had the house built last year he would find that it cost double.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But in those cases we do not have mountains of information.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think I gave my hon. friends some small hills anyway. What Canada is interested in is not the estimated cost of the work or what somebody has said, but: Are the people of Canada going to benefit greatly from the building of the road? I have endeavoured to show that they will, and I have faith in the country. We have one transcontinental line. Some people thought when it was being constructed that it cost too much money. It has cost a lot, but notwithstanding the fact that it has cost a great deal of money, we do not own any of the road. It is one of the best managed roads on this continent, I am glad to say, and the business of the country has made it a dividend-paying road; that is, when the business of the country was comparatively small. But Canada has reached a new era of development and its business will expand more and more in the years to come. I have faith that the increasing products of the Canadian people and the goods that will be purchased with these products, as well as the traffic flowing from Europe to the Orient and from the Orient to Europe, and the traffic from the United States across the Dominion, will in a few years reach such dimensions that Canada will need to have another transcontinental line built by somebody.

Some people have said that I am too optimistic and take too large a view of this matter. Sir, no country was ever built up by pessimists. If the people who live in a country and have its destiny in their hands, as members of parliament have, have no faith in the country, they ought to get out of the country, at any rate out of parliament. I have faith in the Dominion of Canada. I have faith in its ultimate success; I have faith that it will yet possibly be a nation by itself on this continent; I believe in the resources of the country. I believe the Grand Trunk Pacific Company will never call on the Dominion of Canada to pay one cent of the guarantee of the bonds nor one cent of the 3 per cent interest on the cost of the railway, but that on the contrary the traffic will so crowd this great transcontinental line that in a very few years we shall be compelled to see that another transcontinental line is built from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

I would have liked to have gone further and have said a few words about the waterways, but I feel that I have encroached already too long on the time of the House. But this I want to say in conclusion—Canada has value for the money that she is putting into the Transcontinental Railway and she will own it in her own right from Winnipeg to Moncton, a stretch of more than 1,800 miles. If the interest of the people is what we are looking to, then every dollar we spend in order that the products of the people may reach their market in better condition and at less cost is money well spent and will be returned to the people many fold. I trust that in the discussion of this matter we may deal with it in a broad spirit, and act as Canadians towards a great enterprise which we all believe to be in the interest of the entire people of the Dominion of Canada.

At one o'clock, House took recess.

Committee resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. GRAHAM. I want to refer for a moment to the question of the Winnipeg terminals. It is a small matter but I wish to be absolutely correct, and perhaps save time. I read my decision on the digest of the agreement. Since that time I have read the agreement itself, I want to be frank with my hon. friend, and I will say that he was right.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The statement made by my hon. friend is very fair indeed, and I am obliged to him for the correction. As a matter of fact, I am inclined to think that perhaps he has admitted too much against himself. I want to be fair, too, and on looking over the agreement as to the Winnipeg terminals, I think I should have made some deductions, but not to the extent he mentions. I want to say to my hon. friend that in not making the deduction, I was entirely misled by the statement he brought down. I will read that statement, and the hon. gentleman will see how easy it was to fall into error. The statement brought down was this:

With regard to terminals at Winnipeg, by the agreement of March 1, 1907, confirmed by the Act of that year, chapter 52, between the Canadian Northern, the Grand Trunk Pacific and the government, the value of the Canadian Northern lands is fixed at $2,625,000, upon which sum the Grand Trunk Pacific and the government, under clause 13, are to pay, in equal shares, one half of 4 per cent, or $26,250 a year each. This includes grading, levelling and filling, as at the date of the agreement; but does not include buildings, fixtures, tracks and other improvements and facilities. For these—which the Canadian Northern undertakes to construct and supply—the Grand Trunk Pacific and the government are to pay, in equal shares, one half of 4½ per cent. The assumed cost is set down by the chief engineer of the Transcontinental Railway at $2,000,000, making the amount payable by the government yearly $22,500, or a total for the Winnipeg terminals of $48,750.

Now inasmuch as the information I asked for was expressly asked in order to ascertain the total cost of the road, and as the cost of the road brought down by the minister in the first place was stated subsequently not to include the terminals, it is plain that what I wanted to get at was the cost of the terminals for the purpose of making a computation of the total cost of the road from Winnipeg to Moncton. This statement informed me that I must take into consideration an annual charge of $48,750, and my attention was not directed to any qualification. I think the hon. gentleman was right to a certain extent in what he said the other day, and to a certain extent in what he said this morning. In looking over the agreement which I will read, I find this to be the condition of affairs, and if my attention had been directed to it I would have placed it before the House when I made my previous statement

But it is agreed between the Grand Trunk Pacific and the government, that in the lease of the eastern division the interest of the government under this agreement in the joint terminals shall be transferred to the Grand Trunk Pacific upon the following terms:

(a) Prior to the execution of the lease of the eastern division to the Grand Trunk Pacific, the compensation payable by the government to the Canadian Northern under clauses 13 (a) and (b) shall be paid by the commissioners and form part of the cost of construction within the meaning and for the purposes of the said agreement of July 29, 1903.

It is apparent then that so far as that annual charge of $48,750 relates to, and is paid in respect of any period up to the date of, the signing of the lease to the Grand Trunk Pacific, it must be added to the cost of construction. I do not know what that will be, we can only estimate it. But then the agreement continues as follows, in paragraph (b) of the same section:

For the first seven years of the lease, the said compensation payable by the government shall not be carried to capital account or cost of construction, or be otherwise chargeable against the Grand Trunk Pacific, but shall be borne wholly by the government.

So that for these seven years it is abundantly borne out by the terms of the clause I have just read, that the government must pay $48,750 a year without any recourse whatever, and that would amount to a sum of $341,250. Then paragraph (c) provides that for the remaining forty-three years the Grand Trunk Pacific shall pay this rent, but if in the three years during which they are not to pay the whole of the rental unless the net earnings of the road are sufficient for that purpose, they may escape this payment either in whole or in part, because they are bound to pay only such proportion of it as their net earnings bear to the total amount of the rental payable during those three years. I will come to my estimate in that respect further on. For the present, it is enough to say that so far as this charge is concerned, the government must in the first place pay without recourse until the lease is signed; for seven years after the lease is signed, it must also pay without recourse and perhaps also during the three succeeding years, that question depending on the earnings of the road. Then after the fifty years have expired, if the government sees fit to operate the road, or to lease it to any one else, this annual charge of $48,750 in respect of the Winnipeg terminals must be taken care of in some way, it is a sum which for all time in the future is payable by the government under the terms of this agreement, as long as the terminals are used upon the basis set forth in that agreement.

Now my hon. friend was a little warm with regard to the headlines which have appeared in the newspapers, and for which he very fairly did not hold me responsible, and for which of course I could not be held responsible. I do not know whether in his own experience as a journalist he has always maintained the standard with regard to headlines which he lays down for his brother journalists, who, as he thinks, have erred in this case. But if he really would like something that should call for his animadversion and very severe criticism, I would direct his attention to a certain pamphlet which I hold in my hands, and which sets forth in very large and striking headlines, this legend:

A transcontinental railway for $13,000,000.

I would direct his attention to the circumstance that in the same pamphlet a certain alternative proposal which I had put forward as one to be preferred to that of the government, was set forth as costing the country $266,000,000, and in this pamphlet not one of those considerations which the hon. gentleman enlarges on as proper to be taken account of, was given the slightest attention, or allowed to influence the calculation in the slightest degree. I think if my hon. friend would take this pamphlet and sit down and read it—I suppose he is too busy a man to trouble himself with light literature of this kind—but if he could find time to sit down and read this pamphlet we would hear from him at the beginning of next session an even warmer speech than that which he delivered this morning with regard to headlines and misrepresentations.

My hon. friend referred to the fact that he did not reply to my statement immediately as the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) had asked the discussion upon this particular subject to stand over until another day. It was very courteous, indeed, of my hon. friend to give me the opportunity of making my statement, it was convenient for me to do so, the session was approaching an end and I was anxious that the business should be advanced. I under-

stood him then to say he did not make his statement because he was not prepared to make it.

Mr. GRAHAM. I did not say that to my hon. friend, but he will understand that the arrangement I had made with the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) altogether banished that from my mind. I had put away any papers I had and I would have had to procure them from my office. If I had not made the arrangement with the hon. member for North Toronto I would have been compelled to make the statement immediately.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would have waived as far as it was in my power, any arrangement of the kind because I realized that it would be quite improper for me to make any statement and at the same time hold the minister bound to silence. I did not feel I was making my statement under such conditions and if he had suggested it I would have let the matter stand; in fact I suggested that myself.

Mr. GRAHAM. I was not blaming my hon. friend or complaining; he did not take the least advantage of me and I did not mean it in that way.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have referred to the paucity of information in the report of the commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway. I have been putting the Minister of Railways to more or less trouble during the session by asking for information by motions for returns, questions and inquiries in the House as to various items relating to the cost of the road from Winnipeg to Moncton and also in some cases to the liability of this country in connection with its guarantee of bonds upon the Mountain division. It should be the duty of the commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway, at least so far as the eastern division is concerned, to give us that information in their annual report. What are these gentlemen doing, what are their duties? Is their time so greatly occupied that none of it can be devoted to the important subject of acquainting this country from year to year with the extent of the liability likely to be incurred in the construction of this road? All of the time of this House and of the department that has been occupied in giving out this information should have been saved and the report of these gentlemen should have placed before every member at the commencement of this session or at some time during the session, the information I have been at so much pains to obtain. I trust the Minister of Railways will see to it that in future the report of the commissioners shall be more worthy of what we might expect from an important body of this kind and that it shall not simply consist of three or four reports of engineers and a report of the chief engineer, but that it shall contain these important matters of information to which I have referred and that it shall be presented at the earliest possible moment.

My hon. friend's statement in criticism of my own was fair in its tone from his standpoint; I have nothing to complain of it. He went over my statement in detail and admitted some of my items and rejected others The items admitted and rejected by him are:

Items admitted by Minister of Railways.

Construction of railway from Moncton to Winnipeg 1,803:55 miles, at estimated cost of $63,427 per mile..	$114,393,765
Allowing five years for period of construction there will be an average of 2½ years simple interest at 3½ per cent per year during construction, or $4,003,781.67 per year for 2½ years..	10,009,454
To this must be added 7 years interest at 3 per cent (not compounded) after completion during which Grand Trunk Pacific is to pay no rent..	26,124,676
Estimated cost of our share of terminals at Quebec, Winnipeg and Moncton, and shops east of Winnipeg..	4,591,250
	155,118,745
Interest on bonds on Mountain section without recourse for 7 years at 3½ per cent, amounts to.	11,304,250
	$166,423,045

Items rejected by Minister of Railways.

In respect to Winnipeg terminals.	878,750
Quebec Bridge....	14,422,238
Also interest at 3 per cent for three years additional during which no rent is collectable on Eastern Division unless earnings are sufficient..	11,196,290
	$26,497,278

I might criticise some of his views in respect to the terminals, but the total cost of the road is so great and so startling that any criticism of mine would make so little difference that I pass it by as unworthy of consideration, at this stage of the session at least, and therefore I am willing to accept his view of the situation.

Let me take up the three items in my estimate to which he objects. As to the interest I take simply the $48,750 a year during the first seven years of the lease about which there can be no question. Upon this basis we have $4,591,250 as the cost of the terminals. In making that estimate I am adopting all the views of the Minister of Railways with respect to terminals. So far as Moncton is concerned no one would pretend for a moment that these huge terminals and shops would be built there if the Grand Trunk Pacific were not to be constructed. Taking the items in my estimate that are admitted by the minister we have a total of cost of $166,423,045.

Mr. GRAHAM. Might I ask a question? That last amount includes the Mountain section, and is not the cost really from Winnipeg to Moncton?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I will repeat it in order that there may be no misapprehension about it. The estimates which the Minister of Railways admits in respect of of the road from Winnipeg to Moncton amount to $155,118,745. The hon. gentleman says, and says correctly, that in estimating the cost of that portion of the road, one should not take into consideration the interest on the Mountain division because that portion is not to be owned by the government and is under a different stipulation to the contract. But what I am endeavouring to do just now is to set forth the total cash outlay to the country, not only in respect of the government portion of the road—the eastern division so called—extending from Winnipeg to Moncton, but the cash outlay which, under the terms of the contract, must be borne by the government in respect of the whole road from the Pacific coast to Moncton, and that properly includes the $11,304.250 interest on bonds on the Mountain section and amounts to $166,423,045 as admitted by the minister.

Let me now come to the three items in respect of which he attempted to seriously criticise my statement. The items rejected by the Minister of Railways consist in the first place of the sum of $878,750 for the Winnipeg terminals. With respect to that, I was misled by the return brought down by the minister in reply to my request for information as to the cost of terminals. I am willing to make this deduction which is relatively insignificant. The deduction would be much less if I took into consideration the payments during construction and the payments after the Grand Trunk Pacific lease shall have expired.

Then I come to the Quebec bridge. My hon. friend eliminates that item altogether. Well, if we could get rid of the expenditures of the country by striking out items of this kind that would be a very delightful and satisfactory process. But I do not understand that the country is going to get rid of its liabilities merely by a statement of the Minister of Railways. We are already guarantors on the bonds of the Quebec Bridge Company for upwards of $6,000,000, and we have in return nothing but the wreck of that bridge after its partial construction. Does any one suppose that the Minister of Railways, by a very plausible wave of his hand, can rid us of his guaranty on these bonds? If a process of that kind were possible, if the Minister of Railways could extend that to our total debt in how splendid a position we would be! I might say to him that I am inclined to think some process of that kind will be very necessary if the government keeps on in the road it has been travelling the last five or six years. Look at the situation of the country with regard to the Quebec bridge. It is perfectly true that that bridge, the construction of that bridge, was not initiated as a portion of the Transcontinental. But it is equally true that over and over again it has been admitted and acknowledged that some portion at least of the cost of that bridge must be taken into consideration in estimating the total cost to the country of the Transcontinental Railway. I have not the references here, but that position was acknowledged and taken by hon. gentlemen on the treasury benches during the lengthy debates we had in 1903-4 on this Transcontinental Railway project. The construction of a bridge across the St. Lawrence is just as essential to the effective operation of that road as a Transcontinental Railway as any one or five or ten miles between Winnipeg and Moncton. How are you to operate your trains if you have not a bridge across the St. Lawrence joining the two portions of the eastern division? We have the Quebec bridge a wreck—everything lying under the St. Lawrence except the piers and a portion of the superstructure. We are guarantors on the bonds of the Quebec Bridge Company to the extent of $6,000,000, we are face to face with the necessity of bringing the construction of that bridge to a conclusion at the earliest possible moment. I asked the government across the floor for some information or data on which I could base an estimate of the amount required to complete the construction of that bridge and the return brought down states that there is no information in the possession of the government on that very important subject. My hon. friend has not criticised my estimate of $9,000,000 as the cost of completing the Quebec bridge and I take it he has none to offer. I have said that adding to the amount already expended on the bridge the sum of $9,000,000 required to complete it you have a total of $14,422,238. I am not very much concerned with the argument as to whether or not the whole or a part of this, or what part must be charged against the Transcontinental. The particularly important point to face is that the amount must be provided by the country out of public revenues. Therefore inasmuch as this bridge is an essential to the operation of the Transcontinental, we must take it into consideration in computing the liabilities imposed upon the country by the construction of the Transcontinental Railway. Do I make myself plain? Is there any one who can say that is not a fair and plain statement of the situation which must be faced by the government?

Now there is only one other item in respect of which my hon. friend made any comment or criticism, and that is the item

of $11,196,290. That item represents the interest at 3 per cent for the three years during which no rent is collectable from the Grand Trunk Pacific unless the earnings of that road are sufficient for the payment of the rent. My hon. friend strikes that out because, as he says, he is an optimist. Well, in suggesting the possibility, and indeed I think the extreme probability, that we will have no return in respect of that sum, I trust I am not convicting myself in the judgment of my hon. friend of being a pessimist. I have taken some opinions on that subject from gentlemen who I think are as well qualified to offer an opinion as any hon. gentleman in this House and much more qualified. I would regard it from the information that I have been able to obtain, as extremely improbable that the net earnings of the Grand Trunk Pacific will be sufficient for any such purpose during those three years. Let us not put out of sight the very great difficulties that will arise in the operation of the road during the winter season. Let us not dismiss from our minds the circumstance that even during those three years there will be a very limited amount of local traffic upon that road and there are rumours, I do not know how well founded, that certain gentlemen connected with the Grand Trunk Railway have been making some investigations into the possibilities of local traffic and into the character of the country which will be opened up by that road between Moncton and Winnipeg, and they have arrived at a much more pessimistic (if I may use the term) conclusion with respect to the operation of that road during the first ten or twenty years than any I have seen fit to express to the House to-day. It is all very well to be optimistic, but let us remember that the optimism of to-day will not pay the debt of to-morrow. You must remember that by a mere statement in this House and an airy wave of the hand we cannot get rid of natural conditions and we cannot get rid of the difficulties that certainly will confront the operation of the road during the first seven or ten years. I trust that these difficulties may, in the end, be found to be much less than they are anticipated at the present time by some persons who have made a study of the situation and I would be only too delighted if the optimistic outlook of my hon. friend to-day should be justified by the events of the future. I realize to the full that my hon. friend is entitled to his opinion on this subject. It is a question of the future depending upon conditions which no one in this House has either the experience or the knowledge to estimate in a very confident manner. Therefore, my hon. friend, very sincerely, no doubt, sees fit to strike this out. I have ventured to include it as a probable amount which this country will have to meet and it is only the future that will be able to determine whether he is nearer the mark than I am in this particular instance. I think that is about all the criticism that my hon. friend made. Let me add that in the estimate I have made I have not taken into consideration the construction of telegraph lines. I do not remember at the moment whether they were embraced in the estimate which the hon. gentleman presented to us. Could he give me that information?

Mr. GRAHAM. My recollection is that they are included in it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not remember seeing them mentioned, but my hon. friend is under the impression that they are included. I have not taken into consideration any interest on the cost of terminals, and I have not taken into consideration any of the necessary expenditures that must always be looked for in the early operation of a new road some of which at least would, under the terms of the agreement, fall upon the government, if my interpretation of the agreement is correct. My hon. friend did not state, and I would like to have that information if I could get it, whether or not any part of the computation upon which the sum of $63,427, as the cost per mile of this road, is based upon the original estimates which were before the government in 1903-4 or whether all these estimates were made recently and upon such information as is in the possession of the engineers at the present time.

Mr. GRAHAM. As far as contracts have been let, these figures are taken from the contracts and the balance, which is not very large, is taken from the present estimate of the engineers as to the cost of construction.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. At all events they are recent estimates?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The old estimates are not relied upon. My hon. friend alluded to some $97,000 for terminals which I did not include in the cost of construction for the reason that he has given.

The hon. gentleman spoke of the very greatly increased cost of this road as being due to the character of its construction. The hon. gentleman will remember that the contract, if I recall its terms correctly, provides that it should be built up to the standard of the Grand Trunk Railway between Montreal and Toronto. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is the contract.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is the contract. I would like to direct the attention of the House, in connection with the argument of my hon. friend, to the opinion of the expert of the government in 1903, a gentleman who was put up for the purpose of answering the Hon. A. G. Blair, a gentleman who evidently had been in consultation

with the government, whose opinions were put forward as those of the government, although he was not a member of the administration and who made the principal argument as far as the cost of the road is concerned, in support of the government's proposition. Mr. Charlton, to whom I allude, at page 8484 of 'Hansard,' 1903, used this language:

Now, Sir, if we build a line from Winnipeg to Quebec, say 1,400 miles long, and if we can secure four-tenths per cent grades; if we lay that road with 90 pound rails, if we put bridges upon it that will carry the heaviest locomotives and trains of cars, each car carrying a load of 50 tons, we can carry, in my opinion, grain from Winnipeg to Quebec for 12 cents a bushel and perhaps even less.

I do not understand from the statement of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals that the character of the road to-day is superior to that which was set forth in the remarks which I have just quoted from the speech of Mr. Charlton delivered in this House on the 11th August, 1903. Proceeding farther and dealing with the cost of this road, he said, at page 8486:

I do not believe that this road will cost over $30,000 a mile from Moncton to Chaudière Junction, and I doubt very much that it will cost more than $30,000 per mile, or even that, from Quebec to Winnipeg.

The hon. gentleman was very far away from the mark in making that statement. Then again, at page 8496, he uses this language:

As I said last night, this road from Winnipeg to Quebec, if it is to serve the purpose which it is intended to serve, must be a first-class road. It must have not more than half per cent grades, and should have four-tenths per cent grades, coming east, or twenty-one feet to the mile. It should be laid with 90-pound rails, should have bridges that would carry the heaviest rolling stock in use, with a margin to allow for an increase in the weight of rolling stock; it should have engines of 100 tons weight without the tender and cars of 50 tons capacity of cargo. The road must be built with bridges capable of sustaining the weight of cars with a carrying capacity 50 per cent greater than is now required and with corresponding increase in weight of engines.

At page 8497 he impresses upon the government the absolute necessity of securing the construction of a road of this kind, and at page 8512 he says:

Then, we have a provision in the public interest that the standard of the road, west of Winnipeg shall be equal to the standard of the Grand Trunk between Toronto and Montreal. That is a much higher standard than that of any road that the west now possesses. The Mackenzie and Mann road is laid with 60 pound rails. The Grand Trunk between Toronto and Montreal is laid with 80 pound rails, and in some sections 90 pound rails. It is a first-class road, with the best bridges and with low grades. And, if this provision in the contract is complied with and the Grand Trunk builds a road in the west that shall not be inferior to the Grand Trunk between Montreal and Toronto, it will build a road 30 or 40 per cent better than any road now in that western country.

It would appear to me perfectly clear that Mr. Charlton, speaking for the government, considered that the standard of the Grand Trunk Railway between Montreal and Toronto was practically equal if not quite equal to the standard of the road he described in the quotation I first read to the House. It is impossible to come to the conclusion put forward by my hon. friend the Minister of Railways that the difference between the $52,000,000 or $53,000,000 estimated by the Minister of Finance and by Mr. Charlton for the construction of this 1,800 miles of road, and the sum of $114,500,000 now acknowledged by the government as the cost, is due to the fact that the character of the road has been so greatly improved. Does the Minister of Railways or does any member of the government pretend for one minute that the standard of the road between Winnipeg and Moncton is so vastly superior to the standard of the Grand Trunk between Toronto and Montreal that it will account for this excess of $61,000,000, which brings the cost of the road to much more than double the original estimated cost? The statement has only to be made to carry its own confutation. There might perhaps be a few million dollars involved, but when it is seriously proposed to the House that the superior excellence of the Transcontinental as compared with the Grand Trunk between Toronto and Montreal accounts for $61,000,000, you place a strain upon our credulity that it will not stand. I do not think the Grand Trunk Railway will make an admission of that kind.

Mr. GRAHAM. The hon. gentleman will agree that I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the hon. gentleman did not say so then we absolutely agree that it would be absurd to put forward any such reason as accounting for the increased cost of the road by $61,000,000, and, therefore, the $61,000,000 excess cost must be accounted for in some other way. The people of the country will be deeply concerned to know what the cause of it is. Some of the causes may have already been disclosed in a recent debate, and we may hear more about that matter in the time to come.

The Minister of Railways closed with a very eloquent peroration in the course of which he described himself as an optimist and deplored pessimism. Well, I do not think there are any pessimists in this country to-day. There were pessimists in Canada 20 years ago. Perhaps the Minister of Railways was not amongst them; perhaps he dissented from his party in these

days. But surely he has not forgotten the doleful wailings that went up from gentlemen with whom he is now associated in the cabinet when it was proposed to build the first transcontinental railway across Canada. Why, the rumblings of these wailings have been heard even in recent years, although they possibly have ceased now.

Mr. GRAHAM. We may both have been converted since then.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It was refreshing in this heated season to hear the Minister of Railways deplore pessimism, and no doubt he feared some recrudescence of the Liberal pessimism of 20 years and more ago might appear, and so he thought by his eloquence to stifle it. We on this side of the House have an abiding faith and unalterable confidence in the resources of Canada and in its future material prosperity. But that is not necessarily inconsistent with the safeguarding of the public interests and with the principle that we should have a comprehensive appreciation of the ultimate cost of a great undertaking before we plunge heedlessly into it. That is true statesmanship ; it is not pessimism. We trust that tangible benefits may be derived by our country from the construction of the Transcontinental Railway. When the Prime Minister laid his scheme before the House we were told we had mountains of information about it, but even at this date the mountain of information with regard to the ultimate cost of the road is a veritable molehill. To-day we are confronted with the situation that even on the admission of the government the road will cost more than double that which they estimated at the start. I do not know what course the government would have taken had they been compelled to admit to parliament in 1903 that the road from Moncton to Winnipeg would cost $114,500,000 at the very lowest, without terminals without computing interest, and without including those other items which I have included in my estimate of cost. They presented the Transcontinental Railway to the people of Canada as a project which would be paid for by the investment of $13,000,000, which would represent every possible charge against the public exchequer in connection with it. It was interesting to notice to-day that the Minister of Railways in his estimate of cost exactly doubled the original estimate of the government. The Prime Minister, the Minister of Customs, the Minister of Finance, all laid stress in 1903 on $13,000,000 as sufficient if invested to discharge every possible obligation of the country in connection with the road. They put it in their campaign literature, they flaunted it through their press in glaring headlines so that all might see, and to-day the Minister of Railways, not by way of boast, but by way of apology, ventures the statement that if $13,000,000 would not be sufficient, $26,000,000 for $27,000,000 would accomplish the purpose. I should think that considerations of this kind would give pause to the government and would induce greater care and greater prudence on their part before they embark in these huge undertakings. I have done nothing more than my duty in placing the present possibilities of the cost of this road before parliament and before the country. I am very glad indeed that after my estimate has been made and submitted to the House, and has been under the consideration of the Minister of Railways for several days, the only criticism he can make of it is in respect to a sum of about $800,000 as to which I was led into error by a statement which he himself had brought down to the House. I admit of course the reasonable character of the minister's observations with respect to the item of $11,000,000 for the three years' rental. I frankly admit that that is a matter of opinion, and that my hon. friend was perfectly justified in putting forward his view of the situation. Apart from that I cannot see that we differ in the slightest, except as to the item of $800,000 to which I have alluded. As to the Quebec bridge, the only difference between us is as to whether it should be charged to the Transcontinental Railway or not. I am not concerned with any matter of bookkeeping. I am concerned with the fact that before this railway is completed that bridge will have to be reconstructed and the country will have to pay for it.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Mr. Speaker, the National Transcontinental Railway is the greatest undertaking of this government, a work of the greatest importance to us at present, and, as we believe, of vast importance in the future development of the country ; and therefore any hon. gentleman who approaches the question with an intelligent consideration of the cost of the road and its value to the country, is only doing what is rightly expected of a gentleman in the position of the hon. leader of the opposition. If my hon. friend had approached the question in what I regard as a fair spirit, we would certainly have no reason to complain ; but I must say that if my hon. friend did approach the question with a desire to be fair, he strayed sadly away, with the consequence that he has presented to the House and the country a statement of the cost of this road to the people of Canada which I am obliged to say is not only inexact, but is absolutely and monstrously misleading. No statement which could be presented to an intelligent body under such conditions could be more misleading than that of my hon. friend. I am afraid that his desire to make a little political capital, for which I suppose allowance

must be made, has rather blinded his judgment, for I cannot conceive how otherwise he could have presented this extraordinary statement. It is not that the figures of my hon. friend in many instances are incorrect. In many instances I assume that they are correct. My quarrel is not so much with his figures in detail as with their grouping and the conclusions he draws from them. It is as if a man having a volume of papers containing accounts for and against him should hand them to an accountant with instructions to collect them and present him with a proper statement afterwards, and the accountant should charge both the debts and the credits to the debit side of the account, and leave the other side blank. That is what my hon. friend has done. He has charged to the government and the people of Canada expenses which the contract does not contemplate shall be paid by the people of Canada, and which there is no reasonable probability that the people of Canada will ever be obliged to pay. Perhaps nothing indicates more clearly the manner in which my hon. friend has approached the question than the fact that at the beginning of his remarks he again revived that exploded fallacy that the right hon. the Prime Minister had told the people of Canada that this road could be constructed from ocean to ocean for thirteen million dollars. We have had that question threshed out over and over again in this House. Hon. gentlemen opposite have only been able to establish a colour of excuse for that statement by quoting a sentence from the speech of the Prime Minister separate and apart from its context, and utterly at variance with the spirit of the whole speech. Can any one imagine that the Prime Minister, whatever, hon. gentlemen opposite may think of him, would be so absolutely mad as to ask the people of Canada to believe that a railway 3,558 miles in length, from Moncton to the Pacific, could be constructed for $3,600 per mile? If the people of Canada believed the statement which hon. gentlemen opposite attribute to the Prime Minister, they must have understood it to mean that.

Mr. LENNOX. Are we to pay for the whole of it ?

Mr. FIELDING. We are not talking of the cost of construction.

Mr. LENNOX. The Prime Minister was talking of the cost of construction to the public—not the cost of the entire road.

Mr. FIELDING. Hon. gentlemen opposite have again and again in this House—and it has been carried into their press—represented the Prime Minister as saying that this road could be constructed from ocean to ocean for twelve or thirteen million dollars.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Never.

Mr. FIELDING. Why, in the speech of the hon. leader of the opposition which I have now under review, he quoted a sentence from the speech of the Prime Minister for the purpose of saying that very thing. Let me read :

The right hon. the Prime Minister at page 7691 of 'Hansard' used these words:

The sum total of the money to be paid by the government for the construction of the line from Moncton to the Pacific will be in the neighbourhood of twelve or thirteen million dollars.

Hon. gentlemen opposite seek to convey the impression that thereby the Prime Minister meant—and they have again and again referred to it in this House—that the cost of construction from ocean to ocean was to be $3,500 or $3,600 per mile.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Never.

Mr. FIELDING. They quote a sentence from the Prime Minister's speech, separate from its context and entirely at variance with the whole spirit of the speech, and spread it abroad.

Mr. BOYCE. Why did you put it in your own campaign literature and circulate it throughout the country ?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think it was ever put in that form. Hon. gentlemen opposite have persistently confused two things—the cost of constructing the road and the cost ultimately to the government, having regard to what the government will be called upon to pay and what the Grand Trunk Pacific Company will be called upon to pay. And so when our hon. friend the leader of the opposition began his remarks the other night by reviving that exploded fallacy, it rather indicated that he was not approaching the question in quite the fair spirit that he would have us believe he was bringing to the discussion of the matter.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What could this sentence mean, in the hon. gentleman's campaign literature ?

Mr. FIELDING. Is my hon. friend prepared to explain every sentence in his campaign literature ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I will deal with that when it comes before the House. I am talking about this matter at the moment, and I would like to ask what was the meaning of it :

A transcontinental railway for $13,000,000.

Mr. FIELDING. That is a correct statement of what the right hon. the Prime Minister said. He was not dealing with the cost of constructing the road ; he was dealing with what he then believed would be the cost to the government of Canada, taking into account that which they would have to pay and that which the Grand Trunk Pacific Company would have to pay.

and upon the statements and estimates before the House, which it is now found were too low and which I will deal with in a moment.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes. We will probably find that some other estimates were incorrect too. The Prime Minister held that having regard to what the Grand Trunk Pacific Company would pay, and what the government of Canada would pay under the contract, if you had taken twelve or thirteen million dollars and invested the money at that time in the hands of a bank or a trust company and asked them to make provision for all the obligations arising to the government under that contract, that amount of money would be sufficient; and, according to the estimate of the work then made, the right hon. the Prime Minister was absolutely correct. No other view was ever expressed by the Prime Minister; and when again and again my hon. friends opposite refer to that statement as conveying the impression that the cost of the construction of the road was to be thirteen million dollars, they are not treating the matter fairly. The cost of construction is one thing, the cost which the people will have to bear ultimately for the purpose of constructing this road—having regard to what the company and the government have to pay—is an entirely different thing.

I desire to take up the statement which my hon. friend the leader of the opposition submitted the other night. It has been dealt with in part by my hon. colleague the Minister of Railways, but I should like to have the privilege of reviewing some features of it also. I want to call attention to the nature of the tabular statement my hon. friend gave the House and which is now being paraded throughout the country. It will be found on page 12596 of 'Hansard.' I regard that statement as of importance as showing what it was my hon. friend tried to convey to the country. The heading is this: 'Statement of cost to Canada of National Transcontinental Railway.' Observe the words 'Statement of cost to Canada of National Transcontinental Railway.' That is the beginning. And the end is, after the various items are set forth, 'Total, $249,335,823.' My hon. friend explained afterwards that there was one item which he had under-estimated, and he increased the amount to $250,968,723. So we have the statement that the cost to Canada of the National Transcontinental is $250,968,723.

My hon. colleague the Minister of Railways referred to the heading in the press, which conveyed the impression that this $250,000,000 was the cost to Canada of the road from Moncton to Winnipeg. That is the portion which is being constructed by the government and is called the eastern division, and he pointed out that in that respect the newspapers had gone beyond the limits even of the speech of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition. That remark was certainly correct. The leader of the opposition did not represent that the cost of the road from Moncton to Winnipeg was $250,000,000, but he did represent that the cost to Canada from Moncton to the Pacific—the whole road, what we call the National Transcontinental, including eastern and western division—he did represent that the cost to Canada of the National Transcontinental was $250,968,723, and I am obliged to criticise that as a monstrous statement. Let us take it up item by item. I have already said that I am not calling in question the accuracy of the hon. gentleman's figures in detail. Some of them are based on information furnished the House by the National Transcontinental Commission, and presumably they are correct. Some of them are in the form of calculations with respect to interest made by the leader of the opposition, and I presume they are correct. In any event, there could not be any difference that would amount to anything. He puts in a statement showing the cost to Canada of the National Transcontinental Railway. His first item is:

Construction of railway from Moncton to Winnipeg, 1,803·55 miles, at estimated cost of $63,427 per mile, $114,393,765.

I say at once that it is a monstrous statement to say that that represents the cost of that road to Canada. In this case the hon. gentleman has simply set forth the one side of the account. What actually might be said would be that the cost to the government of that section of the road, which he puts in at $114,000,000 and increased by the addition of certain interest to $124,000,000—the cost to Canada of that road is not that amount, but seven years' interest on that amount, because, after the expiration of that seven years, the interest on that amount is paid by the Grand Trunk Pacific and ceases to be a payment for the people of Canada at all. As my hon. friend has taken account of that interest in a later item it is not necessary to take account of it here, and therefore you must strike it out entirely.

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

Mr. FIELDING. That $114,393,765 must be struck out, because, although the government advance the money, the Grand Trunk Pacific, after a period of seven years shall have passed, pay the interest on every dollar of that expenditure. And as that interest is included in another item to which I shall come it cannot be allowed in this case, and therefore, in absolute fairness, the whole item of $114,000,000 must be struck out.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If my hon. friend should build a house costing $10,000 and

lease it for ten years at $1,000 a year, would he claim that the house cost him nothing?

Mr. FIELDING. Suppose a man engaged in real estate were to put up a house costing $10,000 and then made a contract with a good, reputable tenant to lease it for fifty years at a price which would cover the interest, would my hon. friend say that he would be ruined? It seems to me he would reply that he had a reputable tenant for the next fifty years and was perfectly content with his bargain.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would my hon. friend say that in that case the house cost nothing?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not say that the house cost nothing, but I say that to put down the house as costing $10,000, and leave out of the calculation the rental during fifty years, would be a grossly misleading statement.

Mr. FOWLER. What would the house cost him?

Mr. FIELDING. It might cost him nothing. It might absolutely be a profit to him, and if my hon. friend were to say to him, you are ruining yourself, he might well reply: I am putting it up under terms and conditions which make it a source of great profit, and it is no burden at all.

Mr. CONMEE. Bring up another house.

Mr. FIELDING. The next item in my hon. friend's item is this:

Allowing five years for period of construction, there will be an average of 2½ years simple interest at 3½ per cent per year during construction, or $4,003,781.67 per year for 2½ years, $10,009,454.

I do not dispute the accuracy of these figures. I am assuming that they are correct, but again I say you must strike this out. Why? Because, under the Railway Act, as well as under the contract, the interest during construction is a proper charge to capital. The interest, therefore, that is paid during the construction of the National Transcontinental becomes a part of the cost of construction, becomes a part of the principal sum, and all that the government will have to pay will be seven years' interest on that principal sum. And after the seven years every dollar of interest for the remaining forty-three years is a charge, not upon the government of Canada, but upon the Grand Trunk Pacific, and therefore the representation of my hon. friend that this is a burden on the country to that extent is entirely unwarranted, and that item must be struck out. The interest has to be paid during construction, but it is added to the capital sum, and on that capital sum we grant freedom from rental, which is the same as interest, for a period of seven years. We are properly chargeable as a cost to the government, for seven years' interest, or rental, on that item, but we are not properly chargeable with the capital sum itself.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then it would not make any difference what rate of interest we pay; we might just as well pay ten per cent as three and a half per cent, because it will all have to be struck out.

Mr. FIELDING. Having regard to the manner in which my hon. friend has made up his statement, I am not surprised at that observation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It was the observation of the minister, not mine.

Mr. FIELDING. It is about as easy to understand it as the statement itself.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Seriously, does the hon. gentleman make no difference in his computation what rate of interest we pay during construction?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not see the point that is raised by my hon. friend's question. We should get the interest back after seven years at three per cent, and if we paid a higher rate for our money then to that extent there is a difference. But we get back three per cent on our money. If we have to pay a somewhat higher rate, to that extent we lose after the seven years, and to that extent only. Then I take the next item:

To this must be added seven years interest at 3 per cent (not compounded), after completion during which the Grand Trunk Pacific is to pay in rent, $26,124,656.

I assume my hon. friend's calculation is correct, I am taking his figures, and I assume that this is a proper item to charge against the government. The interest which the government will have to pay for seven years during which they will receive no interest or rental from the company, is a proper charge, and that is the true measure of what the country will have to pay for the eastern division of the Transcontinental. For every dollar beyond that, the Grand Trunk Pacific Company is obligated to pay, and we have no reason to doubt that they will be able and willing to pay. So that item I do not strike out, that item properly remains. Then we come to another item:

Also interest at 3 per cent for three years additional during which no rent is collectable unless earnings are sufficient, $11,166,290.

I observed the other night that my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), in a passing remark, indicated that he realized the hopelessness of this item being kept in the computation, because he alluded to it as something which at all events was very debatable. Now there has been some dis-

cussion between my hon. friend and the Minister of Railways concerning that, and my hon. friend has admitted that perhaps the company will be able to pay it during those three years, but he is very dubious. Still, for the purpose of my argument it makes no difference whether the company pay it during those three years or not. In either case this item must go out. If they pay it during the three years, then of course the item goes out; if they don't pay it during the three years, it becomes an addition to the capital sum, which is secured to the government by the terms of the lease and upon which the government will receive interest for every dollar. So whether they pay interest as my hon. friend the Minister of Railways thinks they might, and my hon. friend the leader of the opposition thinks they won't, it makes no difference with regard to the ultimate responsibility of the government. If they pay interest, that settles it, and the item is out; if they do not pay interest, then it is simply a deferred payment which is secured to the government by the terms of the lease; it is added to the capital sum, and if the capital sum includes this $11,000,000 the government will receive interest on it for every year after the expiration of the seven years.

There is an item which follows close upon that, in relation to terminals. I do not wish to enter into that further than to say that the same method of reasoning applies to it. I am assuming that my hon. friend's statement is correct as to the cost of terminals. But whatever these terminals may cost, that cost becomes a part of the cost of the eastern division of the Transcontinental, and on that cost of the eastern division, whatever it may be, we grant them freedom from rent or interest for seven years. But after the expiration of the seven years they are obliged to pay interest on the whole cost, including terminals. Therefore my hon. friend, in charging up this principal sum as something which has to be paid by the government, and by the government only, is entirely wrong. You must strike out that sum, because the government will pay interest on that for seven years, after which the company are obliged to pay interest on it, that being a part of the construction of the eastern division.

Mr. LANCASTER. Who pays the principal?

Mr. FIELDING. For the purpose of this discussion we are dealing with the question of the burden that is to be placed on the people of Canada.

Mr. LANCASTER. There is no principal, for the purpose of this discussion.

Mr. FIELDING. For the purpose of this discussion I say if the government of Canada advance moneys for the eastern division of the Transcontinental, and if they lease that to the Grand Trunk Pacific Company for seven years without any rental, then that seven years interest is a charge upon the treasury of Canada, and from the eighth year down to the fiftieth year the Grand Trunk Pacific pay interest. Then I say there is no charge and no burden upon the treasury of Canada.

Now, I come to the Quebec bridge. I say there is not a shadow of a reason for carrying into this account the cost of the Quebec bridge. My hon. friend made a statement upon that, which I have not at hand, but this is the substance:

> It is acknowledged by everybody that the construction of the Quebec bridge is an essential part of the Transcontinental.

I think my hon. friend will find I have quoted him with substantial accuracy. Now I take exception to that. If my hon. friend will say that it is agreed all round that the Quebec bridge must be constructed, I can agree with him heartily. But when he says, for the purpose of this argument, for the purpose of charging up this item against the government, and of swelling the total of this amount, that it is universally agreed that the construction of the Quebec bridge is an essential part of the Transcontinental Railway, I am obliged to take exception to that statement, because the construction of the Quebec bridge was recognized as an essential feature of the policy of Canada before a spade was ever put into the ground with regard to the Transcontinental Railway. We can prove that by the hon. gentleman himself. I find that he is charging up this whole item, making now $14,000,000—I am accepting his own figures—he charges this whole item as something which has become necessary by reason of the Transcontinental scheme and something which without the Transcontinental would not have been a charge upon the country at all. I am doing my hon. friend no injustice when I say that is the effect of the statement he put before the country in saying it is an essential feature of the Transcontinental Railway. Now do we not all know that a good many years ago, long before the Transcontinental was commenced or even dreamed of, the people of Canada had practically recognized the necessity for the construction of the Quebec bridge? It is a well known fact, I state it on Conservative authority, that the Conservative government years ago, practically promised to construct that bridge. The promise has been made in the province of Quebec by their own political leaders. Not very long ago, at a banquet given in the city of Quebec to my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, shortly, if I remember aright, before the Transcontinental contract was approved by this House, I find that the chairman of the meeting, the Hon. Mr. Pelletier,

in introducing my hon. friend, made some remarks from which I extract the following:

The Quebec bridge has been promised to us by important Conservatives. That promise was not kept and that was an error. The electors should always insist upon the accomplishment of any promises made, and they should prefer that fewer promises be made and that those made be carried out.

Here we have from the presiding officer of a Conservative gathering in Quebec held in honour of the leader of the opposition, to welcome him in that capacity, making the declaration that the construction of that bridge had been promised by the Conservative party years ago. If it was promised years ago why should my hon. friend now treat it as something which has only become necessary by reason of the Transcontinental Railway?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The leader of the opposition happened to be there the day the bridge tumbled.

Mr. FIELDING. Coincidences often occur, but it is not always wise to connect two things together. The leader of the opposition was not only there when the bridge tumbled, but he was there when our friend Mr. Pelletier tumbled into this confession of the former action of the Tory party. But we had the leader of the opposition on record at that time. Did he speak of the Quebec bridge as something which was going to be required by the National Transcontinental Railway? Not exactly, he was opposing the National Transcontinental Railway, but he was there to proclaim the need for the Quebec Bridge.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What was the date?

Mr. FIELDING. October, 1903, at the time I think that the legislation respecting the National Transcontinental was either just about completed or was still before the House. Mr. Borden says:

In advocating the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to Georgian bay, I believe that we can hereby secure for Canadian ports a large proportion of the trade from the west. Traffic carried over a railway owned by the people of this country must come to our own ports and the amount of that traffic will develop in the future to a remarkable extent. Moreover, the extension of the Intercolonial Railway, coupled with the completion of the Quebec bridge, to which both political parties are committed, may mean much for the future of Quebec.

There is not a word about the Transcontinental Railway in that. The hon. gentleman asserted that it would be useful to the Intercolonial Railway, it would help trade generally, it would develop Quebec. I find no fault with that, but we know that the Quebec bridge was promised many years ago by Conservatives, if the testimony of the hon. gentleman who presided at that gathering was correct. We know that many years ago this government made a grant of $1,000,000 to help it, and that the Quebec government and the city of Quebec also made grants for that purpose. We know that the subject has been discussed for many years. The Quebec bridge was undertaken, aid was promised to it, the plans were made and the work begun long before the Transcontinental Railway was undertaken. When, under these circumstances, my hon. friend drags into his statement $14,000,000 for the Quebec bridge as a part of the Transcontinental Railway, he simply shows that he has no desire to deal with the matter fairly.

With regard to the Mountain section, my hon. friend carries into that the same erroneous methods of calculation as to the cost which the government has to bear in connection with this road.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. How much has been paid or will be paid by any other party than the government of Canada for the construction of the Quebec bridge?

Mr. FIELDING. If I thought it had any bearing on the question at issue, I would be happy to get the information, but whether it costs $1,000,000 or $10,000,000 or $14,000,000 or $20,000,000, it is not merely a part of the Transcontinental road, for every dollar of that money would have been necessary as an expenditure if we had never heard of the Transcontinental Railway.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does the minister take the ground that absolutely no portion of the cost of that bridge is chargeable to the Transcontinental?

Mr. FIELDING. I say that when the bridge is completed the Grand Trunk would have the right to use it, and if they used if they should pay for that, but whether the Transcontinental Railway was built or not we would have to construct the bridge.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman said in this House in 1903:

But some part of the cost of that bridge is properly chargeable to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. . . . What proportion of that would be fairly chargeable to this enterprise? I am going to assume that out of what it may cost we may fairly charge the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, $2,000,000.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, surely, I charged two millions and my hon. friend fourteen.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is hardly fair, because the hon. gentleman at that time was estimating the cost of the bridge at four and a half million dollars.

Mr. FIELDING. At that time I was complaining of the very thing my hon. friend is doing now, that he is not distinguishing between the part properly chargeable to the Transcontinental Railway and the part properly chargeable to other railways. Then

as now he charged up the whole thing to the Transcontinental Railway for the purpose of swelling the amount and alarming the country.

Mr. FOWLER. Now you are charging one-half.

Mr. FIELDING. No, I am not charging anything. I say it becomes a matter of debate. I made a rough estimate and for my purposes charged two millions. I say that the Grand Trunk Pacific if they use the bridge must pay for it to the extent of their user. That is a matter of detail, that has not been adjusted, but I take it that a portion of that expenditure would be properly chargeable to the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Mr. FOWLER. At the time you made the statement in 1903 the estimated cost of the Quebec bridge was four and a half millions.

Mr. FIELDING. No, at that time we were guaranteeing bonds to the extent of nearly seven million dollars.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend has entirely forgotten. Here is his own statement:

I understand that the bridge proper, the crossings and the approaches, will cost about $4,500,000. . . . What proportion of that would be fairly chargeable to this enterprise? I am going to assume that out of what it may cost we may fairly charge the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway $2,000,000.

Mr. FIELDING. There would have to be the bridge proper, the approaches, &c. But that makes no difference. The point is that the Grand Trunk Pacific is properly chargeable with some portion of that work, having regard to the business which it would do over it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister said not just now.

Mr. FIELDING. No, my hon. friend is mistaken. I say, on the contrary, that if that work is to be built by the government of Canada or by a company, the Grand Trunk Pacific cannot be permitted to use it for nothing. They might claim, and I do not wish to say anything that may be used as an argument by the Grand Trunk in future discussions, that we have a right to give them seven years freedom from interest on that portion of the bridge cost which would be their share. That is a matter of detail, but I say they are only to be charged with what is their proper share. If two millions is the proper sum, well and good, if that is to be the charge or a smaller sum, whatever may be found to be proper, the Grand Trunk Pacific should pay as sharing in the use of the bridge in proportion to the amount of business they may do. That is a proper charge against the Transcontinental scheme and I suppose the company might claim that as respects that charge they would be entitled to seven years' freedom from interest.

Mr. FOWLER. The minister says that in the computation of $2,000,000 he took only the bridge proper and not the approaches, but the Grand Trunk would find it necessary to use the approaches as well as the bridge and therefore should they not pay a fair proportion of the cost of the approaches ?

Mr. FIELDING. I think so. That is a matter that has not been determined. The moment the bridge is completed of course that question will have to be determined, perhaps before it is completed. Before the Grand Trunk Pacific can be permitted to use the bridge there must be a determination of what proportion of the cost is a proper charge against the Transcontinental Railway and if the leader of the opposition had treated it in that way and charged some part of it against the National Transcontinental Railway, I could find no fault whatever with his statement. When he charges the whole sum as something which is necessary to the creation of the Transcontinental Railway scheme he must see that that is not a fair presentation of the case.

Mr. FOWLER. I would like, right here, to read from 'Hansard' of August 12, 1903, page 8587, what the hon. gentleman said then:

I understand that the bridge proper, the crossings and approaches, will cost about $4,500,000.

He says also a few lines down :

That is to say, that we will be obliged to give to the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, if they demand it, a crossing on that bridge, and that in connection with the general arrangement to provide a crossing $2,000 000 will be the outside obligation which we should charge to this scheme. Our $2,000,000 will stand as part of the cost of the railway upon which the Grand Trunk Pacific company will ultimately pay interest in the same manner as on any other portion of the railway.

That is including it certainly as a part of the Transcontinental Railway.

Mr. FIELDING. If my hon. friend will look further I think he will find that during that same session we guaranteed the bridge company's bonds to the amount of $6,000,000 odd; so that it is quite evident that the estimate of the cost must have been revised. However, it is of no consequence.

Mr. FOWLER. You are constantly revising your estimate.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes; my hon. friends opposite are not likely to revise estimates. That is a responsibility that only comes to ministers. I do not dispute charging a portion of the bridge to the Transcontinental Railway. What is a proper proportion is a fair matter of debate, but I do not want to make any estimate which would be used against the government in years to come. If we could charge half of $4,000,000 or $5,000,000 to the road it might not follow that

we could charge half of $14,000,000, but what I do say is that we will be disposed to charge the amount that is right and proper. What I contend is that this bridge was rendered necessary by the condition of the country long before the Transcontinental Railway was dreamed of and when my hon. friend charges the whole cost, which he places at $14,000,000, against the Transcontinental Railway it is not a fair charge at all, because all he could properly charge would be a proportion, whatever may be thought to be proper, in proportion to the user of the bridge as compared with the user by other companies. Now then with regard to the Mountain and Prairie sections——

Mr. LANCASTER. Before the hon. gentleman proceeds to deal with the Mountain and Prairie sections, would he say what, in his opinion, is the cost of the road from Winnipeg to Moncton ?

Mr. FIELDING. No, I am going to assume that the statements which have been presented by my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals and which have been accepted by the hon. leader of the opposition, are correct. I have not given any attention to it. I presume they are correct and I am quite willing to accept them.

Mr. LANCASTER. I thought you said that it was nothing. That was the logical conclusion of your speech.

Mr. FIELDING. Logic is a thing as to which different people have different views. An hon. gentleman near me has called my attention to a remark made by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) in the debate which occurred in 1903. He was making some references to the Quebec bridge and he said :

I mention this because I have always been favourable to that project and the Conservative party, as members of this House are well aware, was committed to assisting the construction of the bridge before 1896.

So we have, in addition to the statement I have already quoted, the acknowledgement of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier that the Conservative party was committed to the construction of the bridge before the year 1896, long years before the Transcontinental Railway scheme was undertaken.

Now, in regard to the Mountain and Prairie sections, my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, I am sorry to say, carries into this also the same erroneous conclusions. He charges up practically everything. He charges up the guarantee of bonds to the cost to the people of Canada of that road. A more monstrous contention could hardly be conceived. I have read his statement, but that there should be no mistake let me read it again :

Mr. FIELDING.

Statement of cost to Canada of National Transcontinental railway.

He sets out all the items and at the bottom gives the total $250,968,723.

What can be more preposterous than that? Take the cost of the Prairie section. The government of Canada guarantees the bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, to the extent of three-quarters of the cost, up to a limit of $13,000 per mile. We have guaranteed the bonds of the Canadian Pacific Railway, but it never cost the people of Canada one dollar; we have guaranteed the bonds of the Canadian Northern Railway, but it never cost the people of Canada one dollar; we are guaranteeing the bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific for the Prairie section on the condition that they must pay interest on the money from the moment the road is open. Who says that they will never pay that interest ? Surely my hon. friend will see the fallacy of that argument. It may be that on the eastern division and on the Mountain section you will not have interest paying traffic immediately and we have made allowance for that. We recognize that, as respects the eastern division and the Mountain portion, at the beginning of operations the traffic will be very moderate and that they may not be able to pay interest and therefore we grant them seven years freedom on the eastern and Mountain divisions from the obligation to pay interest. But, when it comes to the Prairie section, with the teeming business which is there waiting to be done, with the crop which is standing today in the Northwest enough to furnish a traffic for the Transcontinental Railway, in the face of the enthusiasm of the people of the west, in the face of the demand for railways in all directions, in the face of the cry that the need of the country is not traffic but railways to carry it, the hon. gentleman carries in, as the cost to the people of Canada, the amounts that we are guaranteeing on these bonds and assumes that not one cent will ever be received on the other side of the account.

Then you turn to the Mountain section. There we guarantee three-quarters of the cost whatever it may be. We cannot expect that the Mountain section will pay at once, and so we allow them seven years without interest on the amount which we shall guarantee. But, there will come a time surely—and seven years is not too long perhaps to allow them—when, on that Mountain section, as well as on the eastern division, the traffic will pay. My hon. friend is only able to sustain his position on the assumption that the whole scheme is worthless, that the country is going to the dogs and that there is no traffic anywhere to give business to the railway. Upon that assumption my hon. friend's figures may be justified, but if that is not the fact, if

the business of that country needs more railways, if the great crops of which we have heard so much and of which we are so proud in that western country will give business to this Transcontinental Railway, or as much of it as will be ready this year, why should my hon. friend assume that for the moment or after the lapse of seven years we will not be able to get enough traffic even for the Mountain section to pay the interest on three-quarters of its bonded debt ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman is mis-stating altogether my position. I said not one word about any cash outlay by the government upon the Mountain section except in the seven years when we have to pay interest on the bond guarantee without recourse. The hon. gentleman has over and over again distinct portions of my statement without including what was right before his eyes and he knew it; he knew it perfectly well ; I said at the end of my statement :

Cash expenditure..	$192,920,723
Bond guarantee..	58,048,000

Mr. FIELDING. What else?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And the total cost of these two, that is, the total of cash expenditure and bond guarantee, $250,968,-723. The hon. gentleman has repeatedly during his speech endeavoured to convey an absolutely different impression from that which an examination of the document would convey to any fair-minded person.

Mr. FIELDING. I differ from the hon. gentleman. Any man who examines the document as it stands on 'Hansard' and as it has been published throughout the country by the organs of the hon. gentleman can see nothing else in it but that which I have read, and I will read it again:

Statement of cost to Canada of National Transcontinental Railway.

Total, $250,968,000.

If the hon. gentleman did not mean to represent that that was the cost to Canada why did he put it in that statement as such?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I neither meant to state it nor did I represent it, and the hon. gentleman when he made his misleading statement to the House was perfectly aware of it.

Mr. FIELDING. Well, this statement as it was given by the hon. gentleman and as it is printed with his approval in 'Hansard,' and as it has been distributed throughout the country, will go on record, and my statement will go alongside of it and I will let the country judge who misled the people.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON. He says now his statement is all wrong.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Johnston) has stated what is not correct and what he knows is not correct.

Mr. CROCKET. I wish to ask the Finance Minister if that statement does not clearly separate the cash outlay from the bond guarantee?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, but it places them both as part of the cost to Canada, and it is going the round of every Conservative paper in Canada to-day, and the only point of difference is that some of them wishing to see the leader of the opposition and go him one better represent that as the cost of the construction of the road from Moncton to Winnipeg. The leader of the opposition makes the statement that the cost to Canada—I am quoting his words so that there may be no mistake, 'Cost to Canada'—let it be printed in large letters :

'Cost to Canada,' total $250,969,723.

The figures in the first statement were slightly different and the hon. gentleman corrected them, and I am giving him the benefit of the correction.

Now, what is the actual cost to Canada? The actual cost to Canada for the eastern division is seven years' interest on the cost of construction.

Mr. CROCKET. How much is that?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not know. I am taking the figures of the leader of the opposition, which I assume to be correct, and my argument is based on the assumption that they are correct. For the eastern division the cost to Canada is not the cost of construction; it represents seven years' interest on the cost of construction, and after that for every dollar we get interest from the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. The cost of the Prairie section is nothing to the people of Canada, because we guarantee three-fourths of the cost of construction and we are to get interest on that from the moment the road is open. Not one dollar does that Prairie section of the road cost the people of Canada in the proper sense of the word.

Coming now to the Mountain section, the cost to Canada is not the cost of construction, but it is seven years' interest on three quarters of the cost of construction, because for every year beyond that seven years the Grand Trunk Pacific is obliged to pay the interest.

So then we have this summing up :

Mr. Borden's statement of the total cost to Canada..	$250,969,723
Actual cost to Canada :	
Seven years interest on the eastern division (I take my hon. friend's figures)..	26,124,676

Seven years' interest on the guaranteed bonds for the Mountain section (again I take my hon. friend's figures). ....$	11,304,300
I insert seven years' interest upon his own estimate of the terminals—if they are not covered by his general statement of cost the item will be necessary—seven years' interest on the cost of the terminals (estimated on Mr. Borden's figures)	1,340,150
So we have the net result that the actual fair cost to the people of Canada of this enterprise, the cost the people of Canada will have to pay according to the figures of my hon. friend himself, in reality should be....	38,769,126
The hon. gentleman has overstated the cost of that work to the people of Canada to the extent of not less than.. ..	212,200,000

I am making this statement of the interest on the basis of my hon. friend's figures, but of course that interest has not to be paid immediately. It will be paid during a series of years and by an actuarial calculation you could establish its present value. I have not gone into that fully, but no doubt it would make the figure considerably less than the $38,000,000 to which I have referred.

Now, as I have stated, the difference in the statements is the point of view from which they are approached. There is only one possible excuse—if one may dare call it an excuse—for my hon. friend opposite his only possible defense for his statement would be that the whole undertaking is worthless, that the road will never earn anything and that the country has gone to the dogs. On no other grounds whatever can he justify a statement which ignores the obligation of the Grand Trunk Pacific to pay this government 3 per cent interest on the cost of the eastern section of the road after the first seven years; which ignores the obligation of the Grand Trunk to pay us interest from the very beginning on the Prairie section and which ignores the obligation to pay nterest on the Mountain section also after seven years. If it be true that the country has gone to the dogs my hon. friend is right, but our statement is made upon the belief and the faith that great has as has been the progress of Canada in the past it is going to be greater in the early future, and so we refuse to believe, and we are sure the country will refuse to believe, in the basis upon which the leader of the opposition makes up his statement.

Much has been said from time to time concerning certain estimates which I made in the debate of 1903 on the Transcontinental Railway scheme. It is easy to be wise after the event, but those of us who deal with the actualities of life must present every question in the best light we can bring to bear at the time; then if we are honest in our endeavours to get light from the most intelligent sources and present it to parliament, we need not be ashamed if it turns out afterwards we were mistaken, so long as we have brought it forth in good faith and with the best possible intent. My hon. friend quoted me as having estimated the cost of the New Brunswick section of the eastern division at $25,000 a mile. There is a sense in which that is correct, but it is hardly as fair and as full a statement as we ought to expect from the hon. gentleman. My hon. friend should have said that I made no estimate at all of the cost of that section in the sense in which he quotes it. The estimates which I presented to the House I did not presume to make myself. They were made upon the authority of a capable and experienced engineer whose integrity and ability will be unquestioned. I received the report from Mr. Schreiber, who was at that time the chief engineer of Railways and Canals, a man of the highest character, a man whose intelligence and capacity no one can doubt. Mr. Schreiber estimated that you could build a road of the character of the Intercolonial—not inferior to that—for $25,000 a mile east of Quebec and for $28,000 a mile from Quebec to Winnipeg. It is to that which my hon. friend refers when he quotes me as estimating the cost in New Brunswick at $25,000 a mile. I would remind my hon. friend that while I presented these figures and gave Mr. Schreiber as my authority for them, I stated that that would not be sufficient for the higher standard of road which we required. Therefore, I added—it was but a rough estimate—25 per cent for the better grade that we desired to have, and so the estimate I gave for the New Brunswick section was not $25,000 per mile, as my hon. friend states, but $31,200 per mile. It is not a very important thing, because the actual cost is very much above either of these sums. But I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that any estimates I gave were not estimates which I presumed to give of my own knowledge, because I had no such knowledge, but were based on the report of an intelligent and capable engineer. The hon. leader of the opposition gave us some estimates too, and he quoted them the other evening. He said:

> I estimated the road from Winnipeg to Moncton at $40,000 per mile for 1,875 miles, or a total of $75,000,000.

If the hon. gentleman had engineering advice for that estimate, he never gave it to the House, so that we have to hold him responsible for it. I had the estimate of an engineer to fall back on, but he had not.

Mr. LANCASTER. He was more correct than your engineer.

Mr. FIELDING. Neither of them was correct. My hon. friend's estimate of the cost of the road from Winnipeg to Moncton was $75,000,000 ; and yet he is now putting forward the statement that it will cost $124,000,000. And so it would seem that neither my hon. friend nor I was very near the proper estimate.

Mr. LANCASTER. Who was the nearest ?

Mr. FIELDING. Well, there is not much to choose between us. My estimate of the cost of the road from Quebec to Winnipeg was $35,000 per mile, and my hon. friend's estimate was $40,000 per mile, so that there was not a wide difference between us.

Mr. LAKE. He did not take into account the Quebec classification.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friends have not made much of the Quebec classification. What will be clearly understood by the public as to the Quebec classification will be this, that an engineer, who doubtless meant well, but was mistaken, made some accusations against the National Transcontinental Commissioners implying that they acted improperly and perhaps corruptly with regard to the classification of the road ; that when the matter was investigated and that engineer was brought face to face with the committee and with the gentlemen concerned, he frankly said that he had made a mistake and withdrew his charges.

Mr. LENNOX. We do not and the country does not have to depend on Major Hodgins at all in the matter.

Mr. FIELDING. But as Major Hodgins, the gentleman who made the accusation, came before the committee and frankly acknowledged that he was mistaken and had no longer any charge to make, the country will understand that.

Mr. LENNOX. Major Hodgins was not the only person who made accusations. Vastly more important accusations were made by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, and they stand on record yet.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Might I ask, for information, what did Major Hodgins withdraw ?

Mr. FIELDING. I was not present at the meeting. I read it in the public press, and I am stating it as the public know it, that the gentleman who made these accusations came before the committee after the inquiry and frankly acknowledged that he was wrong, stating that the points of difference were points of difference between engineers, upon which men might honestly exercise difference of opinion. The three salient facts were : first, that Major Hodgins made his accusations ; second, that Major Hodgins withdrew his accusations; and third, that even if they wanted to do so, the Transcontinental Railway Commissioners could not change the classification, because that is the work of the chief engineer, and there is not a man on either side of the House who will dare to asperse the integrity of Hugh Lumsden.

Now, my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, in presenting this deplorable picture of the future, this picture of a time when the roads would not earn anything and the revenues go to the bow-wows, gave a statement of the enormous addition that would have to be made to the net debt of the country in consequence of this arrangement. My hon. friend said :

> The public debt of Canada at present is, I suppose, from $265,000,000 to $268,000,000.

He is there alluding to the net debt, which is usually the basis of our calculations. Then he goes on to say :

> The public debt of Canada at present is, I suppose, from $265,000,000 to $268,000,000. The cost of this road will amount to at least $190,000,000 before we are through with it; and unless some considerable portion of that amount can be paid out of revenue—which does not seem very probable under present conditions—the total debt of this country, by the time this road is completed, without our spending a dollar for the development of our ports and inland waterways and on subsidies to railways or for any other of the enormous calls that will be made on the treasury within the early future—without taking into consideration a single one of these demands on the public treasury, the public debt of Canada is likely to reach $450,000,000 before we pay for the building of this National Transcontinental Railway.

I say again that my hon. friend indulges in pessimism of the worst kind. He can see no hope of anything but ruin coming out of this thing. He cannot think it possible that any portion of the payments made on this work will be paid out of revenue. He is of opinion that every dollar of the cost of the road, which at one place he puts at $190,000,000 and at another place at $250,000,000, must be added to the net debt of the country. I hope my hon. friend is not always going to be in such a gloomy frame of mind. Things are not so bad as that, I can assure him. As a considerable portion of that money has already been expended, we are able to put his theory to the test. Up to the 30th June, as near as I can get to it, we have paid out on Transcontinental Railway account $30,000,000. According to my hon. friend's idea, we must have added that $30,000,000 to the net debt of Canada ; but I am glad to be able to tell him that we have not added one-half of that to the net debt of Canada.

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

Mr. FIELDING. I have not the exact figures, but I think it would not be more than $14,000,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I mean what is the amount of the debt ?

Mr. FIELDING. I have not the exact figures. The net debt is a little more than my hon. friend stated ; it is about $270,000,000. I am taking the expenditures on the Transcontinental Railway since the contract was made and the increase of the net debt during that time, and from that I deduce that if during that time we have been able to pay $30,000,000 on account of the Transcontinental Railway and have added less than one-half of it to the net debt of the country, we can go on with the assurance that we can finish this road without making such a large increase to the net debt of the country as my hon. friend seems to think.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Can the hon. minister tell me what he estimates the net debt will be at the end of the present fiscal year?

Mr. FIELDING. I would not like to make an estimate of that. But suppose we were going to add that enormous sum of $190,000,000, as my hon. friend said in one place, or $250,000,000, as he said in another place —suppose we were to add either of these sums to the public debt of Canada, the net debt, would that be so very alarming ? Would a charge upon the treasury of the Dominion for that work, amounting to either the $190,000,000 or the $250,000,000, be an enormous and alarming sum for the people to have to bear for this railway extension ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does my hon. friend say I mentioned the amount of $250,000,000 in connection with the net debt ?

Mr. FIELDING. In that case my hon. friend used $190,000,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I never used the expression $250,000,000 in connection with the net debt. My hon. friend is not giving my statement fairly. He is omitting altogether any reference to this. I ended my statement with this expression. Total cash expenditure $191,305,823 ; bond guarantee, $58,048,000. In addition to the above cash expenditure the government incurs the following obligation on its guarantee of bonds :

Guarantee on bonds issued on Mountain section as above.. ..	$46,140,000
Guarantee of bonds issue on Prairie section, 916 miles, at $13,000 per mile..	11,908,600
Total..	$58,048,000

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend is repeating his statement and therefore I must repeat my reply. Again I call attention to his tabular statement in 'Hansard,' page 12595, headed 'Statement of cost to Canada of the National Transcontinental Railway.' The various items are there set forth in tabular form. And at the foot of the tabular statement appear these figures—Total, $249,253,823.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What are the words immediately above ?

Mr. FIELDING. As I have said my hon. friend carries into his statement interest that we do pay, interest that we do not pay, cash expenditure and bond guarantee. He clubs them all together and makes up a total cost to Canada of $249,353,823, which he afterwards corrected to $250,968,723. But suppose we had to add this very large sum to the debt of Canada for railway purposes, would that be so alarming as my hon. friend seems to suggest ? Would it create a paralysis in the credit of Canada ? I might remind my hon. friend that one great corporation in Canada, the Canadian Pacific Railway, is paying to-day interest and dividends on stocks, bonds and debentures which amount in all to $311,000,000. If that corporation—and a great one it is—is able to carry that amount, if it is able to bear the burden, and instead of doing evil be of great benefit in the development of the country, do you suppose that any one in Canada is going to be alarmed if we have to add either the $190,000,000 or the $250,000,000 to the public debt of Canada ? But while there will be a nominal addition for the time to the debt of Canada, the true measure of the cost of this enterprise to the people is not the cost of construction but the seven years rental on the eastern division and the seven years interest on the Mountain section.

That the road has cost more than we expected, I admit, and I have no apology to offer. I gave the best information I could get. What better could I have done than go to the eminent engineer whose integrity and ability are beyond question ? I gave the House the information he gave me. The road has cost more than we anticipated and there is not a man in the Dominion who voted for that Transcontinental scheme in 1904 who would not have voted for it just as readily if he had known it was going to cost the actual figures it has. But take the figures as they are presented to-day and contrast them with the cost of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Canadian Pacific Railway was a great enterprise. It was liberally endowed, and I am not saying it was too liberally subsidized. We are all, to-day, whatever may have been our difference in the past, proud of it ; but we know that in order to secure that road, the country had to make great sacrifices, and by comparison we are getting the Transcontiental Railway on very favourable terms. That road, it is true, is costing us more than we estimated, but the reasons are not far to seek. Every railway company knows why it is costing more because it has had the same experience. Every engineer knows why the road is costing more because he has

had the same experience. Every manufacturer of Canada, whose wares enter into the construction of the Transcontinental, knows why it is costing more, because he is getting higher prices than he did in 1903. Every workman in the factories knows why, because he is getting higher wages for the work on the Transcontinental than he did in 1903. Every rail maker knows, because he is selling his rails at a higher price than he did in 1903. Every coal miner knows because he is getting more from the coal he produces which is used in making the rail. Every lumberman who supplies the ties, every shantyman who goes into the woods to cut the timber for the ties, knows why this road is costing more, because he knows he is getting more wages to-day than he did in 1903. Every labourer on the road knows that the higher wages he is getting must increase the cost of the road. But so long as this road is well constructed, so long as we have the proud satisfaction of knowing that we are getting the best Transcontinental railway ever built on the continent of America, so long as that railway is well constructed and equipped, so long as we are moving forward rapidly to the fulfilment of our expectations, the country will not quarrel with the increased expenditure but will say: We wanted the road in 1904, we want it now, and if it becomes necessary to send the government back to power to give us that road, that will be one of the many reasons why they must be returned.

Mr. HAGGART. We have had a very exciting debate over a very simple question. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition asked information from the government as to what the cost of our Transcontinental Railway would be. We got that information from the Minister of Railways, My hon. friend made a calculation upon it and presented it to the House and the country. It was a calculation on which two parties might differ, but the experts at the head of the Railway Department differ very little from my hon. friend the leader of the opposition. Why then all this wind? Simply because the figures now given do not correspond with those which the government furnished again and again to this House, and because these figures are so enormous that they have startled the country.

In their campaign literature which hon. gentlemen opposite circulated from one end of the country to the other, they stated that the cost of this road was only going to be $8,700,000. The statement of the Finance Minister, which he sticks to yet, is that it was only to be $13,000,000 plus the interest.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not say that now.

Mr. HAGGART. The leader of the government sticks to the same statement, I suppose, of $13,000,000. Now the Minister of Railways sums the amount up to $26,000,000. A word with regard to this so-called extravagant statement of the leader of the opposition. The Finance Minister tries to make the most out of it he can. That statement is headed 'Statement of the cost to Canada of the National Transcontinental Railway,' and the Minister of Finance tries to lead the House to believe that the leader of the opposition argued that the total cost of this road to the government would be $250,000,000. My hon. friend never intended anything of the kind.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And never said anything of the kind.

Mr. HAGGART. He never said anything of the kind, and he handed over to the Minister of Railways a copy of the account prepared by him, and the account does not contain that amount. My hon. friend makes the amount $191,000,000, and the Minister of Finance says my hon. friend is committing a fraud upon the country by making a misstatement of that kind. The Minister of Finance, however, hasn't brought forward any proof. It is the logic of the Minister of Finance that is entirely wrong. Suppose the imperial government were to build a dock at Gibraltar at an expenditure of £1,000,000 sterling, and they received a benefit from dockage of ships which paid the interest; therefore, the £1,000,000 is not a straight expense by the imperial government, because they are receiving a corresponding compensation from year to year from the dockage of vessels. The same idea enters into the calculations of the Finance Minister. Get it into the capital account, it is a good investment, it does not show in the receipts and expenditures for the year, and it enables him to make a good financial statement. But any one who looks over the way the accounts are kept by the imperial authorities in reference to expenditure on capital account, if he has common sense, sees the fallacy of the book-keeping of the Finance Minister. The hon. gentleman has done it again and again. Because he gets this as a capital expenditure, and we are only to pay interest on it for seven years, he argues it is an amount that should not be charged against the people of Canada. The Minister of Finance says: Oh, an expenditure of this kind is a good investment, we get our money back. We do not, of course, get the 7 per cent back, nor the interest which we have lost on that cash investment. But my hon. friend seems to think that if we get the railroad back again we have good value for our money. I will go so far as to say that possibly the railway from the Pacific to Lake Superior may be a good investment. But that is something which belongs to the Grand Trunk Pacific alone, it is the only part they are interested in. Does the Minister of

Railways, considering the country which that railway passes through from Winnipeg to Moncton, think that if we were obliged to take it over and work it, it would be a good security for the money invested in it? Does it pass through the fine grazing and agricultural country, or the good mining country, that the Intercolonial passes through in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia? It passes through a country from Winnipeg to Quebec which is now a virtual wilderness. Taking the history of the Canadian Pacific Railway, of the Canadian Northern and other railways, we learn that in order to procure a traffic upon that road you require a long time. Some portions of the Canadian Northern have been built for eighteen years, other portions for twelve, eight and six years, and the Canadian Northern, although passing through choice farming lands in the Northwest Territories, is only now beginning to reach a good financial basis, but barely so. Possibly the Grand Trunk Pacific, from the Pacific to Lake Superior, may, in four or five years' time, reach a good financial basis with the traffic of that splendid country it passes through. But as for the section between Winnipeg and Moncton, you may have possession of it from twenty-five to fifty years, and at the end of fifty years you would be poorer than you were at the beginning. We are justified in coming to that conclusion from observing the manner in which the Intercolonial Railway is managed, with a deficit of $4,500,000 per year, and upon a road passing through a country not nearly as good as the Intercolonial passes through you would have a deficit of $6,000,000 or $7,000,000, and, instead of having an asset for the money expended on this road, you would have on your hands an elephant which would cost the country millions every year.

But we are told we have a guarantee from the Grand Trunk Pacific that after seven years or ten years they will pay interest on the amount. What is the guarantee of the Grand Trunk Pacific? It is a guarantee on the value of the undertaking. It does not bind the bondholders of the Grand Trunk Pacific. If they build a road from the Pacific to Lake Superior they are free from any such liability at all. It is only the actual stockholders of the Grand Trunk Pacific that make that promise to the government. Suppose they say: We find that we cannot work that road, the receipts do not enable us to meet the expenditure; they can force the government of this country to take over that road. They can say: We won't work it; and what remedy have you against it? No remedy at all. You are obliged to take over the road. You will have on your hands a road on which you have expended $191,000,000, and under the circumstances it would have been better if that $191,000,000 had been thrown into Lake Superior, because you have a liability of $5,000,000 or $6,000,000 a year to work this railway afterwards. We had a calculation made by the Finance Minister that the eastern section of that road would cost from $25,000 to $28,000 per mile, plus 25 per cent, to bring it up to the standard that Mr. Charlton advocated. The Minister of Finance has forgotten that in the estimate he was providing for the whole cost of the Quebec bridge up to that moment. Does he forget that? If he does, perhaps I had better read to him from the 'Hansard' a statement that he made at the time:

Adding all the various sums together—the present value of seven years' interest on the eastern section, first, on the basis of $25,000 and $28,000 per mile, which is the way the figures are made up; seven years' interest on the Quebec bridge represented by its present value.

Mr. FIELDING. That probably will be on the $2,000,000 which I estimated as the proportion chargeable to the National Transcontinental Railway.

Mr. HAGGART. You were including the Quebec bridge.

Mr. FIELDING. To the extent of $2,000,000.

Mr. HAGGART. The minister made a statement and asked for a guarantee of $6,200,000 and odd or bonds issued to the Quebec Bridge Company. His figures in the estimate for the Quebec bridge were $500,000 too low:

The government's liability for the Quebec bridge was limited by chapter 54 of the Acts of 1902 to a guarantee of the payment of the principal and interest on the authorized bond issue by the company to the amount of $6,678,000. This guarantee was given, the bonds were issued and pledged for the company to the Bank of Montreal for the raising of money. Of these guaranteed bonds £478,700 sterling, approximating $2,330,000, have since been returned to the government and are held as collateral for an advance of $2,000,000. Therefore, we have advanced $2,000,000 out of the amount. The remaining bonds to the amount of the sterling equivalent of $4,348,200 are outstanding in the hands of the Bank of Montreal. The bank's claim against the bridge company on April 13, 1908, for general advances and interest was $3,773,000 and another special advance of $174,000.

Deducting them from the amount the bank holds as security for this amount leaves the amount advanced by the government $5,900,000 or about $500,000 less than my hon. friend estimates it. I remember the Finance Minister stating when he brought down his motion for the guarantee of the bonds by the government that the Quebec bridge was an essential part of the undertaking of the Grand Trunk Pacific. I believed him too. What are you going to do? Are

you going to end the Grand Trunk Pacific at Quebec or do you intend to build a bridge to Point Lévis to connect with the Lévis section ? There is not a doubt that the government will be compelled to build that bridge, either as a separate undertaking or as a part of the Grand Trunk Pacific.

The hon. the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) did not care two cents whether the amount of money was expended on the Quebec bridge under one name or under the other, what he was directing to the attention of the country was the enormous expenditure for the purpose of accomplishing what the government wished in the building of the Transcontinental Railway. My friend's estimate of $9,000,000 to complete the bridge has not been assailed or questioned. It may be too much, I do not know whether it is or not, but I do know that already $5,900,000 have been expended on it and I should judge that as the government had authority in their hands to investigate it and must have had information on the subject as to the probable cost of the new bridge, they know my hon. friend's estimate of $9,000,000 is correct. The $11,196,-290, as my friend puts it, is only a hypothetical amount at the moment and the Minister of Railways and the Minister of Finance so treat it. But what are the probabilities ? After seven years running of that road from Winnipeg to Moncton across the Quebec bridge, if the bridge is built by a company, what amount of money will the Grand Trunk Pacific probably have to pay for the use of that bridge by the Transcontinental ? The probabilities, judging from railway construction in portions of Canada more favourably situated, are that the government and the country for twenty years afterwards, and the Grand Trunk Pacific, if they are in a position to pay it, will be paying more for the running of the road than they get in receipts. It would be a fair estimate to add the three years' interest but my friend says : No, take it off. Fancy the argument of the Minister of Finance in reference to the terminals at Moncton ! The $750,000 is to be spent there but by some jugglery we are to have the shops built by the country and it was not to be a charge to the country or a charge against the Grand Trunk Pacific. Perhaps it is a charge against the Intercolonial Railway ?

Mr. GRAHAM. It certainly is. That is where it is being charged.

Mr. HAGGART. You make an expenditure of $750,000 more than is needed on the Intercolonial Railway owing to the possibility of the Grand Trunk Pacific reaching Moncton and the National Transcontinental is not to pay for it. It does not matter two pins who has to pay for it, the country has to pay the $750,000 and if it was not for the Grand Trunk Pacific reaching Moncton we would not have to spend the money.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend is wrong. He will see that enlarging certain buildings is not nearly as costly as building them from the beginning and we did need shops at Moncton. The only difference is that we might not have built them so large.

Mr. HAGGART. I was taking the hon. gentleman's own estimate. But in answer to my hon. friend's question the minister sends down information that the government are spending $750,000 more at Moncton on account of the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Mr. GRAHAM. I did not say that. I said it was fair to charge the Grand Trunk Pacific $750,000 for their share, but we are not spending that much more on their account.

Mr. LENNOX. Then it is not fair to charge them that much.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, it is.

Mr. HAGGART. Here is the statement from the memorandum.

For the terminals at Moncton the sum of $97,000 was included in the bulk for a terminal yard.

Then it is added to the cost of construction of the road.

With regard to shop accommodation, it is assumed that an arrangement will be made for the joint use of the shops of the Intercolonial Railway. If so, the National Transcontinental Railway's share of the capital expenditure on them is estimated at $750,000 or, at 4 per cent interest, $50,000 a year.

The government estimated the cost of this road at from $25,000 to $28,000 a mile, but they subsequently found that it was going to cost $63,000 a mile. I venture to say that with the terminals and all the other things to be added it cannot be built for much less than $70,000 per mile. The Minister of Railways and Canals says that the excessive cost was caused by the adoption of modern gradients and curvatures and he makes the bold statement that large expenditures are being made on the Canadian Pacific Railway and Canadian Northern Railway and Grand Trunk Railway for the purpose of bringing them up-to-date. That is perfectly true, but he also says that roads being built in the same section of the country which is being traversed by the Grand Trunk Pacific are being built upon that principle, that it is better and cheaper, to build the road with four-tenths per cent grades one way and six-tenths per cent grades the other way. The experience of railway men is to the contrary. Every railway man in the country, especially those connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the Canadian Northern, laughs at the absurdity of building a first class road from Winnipeg to Quebec in the first instance with the gradients and curvatures mentioned by the Minister of

Railways and Canals. The principle they adopt on other roads is to get their road through the country first with moderate grades and curvatures and then, when they have developed the traffic, bring the road up to a higher standard. That is what was contemplated by the original Grand Trunk Pacific agreement. There is no necessity for building a road with gradients of four-tenths of one per cent and a maximum curvature of four degrees under the contract made with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. The road between Montreal and Toronto cannot be compared with that standard as to grades and curvatures. All we were bound to do at best was to build a road equal to the road between Montreal and Toronto. The Minister of Railways and Canals says that the Grand Trunk Railway Company, in view of the difficulties of operating the road with the gradients and curvatures between Montreal and Toronto, are at present contemplating abandoning the road over Scarborough Heights and going along the lake shore. The contract allows the Grand Trunk Pacific to have gradients of at least 90 feet to the mile. At the time that the proposition was made for the building of the road I stated my opinion of the country through which it will pass from Winnipeg to Quebec, I stated that the cost of the road would, at the minimum, be $50,000 per mile, and I stated also that the expenditure on the Quebec bridge would be in excess of the amount that the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the hon. Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) stated it would cost the country. I hardly believed, and I can hardly believe up to the present time, that the government will abandon the building of the road from Quebec to Moncton. I pointed to surveys made by Sir Sandford Fleming and I pointed out that it was impossible to get a better road than they have at the present time to Moncton taking into consideration distance, gradients and expenditure. I was told by the premier that there would be a saving in distance between Lévis and Moncton of from 100 to 130 miles. They have let contracts, but is the proposed route one mile shorter between Lévis and Moncton than that which they have at the present time?

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) whether the policy of the opposition to-day is that this Grand Trunk Pacific Railway should not be built, or, if not built in its entirety, whether some portion of it should not be built?

Mr. HAGGART. I have no authority to speak for the opposition or to state what their policy is.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. What do you say?

Mr. HAGGART. I was a supporter of the building of the Grand Trunk Pacific from Winnipeg to Lake Superior and to the Pacific. I stated that the proposed expenditure from Winnipeg to Quebec was a useless one. I stated also, that of all the monstrous, extravagant, useless expenditures that were ever made by the government of this country, the building of a road from Quebec to Moncton must be given the first place—paralleling your own Intercolonial Railway, making worse an asset which is useless to the people and to be supplemented, as the Minister of Railways and Canals states, by the double tracking of the line from Moncton to Halifax, or, if that is not practicable on account of the gradients, the construction of a shorter cut across to Halifax.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Perfectly satisfactory.

Mr. HAGGART. Of all the extravagant statements made by the Minister of Railways and Canals that is the most extravagant one. Surely he does not contemplate anything of the kind.

Mr. CONMEE. Does the hon. gentleman approve of the section from Winnipeg to Quebec? I understand him to say that he does not approve of the section from Quebec to Moncton, and I want to know if he includes the section from Winnipeg to Quebec?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, he says so.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not think that the road will be in a financial position to pay in the next fifty years from Winnipeg to Quebec.

Mr. CONMEE. I am asking if the hon. gentleman approves of the building of it.

Mr. HAGGART. Last year I spoke on the subject for nearly an hour, and I had the honour of being supported by the government party; they took my speech as the pattern for theirs in explaining the building of the Transcontinental Railway.

Mr. FIELDING. That accounts for the mistakes.

Mr. HAGGART. And they paid me the compliment of giving me the credit of saying that I was the first to initiate or suggest it. But, when we come to such a road as the government are at present building between Winnipeg and Quebec with the prospect of extending it to Halifax or St. John and when we come to consider the claim that it can be industrially used for the purpose of conveying the grain from the Northwest to the sea-board, I do not think there is a sane man, let alone a railway man, in the country who will say that the project is feasible. It is supported by some politicians who are anxious to get votes in their particular provinces by promising all sorts of imaginary things to the people. The statement made by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition as to the financial position of this road is strictly correct. There is nothing in the argument of my hon. friend

the Minister of Finance that because the Grand Trunk Pacific promises to pay at the end of seven years it is not a liability to the country. The liability of the country begins the moment the amount is paid. We do not know whether it will ever be returned.

We may not treat that as a liability, but though our creditors will treat our endorsation of the bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific on the Mountain and Prairie sections as a liability, I believe that we may never be called upon to pay the interest with respect to the section from the Pacific ocean to Lake Superior. The line passes through a fertile country there, and it brings the grain to the quickest ports from which to reach the markets of the world. The development of the immense resources of British Columbia and of the prairies will require the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Canadian Northern Railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific. The Conservative party was never opposed to any proposition to build the Grand Trunk Railway in the west, and, Sir, we could have had that road running to Lake Superior for a nominal sum without loading upon the country the immense liabilities which this scheme of the government proposes. I was sorry to see the plight of the Minister of Finance when he tried to answer the statement of the leader of the opposition. He is generally clear in his argument but he floundered through in a manner which excited not my hostility but my pity. I trust that the next time the Finance Minister has a financial statement to make he will have a better subject, for to-day he showed that he knew it was desperate to attempt to refute the figures given by the leader of the opposition. The statement of the leader of the opposition stands without contradiction as to the liability of the country for this railway. The expenditure will be enormous and it is better that the Minister of Finance should acknowledge it now. It may be too late for him to halt, but he should seriously consider the curtailment of what may not be absolutely necessary in the undertaking.

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford). There are three questions that presented themselves to my mind in considering this matter. First, was an honest effort made by the government to get at the real cost of this railway when the project was launched; second, what was to be the character of the work; and third, is an honest effort being made to fulfil the promises given to the country. The leader of the opposition made it clear to every fair minded man that misrepresentations were made to the parliament of Canada when this project was first commenced. I was surprised to hear the Finance Minister today endeavour to perpetuate the fallacies which were announced by the government in 1903. He seems to have got this $15,000,000 in his head yet. Just look at the Public Accounts of Canada and under date of October 31, 1907, under the signature of the Hon. W. S. Fielding, you will find this entry :

Expenditure chargeable to capital.

Intercolonial Railway..	$1,473,907
Prince Edward Railway..	91,210
National Transcontinental Ry..	5,537,867

This shows that the expenditure on National Transcontinental Railway is put in the same category as the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway, and yet the Minister of Finance sticks to his proposition that all the National Transcontinental will cost the country is the interest upon the capital while the road is being constructed. Would the Minister of Finance dare to go to his bankers and borrow money on the statement that the road will only cost $13,000,000, when even according to the Minister of Railways himself, it will cost anywhere from $125,000,000 to $200,000,000? The hon. A. G. Blair left the cabinet because he refused to become a party to the argument the Minister of Finance set up to-day, and as a fair and honest estimate of what he considered would be the real cost of the National Transcontinental Railway to the country he put it at $120,000,000. All the rest of the ministers apparently disagreed with that and gave an estimate of $13,000,000, basing it on the interest alone, but Mr. Blair, astute and clever as he was, left the cabinet because he would not accept any such argument. Such a statement from the Finance Minister is not calculated to reassure the people of Canada that the management of our finances is at present in safe hands. I doubt if the Minister of Finance in his heart believe his own statement. He cited the instance of a real estate man investing $10,000 in a house and immediately renting it for 50 years so that it would be a paying proposition. That is quite so but he forgot that the man's $10,000 had gone into the house just as the money borrowed on the credit of Canada has gone into the Transcontinental Railway. The Minister of Finance told us that we guaranteed the bonds of the Canadian Pacific Railway and had lost nothing and that we had guaranteed the bonds of the Canadian Northern Railway and had lost nothing up to the present. True, but he did not tell us we had guaranteed the bonds of the Quebec bridge. Will he say we will lose nothing on that? He gives two instances. I give him a third; let him take his chances on that. Two investments out of three may be good, and the third may be bad. There are many men in this country who think that the whole eastern section of this road is likely to be a gigantic failure.

Mr. FIELDING. Is my hon. friend opposing the Quebec bridge ?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I will come to that shortly, and I will endeavour to show that it is a part, and a consistent part, of the Transcontinental project. But I say that whether or not the eastern section is a paying proposition, it becomes a liability of this country. Perhaps the hon. leader of the opposition was technically wrong when he said that the debt was increased by close upon $200,000,000. but he was absolutely right if he said the gross debt instead of the net debt. The $191,000,000 was what the leader of the opposition contended would be the cash expenditure of this country on this project. He did not for one moment say that the bond guarantee was a part of the cash expenditure of this country. Would any one who heard the proposition of hon. gentlemen opposite in the year 1903, that this road would be built for $13,000,000, expect that in this year of grace we would be discussing in this House a vote of $30,000,000 for this road for one year ? The Finance Minister has told us that $30,000,000 has already been spent on it and now the government ask us for another vote of $30,000,000. Therefore the scheme was wrongly presented to the country. It is all very well for hon. gentlemen opposite to try to escape from the representations they made when the scheme was launched, but they cannot do it. They are there in 'Hansard,' in the public press and in their campaign literature; and everybody knows that in the last campaign the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway and what it was going to cost the country, were the principal subjects of discussion.

Now, as the campaign literature has been referred to, I am going to read a few lines from a pamphlet which was sent broadcast all over the country from this House by some one who I suppose spoke for the party. The Minister of Railways complains of headlines; let him read this headline in the campaign literature of his own party : 'A Transcontinental Railway for Thirteen Million Dollars.' Then it goes on to say :

The feature of the bargain in regard to which most of this is done is the financial arrangement. It is an actual fact, an indisputable fact, that $13,000,000 will cover every cent of the country's expenditure in connection with the railway and that if $3,853,502 cash were invested to-day with an insurance or investment company it would have grown large enough by the time the railway is completed to actually pay all the expenditures that the country will have to make. This sum seems only a trifle when it is compared with the 25,000,000 acres of land and the $63,000,000 in cash and completed railway lines that Canada gave to the Canadian Pacific railway, but it represents Canada's total liability nevertheless.

What do they say of the hon. leader of the opposition's counter proposition ? Were any of the allowances or deductions asked for by the Finance Minister made in the case of the hon. leader of the opposition? Not one. This is what they said on the Conservative proposal :

The presentation of the Borden alternative scheme to parliament constituted an admission of the necessity of a new transcontinental railway. According to the calculation of Sir William Mulock this scheme, however, would cost $266,000,000.

These are the only figures that were given. No deductions were made on account of the acquisition of the Canada Atlantic Railway, running from Montreal to Parry Sound, which was a part of the proposition; no deductions were made on account of capital expenditure. Yet these hon. gentlemen come down to-day and make all the deductions in favour of their own estimates and figure that this country is only going to have to pay the interest on this debt. Surely the Minister of Finance will not let it go abroad that he claims that the Transcontinental Railway should be put on any other basis than that of the Intercolonial; and all the money invested in that railway was shown in the public accounts. The only point wherein he showed any difference between himself and the leader of the opposition, was in regard to the net debt being given by the leader of the opposition instead of the gross debt.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

National Transcontinental Railway — surveys and construction, $30,000,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. What does the minister want $30,000,000 for when he says the road is only to cost $26,000,000?

Mr. FIELDING. You will have to give notice of that question.

Ocean and mail service between Great Britain and Canada, $550,000.

Mr. FIELDING. This is a contract which the Allan Line holds and what they have in part sublet to the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. FOWLER. To what extent have they sublet it?

Mr. FIELDING. I understand the arrangement is that the Allans put on the 'Virginian' and 'Victorian' and the Canadian Pacific Railway contribute the two 'Empresses,' so that associated they furnish a very good service. Payments are made on the basis of so much to each steamer according to her class; and as we get the services of a better class of steamers we

have to pay a little more, and in that way there is an occasional increase.

Indians—Ontario and Quebec, $150,155.

Mr. STAPLES. What progress has been made with the sale of the Indian reservation out at Swan Lake?

Mr. OLIVER. We were only able to secure the surrender of part of the reserve, and we intend selling it this fall about the time the crops are in, so that the surrounding settlers will have a better opportunity to bid on the land.

Mr. STAPLES. The last time I inquired, the minister told me that the sale would likely take place during the summer. No doubt he will carry out what he is now saying and call it in the coming fall which would be an advantage for the surrounding settlers. I hope he will stick to that promise and see that the land is sold and that he will not cease in his efforts to get the balance of the reserve in order that it may be opened up. Is it the intention to continue negotiations?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, but we find it difficult to get the Indians to sell out altogether, because they would then have to move to another place. We found them not unwilling to part with a portion of the reserve near Battleford, but the Swan reserve is their home, and they object to parting with all their interest in it. However, if the sale turns out well, they may part with the balance.

Mr. STAPLES. Will it be sold by auction?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, in quarter-section lots.

Mr. STAPLES. To what extent does the minister purpose advertising it?

Mr. OLIVER. We generally give very ample notice, about a month or two advertising in the leading papers of the capital and the local papers in the vicinity. There will be no lack of advertising.

Mr. LAKE. I think the minister will have to issue some new regulations with regard to advertising if he is going to carry out that promise. I have been looking into a number of cases of sales of portions of different reserves which have been thrown open by the Indians relinquishing them. The minister is aware that the Indian lands are in the shape of a trust, and we should do the best we can with them for the Indians. It seems to me that the advertisements are a matter of patronage. I have noticed in the past that advertisements for the sale of Indian lands are only given to those who are on the patronage list. This is a mistake, because it does not give the amount of local advertising which is necessary. Take for instance the sale of the Pasqua reserve, which produced pretty fair prices, but I think it would have produced better prices if it had been better advertised. The advertisement appeared in one or two papers, but it did not appear in all the papers which were circulated through that district, and consequently many people did not know that the sale was going to take place. In the report of Mr. Graham, the inspector of the Indian agency and who conducted the sale, he states that there was insufficient advertising, that many people had not seen the advertisement at all. For the sake of exemplifying this there are two papers published in the town of Indian Head, the nearest large town to this reserve, one is a Liberal and the other a Conservative paper, and the advertisement only appeared in the Liberal paper, so those who only took a Conservative paper did not know anything about the sale. I myself wanted to find out when the sale took place, and I was not able to do so. The words that Mr. Graham used were:

> I regret that the sale was not advertised in the local papers. People living in Regina, Indian Head and other local points did not know anything of it.

The advertisement did appear in some of those papers, but not in all of them. That was not the only sale in which I noticed that there was insufficient advertisement. In the sale of the Moose Mountain reserve of land surrendered by the Indians, the same complaint was made. A gentleman who is now an officer of the government, an Indian agent, complained that he had not seen the advertisement. In that case the advertisement was authorized from Ottawa on the 8th October, the sale was to be held on the 15th of November. The first advertisement appeared on the 25th and 28th of October in the Winnipeg 'Free Press' and in the Calgary 'Albertan.' There was an advertisement in one of the French papers of Manitoba and in the Moosomin 'Spectator.' On the 7th of November the first advertisement appeared in the 'Moosomin 'Spectator.' That is the point nearest to the location of these lands, and so it happened that when the sale took place there was practically no competition at all. The arrangements for the sale were such that a man who wanted to tender had to send his tender down to Ottawa accompanied by a portion of the first payment, and therefore the advertisement which appeared on the 7th of November for the sale to take place on the 15th, made it impossible for any of those people who then saw the advertisement for the first time to put in their tender, consequently there was very little competition for the land.

Mr. OLIVER. In what year was that sale held?

Mr. LAKE. In 1901. The prices realized for the land were below its value. Most of the land was bought by three gentlemen who tendered through a legal firm in the city of Toronto. I think all but ten of the quarter-sections which were put up for sale were brought by them. There were 308 quarter-sections put up, and these three gentlemen from Toronto were able to secure all but ten of them. The prices they paid ranged all the way from 50 cents, 75 cents, 80 cents, 90 cents, $1 and up to $2.50 per acre. In one case I think a section was sold for $3 per acre. These are very low prices for a lot of land which was considered to have a good deal of value. There was no local competition, and consequently the land was practically given away. The ment was considerably more than the land by the officials of the Indian Department was considerably mor ethan the land brought. I think at that time land was being sold right alongside these sections by the railway company for $3 an acre. The report of the agent in charge was that the land was worth about $3 an acre all through, yet it only fetched from 50 cents upwards. A great part of the land did not bring more than $1. There were 47,000 acres sold at that time. There had been some good offers for the land previously from people who wanted to come in and make a bargain with the government for the whole area. Another similar case took place with regard to the reserve near Battleford. The gentleman who was to conduct the sales only had notice at 10 o'clock in the morning of the sale. The sale had to open at 12; he only knew of it at 10 and although he hurried around and put up all the posters he could very few people knew of the sale, the attendance was small, the prices realized not high and it was his opinion that the small prices realized were on account of the sale not having been sufficiently advertised. The minister has said that the sale of the Crooked Lakes reserve will take place this fall. I would impress on him the necessity of fully advertising it all through that district where the people know its value. I doubt if the newspaper published at Broadview, the nearest point, would be on the patronage list and if the advertising is restricted in the usual way it would be a mistake.

Mr. OLIVER. Whatever may have been the mistakes in the past we propose in the future to give ample advertising with plenty of time. I may not be altogether unprejudiced in the view that newspaper advertising should be freely employed, but I believe it is economy and I am glad to have my hon. friend's endorsation.

Mr. STAPLES. What about the section of land near Indian Ford on the south side of Assiniboine river, have there been negotiations ?

Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, but I understand there are several bands, some of them not resident there, who have claims on the land and as the proceeds of the sale would be a small amount to distribute among so many, they do not care to make a sale.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Is it the intention of the government to secure a surrender of the Indian reserve adjoining Fort Pelly ?

Mr. OLIVER. There are two reserves there, one at Kamsack and one at Fort Pelly. We have no surrender in regard to the Keys reserve but we have a surrender in regard to the Cote reserve.

Mr. BENNETT. Did Mr. Peter Ryan receive the ordinary fee of one-quarter of one per cent of the proceeds of the sale of the Dokis Indian reserve the other day ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. That would be about $2,000 that would be paid to Mr. Peter Ryan for selling the timber on the Dokis reserve ?

Mr. OLIVER. About that.

Mr. BENNETT. Does not the minister think that is a pretty large amount of the money of the Indians to pay for bringing that gentleman out of the registry office in Toronto down here and giving him a job for a day? Does he not think that Mr. Ryan could have been induced to ascend the rostrum for an hour for less than $2,000? It is putting a slight appreciation on members of parliament, who are compelled to sit here for seven months for $2,500. I do not think that there is any reason why the Indians' money should be spent in that way.

Mr. OLIVER. I am credibly informed that the percentage that has been paid by private persons for selling timber limits in the Ottawa valley and also by the Ontario government——

Mr. BENNETT. But that was in the old times of the Ontario government. That does not happen now.

Mr. OLIVER. I am informed that private owners having valuable limits to sell have paid, not only one-quarter of one per cent, but two and a half per cent, on whatever was realized over the upset price. In our case we paid one-quarter of one per cent right through. I made careful inquiry into the matter, and I took the action that I did on the results of this inquiry. It is not fair to make a comparison between the wages that an auctioneer receives for the short time that he is employed and the wages that another person receives when his employment is by the year or for a longer term.

Mr. BENNETT. The minister must have known about what the fee would be when

he made the arrangement, because he made an estimate of the property, and knowing that it would realize about $800,000 the minister must have known that the auctioneer would get about $2,000.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. STAPLES. I do not think the government are justified in paying $2,000 for the sale of these limits. You can hire the best auctioneer in Canada for $100 a day.

Mr. BENNETT. I know a case of a large sale of timber limits on the board of trade in Toronto not many months ago for a private concern in which a gentleman was paid $200 for his day, and he thought he had got rather a good thing.

Mr. LAKE. I notice that in the instructions for the sale of these Indian reserves in the Northwest the minister gives a percentage not to exceed $200. I should have thought that this was a case in which some reservation of that sort might certainly have been made.

Mr. OLIVER. The eight limits ran from $50,000 up to, I think, $150,000. It seems to me that in handling that amount of money we were just as much justified in paying the auctioneer a good price as we would be in expending a large amount of money in advertising the sale, as my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle has said that we should.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like to ask the minister if the terms of sale were carried out in every case. Did the buyers pay the first instalment that was due?

Mr. OLIVER. I understand so. It certainly requires to be paid.

Mr. BLAIN. My information is that it was not. However, leaving that; I want to say a word or two on what my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle has brought up. I was interested in the answer that the hon. gentleman gave, that in future he proposed to advertise more widely the sale of lands of this kind. I am sure the committee will appreciate that. Will he confine these advertisements to newspapers that support the government, or, where he finds a Conservative paper with a much larger circulation——

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Hot air.

Mr. BLAIN. I know it is hot air to my hon. friend, but we had to listen for three hours the other night to the Minister of Militia, and perhaps he can stand it now. It was hot air that he gave us, and every man in the House had to listen to him repeat himself in condemnation of the report of the Civil Service Commission that he had himself helped to appoint.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Consider me squelched after that.

Mr. BLAIN. No, I shall not consider the hon. gentleman squelched. It takes more than that to squelch him. I was proposing to say a few words when I was interrupted by the hon. gentleman saying it was hot air. The last man in this House who should talk about hot air, or anything else that is hot, is the Minister of Militia and Defence.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I was not referring to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like to ask the Minister of the Interior if he proposes to broaden out the advertisements in the newspapers in future, and whether, if he finds that a Conservative newspaper has the largest circulation in a district, he will refuse to insert the advertisement in that newspaper?

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend will have to be satisfied with the statement that each case will have to rest upon its merits. There are cases in which it would be desirable to advertise in every newspaper and there are other cases in which it would not be. While it is our desire to give every reasonable publicity, we cannot bind ourselves to advertise in every newspaper my hon. friend may desire to have accorded the government patronage.

Mr. BLAIN. That is not an answer to my question. I did not suggest that the hon. gentleman would put the advertisement in every newspaper that I might favour. I am not objecting to the minister inserting the advertisement in newspapers supporting the government, but what I do say is that in districts where he finds a Conservative newspaper having a very much larger circulation why should he not insert the advertisement in that newspaper in addition to the Reform paper which has a smaller circulation?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not propose to admit that I would not insert it in a Conservative paper.

Mr. BLAIN. That is all right.

Mr. OLIVER. Where there is only one paper and it is a Conservative paper we have no hesitation in advertising in it. Where there are two papers, naturally we give the preference to our own friends. But if it is a question of circulation as between the two papers, my hon. friend knows how reliable the statements of newspapers are in regard to their respective circulations. I do not think we can be guided by the statements made as to their circulations.

Mr. BLAIN. The Minister of the Interior ought to know more than I do about statements that are made with reference to the newspapers.

Mr. OLIVER. The newspaper man who does not claim the largest circulation is not a true newspaper man.

Mr. BLAIN. The Minister of Public Works was about to erect a small post office in St. Marys which only cost about $30,000——

Mr. PUGSLEY. Your ideas are growing; you now seem to think that a $30,000 post office is a small one.

Mr. BLAIN. For the construction of this post office the Minister of Public Works inserted advertisements in thirty newspapers at a cost of $658, but he did not advertise in the London 'Free Press' which has more than double the circulation of any newspaper published in that district. In the future we will look to the Minister of the Interior for wider circulation of advertisements about the sale of lands.

Mr. ALCORN. Is 10 per cent deducted in addition to the expenses ?

Mr. OLIVER. Ten per cent is deducted and out of the 10 per cent the costs are paid.

Mr. LAKE. Quite recently I saw that two sales were postponed evidentiy on account of the notice of them being insufficient to enable the people to examine the lands and put in tenders. I am glad to hear what the minister says about more extended advertising in future. The Indians in whose interests the lands are sold have no politics and the advertisements should be inserted in newspapers irrespective of their political complexion.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT. Is the 10 per cent sufficient for the expense account or has it to be supplemented by a grant out of the consolidated revenue ?

Mr. OLIVER. Except on very rare occasions the 10 per cent is sufficient. The vote of $10,000 to Indian management fund is to recoup the fund for money taken out of it a number of years ago for purposes alien to the fund. The fund was, so to speak, robbed and we are from year to year recouping it.

Mr. W. WRIGHT. Is it not forbidden by the Indian Act to use the money for other purpose?

Mr. OLIVER. The money was taken out of the management fund for other Indian purposes. It was contemplated by the Indian Act but the rights of the Indians are being preserved by restoring it to the fund from time to time.

Mr. LAKE. Can the minister say definitely when the Crooked Lake reserve is to be sold ?

Mr. OLIVER. We have not advertised the sale yet, but my intention is to have it in the fall when the crop has been sufficiently assured to place those in the surrounding country in a fair position to take advantage of it.

Mr. LAKE. Are there any other agencies where land has been surrendered and which will be sold during this fall?

Mr. OLIVER. I think the Swan Lake, the White Bear, and a small piece of Enoch's reserve near Edmonton are all we will be in a position to dispose of the coming fall. We have other surrenders in prospect but they are not concluded yet.

Indians—New Brunswick, salaries, $1,408.

Mr. CROCKET. Who is the Indian agent for the northeastern district of New Brunswick ?

Mr. OLIVER. Robert A. Irving. He was appointed in May, his salary is $500, which is the same salary the previous incumbent had.

Mr. FOWLER. What Indian schools are there in New Brunswick, how many teachers, where are the schools situated, what do they cost and what is the average attendance of pupils?

Mr. OLIVER. Six day schools, number of pupils, 137; average attendance, 77; salary of the teachers, $500. The schools are situated at Burnt Church, Eel Ground, Kingsclear, St. Marys, Tobique, Big Cove Camp. There is an appropriation for a new school building at Eel Ground.

Mr. FOWLER. Mow many doctors are there for the Indians ; I refer particularly to Kings county ?

Mr. OLIVER. The medical attendance vote is $4,000 the same as last year. The expenditure in the nine months ending March 30, 1907, was $2,653. The physicians are: J. D. Rose, Moncton, Westmoreland County, $200; J. A. Leger, Shediac, Westmoreland County, $200; P. F. Sprague, Upper and Lower Woodstock, $100; D. H. McAllister, Sussex, Kings County, $200; R. H. McGrath, St. Mary's, York County, $150; W. J. Weaver, King's Clear, York County, $150; R. W. Earle, Tobique Reserve, $300; A. C. Ferguson, Eel River, Restigouche, $50; W. G. King, Buctouche Reserve, Kent County, $40; F. J. Desmond, Eel Ground and Red Bank, $200; J. L. McWilliams, Big Cove and Indian Island, $175; J. B. Mackenzie, Burnt Church Reserve, Northumberland County, $150; G. M. Duncan, Gloucester County, $100; J. M. Peake, Oromocto, $125. The salary includes medicine as well as professional attendance.

Mr. FOWLER. Was there any resignation of the Kings county doctor during March or April or of the doctor in Sunbury about that time?

Mr. OLIVER. Does the hon. gentleman refer to Dr. D. H. McAllister of Sussex?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He resigned before the 3rd of March. I may say that I recommended his reappointment, as he is a good officer, and I was sorry to lose his services.

Mr. OLIVER. Dr. Peake, of Sunbury, resigned, and is not now in the service of the government. Dr. McAllister, who resigned, has been re-appointed.

Mr. FOWLER. Who has Dr. Peake's place?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot give my hon. friend the information at the moment, but if he will allow the question to stand until we deal with the Supplementary Estimates, I shall be sure to give it to him then.

Mr. FOWLER. In case I should not be in the chamber at the moment, will the minister state it so that it will be on 'Hansard'?

Mr. OLIVER. I will attend to it.

Mr. FOWLER. There is a vote here for seed grain. Where is seed grain supplied to the Indians in New Brunswick?

Mr. OLIVER. The seed grain is supplied to the Indians of different bands on representations made by the agents that it is required. It is purchased and sent forward to the agents to be distributed to the Indians. The plots of ground cultivated by the Indians are very small, and the Indians, not being very provident, are apt to use up the whole of their crop, and to leave themselves without seed.

Mr. FOWLER. Have you any particulars of the amount of seed grain supplied during the last fiscal year?

Mr. OLIVER. The amount distributed last year was about $500 worth.

Mr. LAKE. I received a letter the other day from a gentleman at Qu'Appelle with regard to some trouble in the Pasqua Indian reserve north of that place. Some Indians have interviewed him time and again about some trouble they are having with the instructor. Although my correspondent does not like taking up this matter, yet he thinks something ought to be done to try and settle the difficulties. I do not know what the root of the trouble is and my informant is not able to tell me, but the gist of the thing is that the Indians are not satisfied with a certain Indian instructor, whose name I do not think it necessary to mention. It is a matter the minister might inquire into. These Indians are trying to do some very extensive farming, but they are easily discouraged, and if they are having trouble with their instructor, that is likely to stand in the way of good work being done. If the minister has any information on the subject I should be very glad if he would let me know.

Mr. OLIVER. We have no information of any difficulty existing on that particular reserve. I might say further that, in my experience, it is not to the advantage of the service that the Indians should be too well satisfied with their instructor. If the Indians and the instructor arrive at a basis of too much amity, that may mean that there is not very much work going on.

Mr. LAKE. When, as in this particular case, men who are putting in a large amount of crop are making these complaints, one after another, about the same man, I do not think the minister should go on that general rule. The best results I have seen have been accomplished by men who, while exercising a very strong hand over the Indians, still have their respect and confidence. Mr. Graham has been able to get remarkably good results, yet we do not find the complaints about his management that I do in this particular case. He is a strong man, who holds a strong hand over them and is doing excellent work. I have letters inclosed to me by my correspondent from the Indian Department in which the department say this matter was brought to Mr. Graham's attention. Mr. Graham was out of Ottawa at the time, and the matter should be looked into further. I trust the minister will take it up with Mr. Graham and see if something cannot be done. It is not a good thing to have the Indian thoroughly dissatisfied, as the Indian nature will not stand too much and bloodshed might result when personal violence is used against them as is charged in this case.

Mr. OLIVER. My deputy has not any information on the subject. The disputes may very well be left to Mr. Graham, whose duty it is to deal with such matters.

Mr. WILLIAM WRIGHT. There is a very large amount under the head of general expenses, some $204,000. I would like to ask whether the Indians are self-sustaining, whether all the money spent on the Indians is recouped out of the Indian fund, or how the matter stands.

Mr. OLIVER. The whole Indian expenditure is about $1,250,000. Of that amount $300,000 is for expenses of management, of which $200,000 is for the expenses of management of the Manitoba and Northwest Indians. The Indian expenses are not self-sustaining at all except in the case of one or two bands. The amount of $1,250,000 is what has to be provided each year out of the general treasury of the Dominion to go to the advantage of the Indians in the different ways provided in the Indian Act.

Mr. WILLIAM WRIGHT. I understood that a large amount of land was held by the Indians and was sold from time to time and the proceeds go into the Indian fund

and are used for the management of Indian affairs, and there might be sufficient to pay the amount of expenses generally, or are we short this $1,250,000 annually?

Mr. OLIVER. That is correct.

Mr. LAKE. With reference to the letter about the Pasqua reserve, I have a long statement here of the different complaints of the Indians, and among other minor complaints is one that the instructor gets the loan of the fields of the Indians to put in crop, and when the Indians have broken the land he puts in a crop on his own account and so on. Perhaps the best thing I can do is to send the letter to the minister and ask him if he will inquire into it. The gentleman who writes me is not a man who takes notice of things which he thinks are of small account. He is a gentleman of judgment, and I will send his letter over to the minister.

Mr. OLIVER. I shall be very glad to take the information and have an inquiry made.

Mr. BENNETT. Is the Blood Indian reserve under lease, and to whom and for how long?

Mr. OLIVER. The grazing rights have been leased for five years to the McEwan Cattle Company and the lease will expire in 1913.

Mr. BENNETT. Is that an incorporated company?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not aware whether it is or not.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it one McEwan alone?

Mr. OLIVER. In the books of the department the lease of the grazing privileges stands in the name of the McEwan Cattle Company, and the person who represented the company to the department is D. McEwan. We have no further knowledge of the matter. In the Toronto 'News' of the 27th of November last appeared the following item :

Want forty per cent share—Suit of Peter Ryan, Charles Beck and others regarding a ranch.

Peter Ryan, of Toronto, and Charles Beck, of Penetanguishene, have issued a writ against James T. Gordon, William H. Fares and Gordon Ironsides & Fares, Limited, of Winnipeg; Donald McEwen, of Brandon; Robert Ironsides, of Montreal; and Charles Millar and Walter McKeown, of Toronto. The claim is for a declaration that the plaintiffs and the defendants Millar and McKeown are entitled to a forty per cent interest in the net profits of a certain ranching enterprise on the Blood Indian reserve, leased by the Dominion government to McEwen.

An accounting of the ranching moneys is also sought.

There was considerable discussion on the question in the House, and I think this item throws a little light on some facts that did not come to the surface at that time.

Mr. LAKE. This seems to be a case in which the department has not been considerate of the rights of the Indians. The lease consists of about 219,000 acres, one of the most valuable grazing leases in the whole country. There were a number of applications for the lease of this reserve. One man after another applied for the lease, some of them being local ranchers in the neighbourhood. They offered considerable sums for the right to lease this land. I have before a number of offers which were made, and some of which were certainly as good as the offer which was finally taken by the minister. I have a list of eight or nine different applicants, all offering within a very short time, and all offering sums of money for the property. Under the circumstances, one would think that the proper thing for the government to do was to put the lease up at auction and try to get the best results for the Indians. But instead of that, we find that the contract was made with this D. McEwen and Company without the others knowing anything of what was taking place. The last application before that was dated April 30, offering a good sum of money for the reserve, and on the 16th of the following month the government made an agreement with Donald McEwen, of Brandon, who had only recently appeared as one of the applicants for the lease. The agreement was drawn up and signed with the Indians, acting through their agent, for the sum of $5,000 rent for ten years, and the agreement was ratified on the 6th of June. It was quick work, considering that at that time there were a large number of applicants, good strong men, for the land. I saw in the papers laid before the Public Accounts Committee that the assistant Indian commissioner at Winnipeg, a few days later on the 20th June, stated that he had accidentally learned when he was at Macleod that this lease had been entered into, showing that the commissioner's office at Winnipeg was not the first to know of this arrangement, as it ought to have been. A month later there was some trouble going on in the party camp, for we find that the Hon. Clifford Sifton takes a hand in, and asks that the whole lease should be cancelled because it had not been entered into with his authority. So the matter stood. The Department of Justice was consulted, and they decided that the agreement was valid and would have to stand. We find that there were other people than the applicants who had been unable to get their tenders in, and who were dissatisfied with this lease. But the people who were most dissatisfied were the Indians themselves. Still, the lease has to stand. My hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) just now brought attention to the fact than an action at law had been taken to ascertain who had

a claim upon this leasing privilege. Two or three different sets of people were at that time sending money up to the department and insisting that the money should be received from them on behalf of the D. McEwen Company. That is evident from the extract my hon. friend has just read from the Toronto 'News.' Altogether, it seems to me a very curious deal from beginning to end.

Mr. HERRON. There was a great deal of dissatisfaction when this lease went through among owners and men who were looking for grazing privileges. I know of many strange transactions in regard to it, but I will not take up the time of the House to mention them to-night. But there is another side of the question which is even more serious than the discrimination among the white applicants for grazing privileges, and that is the Indian side of the question. I have not been requested to bring this matter to the attention of the House, but I have heard complaints in the community that there is a great deal of dissatisfaction among the Indians about the way the conditions of the present lease are being carried out. There were certain representations made to the Indians at the time this lease was granted, that they should perform certain duties on the reserve, some of which were to build reservoirs, to dig wells, and make several other improvements that had to be made on the reserve. But they have not been carried out, and it was generally understood that a misrepresentation was made to the Indians by a former government official who stood in very well with them, and was looked upon as a reliable man by the Indians. He went there on behalf of the lease holders and represented to the Indians that the whole transaction was going to be in their favour. The Indians were not aware of the fact that he was not working in their interest. That is the way it was represented to me, and I am told it was on this representation that the Indians consented to this agreement. Now the lease holders are not carrying out this agreement, and the Indians have been much dissatisfied with the transaction.

Mr. OLIVER. My information is that the Indians have made no representations to the department or to any officer of the department with regard to any breach of contract with them, or any failure to carry out the agreements that were made with them. If my hon. friend knows of any breach of agreement it would be a favour to the Indian Department for him to state the particulars in which that agreement was not being carried out. We pride ourselves on carrying out our agreements with the Indians, all the more because the Indian is not in a position to enforce his rights.

Mr. LAKE. In the papers I find that on May 31, McKenna writes of dissatisfaction with the Indians on account of the lease. In December, 1904, the department seems to have taken this matter into consideration and consents to a visit of the Blood chiefs to the east at the expense of the D. McEwen Company in order to have the matter explained to them so that the papers themselves show that there was dissatisfaction and that it was brought to the attention of the department. As to what further dissatisfaction there may be at present, of course the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Herron) will be in a better position to speak of that.

Mr. OLIVER. Has the member for Alberta (Mr. Herron) anything definite to say?

Mr. HERRON. No, as I said in the beginning, I am not supplied with official information in regard to this, but I know it from rumour in the country and from people who are well posted as to what is going on. I do not shirk getting the information.

Mr. OLIVER. This reserve has been made a political and partisan issue of the lowest kind in the House, and we may as well deal with it now on that basis. My hon. friend has intimated that there were breaches of the agreement as between the Indians and the lessees but he has not been able to tell us what they were. We will be glad to hear it at any time because we want to be informed of these matters. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) undertakes to represent that there were breaches of the agreement.

Mr. LAKE. I represented what is in the document, that his own commissioner said there was dissatisfaction.

Mr. OLIVER. He said he had evidence in his hand that there were breaches of the agreement and he read from the paper; but there were no evidences of breach of agreement in the paper.

Mr. LAKE. I did not say I had evidence of breaches of agreement.

Mr. OLIVER. Then he had no evidences of breaches of agreement because he certainly had not in the paper he had.

Mr. LAKE. I want the minister to take that back, I did not state I had evidences of breaches of agreement.

Mr. OLIVER. I will take it back if my hon. friend said he has no evidence. The paper he read did not show any breaches of agreement, it indicated that the Indians were dissatisfied.

Mr. LAKE. That is all I said.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend will not find in the west any band of Indians who are not more or less dissatisfied now or at any time. In his district he will find very few white men who are not dissatisfied in

regard to some matter of business, politics or something else.

My hon. friend suggested that an official of the government had acted as the agent of the ranching company while representing himself as the agent of the government.

Mr. HERRON. I said that a gentleman who was formerly an employee of the government represented to the Indians that he was still an employee of the government when on the other hand he was working on behalf of this grazing company.

Mr. OLIVER. If my hon. friend is alluding to James Wilson who was Indian agent would he be good enough to say so?

Mr. HERRON. No, it was not Wilson.

Mr. OLIVER. Was it Wadsworth, inspector of agencies?

Mr. HERRON. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER. Hon. gentlemen opposite have harped on this grazing lease on the Blood reserve and have suggested it was a case of party graft. The agent of the Indians at the time, James Wilson, who afterwards became an employee of this ranching company was an appointee of the Conservative government and, so far as I am aware, never cast a Liberal vote in his life. Wadsworth, the inspector, who is said by hon. gentlemen opposite to have played double between the Indians and the company, was also an appointee of the hon. gentlemen. The company who occupy the territory today on that grazing lease are, one and all, so far as I am aware, not only strong supporters of the party of my hon. friend, but are prominent in the ranks ; Messrs Gordon and Ironsides.

Mr. BENNETT. Peter Ryan and Beck are not.

Mr. OLIVER. So if there is anything wrong about it I want it to be understood it was a Conservative transaction from first to last.

Mr. BENNETT. Tell that to the marines, rot.

Mr. OLIVER. So far as this party is concerned, it is a straight business transaction in the interest of the Indians, with which the Indians, so far as our information goes, are perfectly satisfied and the agreement made with them is being carried out. They gave their consent to that agreement in due form.

Mr. LAKE. When did Gordon and Ironsides become holders of the lease?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know.

Mr. LAKE. I call attention to the fact that on September 19, 1906, the McEwen Company wrote that Gordon and Ironsides should not pay the rent, that it should be accepted from no one but Miller.

Mr. OLIVER. Gordon and Ironsides are the occupants of the lease. I do not know how they got into possession but they are.

Mr. BENNETT. Does the minister say seriously that Beck, Peter Ryan and Charlie Miller are Conservatives?

Mr. OLIVER. No. I notice that these gentlemen are entering suit to establish some claim.

Mr. BENNETT. That kind of a crowd when they get into a business arrangement always end in litigation.

Mr. LAKE. Gordon and Ironsides offered the rent, but the department would not accept it. The minister says they are the people who occupy it and makes the point that they are Conseravtives.

Mr. OLIVER. Which they are.

Mr. LAKE. And he excuses everything on the ground that some party concerned in the transaction appeared to have been appointed by a previous government.

Mr. OLIVER. I excuse nothing.

Mr. LAKE. These are the grounds which the minister usually takes with regard to these transactions. If there is any question about a transaction, the minister gets very angry and keeps on insisting that there can be nothing wrong with the whole thing. When he begins to get angry I generally begin to look into the papers more closely and think that there is something wrong about it when he thinks it necessary to abuse hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. I have made no insinuations with regard to this matter. I did not know about the matter being brought up before. I simply got the papers and looked into them.

Mr. OLIVER. And found nothing.

Mr. LAKE. I found a good deal. The transaction seemed to be a very peculiar one. I found amonst other things that we had a number of applications, one following the other.

Mr. OLIVER. What is remarkable about that?

Mr. LAKE. There is nothing very remarkable about that, but there is something remarkable when we find that a large number of these applications are made all offering considerable sums of money for this privilege.

Mr. OLIVER. Did they offer more than the man who got it?

Mr. LAKE. Yes, I think in one case.

Mr. OLIVER. Let us have the case.

Mr. LAKE. The man who got it offered a minimum of 7,000 head at 50 cents per head making $3,500. Another gentleman

had applied for the lower half of the reserve at $2,500 straight.

Mr. OLIVER. Is that more?

Mr. LAKE. I could not state, because I do not know the circumstances of the land. Another gentleman offered $5,000, Mr. J. F. McLaughlin. I see that he was to place 10,000 head upon the reserve and pay 50 cents per head.

Mr. OLIVER. Is that a better offer than the other ?

Mr. LAKE. Yes, that is a better offer than that of Mr. McEwen, because he only offered to place 7,000 head at 50 cents a head which would be $3,500. It is a simple matter of arithmetic.

Mr. OLIVER. When the hon. gentleman is through I will show him that it is not a better offer.

Mr. LAKE. The minister had a number of applications, one following the other, and he apparently gave no opportunity insofar as the papers show, to the other applicants to compete for this reserve which in my opinion he was bound to do if he had the interests of the Indians at heart as their trustees. He apparently, in a hole and corner way, had the lease drawn up between the Indians and this applicant, the Indians acting through their agent and the lease was given without the knowledge apparently of the Indian office at Winnipeg which should have been informed upon this subject. The papers show that the department did not act in the way it should have acted if it had had the best interests of the Indians at heart.

Mr. OLIVER. It is rather a pity to take up time at this hour on a hot night in threshing over straw that is five years old.

Mr. LAKE. The minister started it.

Mr. OLIVER. No, the minister did not start it. The hon. gentleman undertook to revive an alleged scandal of five years ago, which has been threshed out in this House by a very much more able man than himself and which never brought any result. In regard to the respective values of these different applications, there is a very serious difference between an offer of $3,500 for 7,000 head and an offer of $5,000 for 10,000 head. My hon. friend does not understand it. That is the great difficulty with him. There are so many things about this matter that he does not understand, and he is ready to jump at the conclusion that he has found a scandal when he does not understand the question. The Blood Indians themselves occupy this reserve. They have a large amount of stock, both cattle and horses. They must use this reserve for the pasturage of their own stock and it must be elementary to any person who understands the situation that they could not afford to allow the reserve to be leased for such an amount of stock as would prejudice the pasturage of their own stock. They preferred to accept an offer of $5,000 for 7,000 head rather than of $5,000 for 10,000 head because it would leave sufficient pasturage on the reserve for their own stock. My hon. friend is only absurd when he suggests the auctioning off of the privilege of grazing under these circumstances. The object is to get a lease at a fair rental for as many head of cattle as the reserve will carry. To let the grazing privilege for a smaller number would not be advantageous because the grazing right would not be occupied and to let it for a larger number would not be advantageous because the Indians would lose the pasturage of their own stock.

Mr. LAKE. The minister himself was at one time of the opinion apparently that the leasing of this tract to outsiders was not quite the correct thing because amongst these papers I find a letter of his dated April 30, 1903, in which he says :

> I shall insist that the interests of the several hundred Mormons who live adjoining the reserve of this part shall be considered in preference to these outsiders.

Mr. OLIVER. I want to say that that is exactly my position, that as a question of policy I did not approve of the leasing of the reserve. I did not consider that it was good policy in the interest of the surrounding settlers. But there is quite a difference between the suggestion that the leasing was the subject of a scandal and objecting to the leasing on the ground of public policy and guarding the interests of the surrounding settlers who were my constituents.

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask the minister who is cutting the timber on the Christian Islands? How is it being cut, and to what extent?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know of any timber cut on Christian Islands last winter, unless it was cut under permit by the Indians or under trespass.

Mr. BENNETT. To what extent was timber cut last year?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not able at the moment to give the exact amount but the Indians get a permit year by year to cut a moderate quantity, ranging from 500 to 1,000 cords.

Mr. BENNETT. I will tell the minister something of the real conditions and perhaps he will have the evil remedied. A number of lumbermen in that country wish to obtain in open competition the valuable timber on that island and it is grossly unfair that they should be treated as they

have been. One firm, Liberals of course, and represented by the son of a defeated Liberal candidate has apparently the entree on this island and they are cutting the timber there not in chords but the most valuable timber in sawlog lengths. There is no use denying this because I know it myself and have seen the timber brought into Midland on a large barge. If you are going to give a tip that only one man can go on the island, well and good, but if you are acting in the interests of the Indians, let there be open competition for the timber and make it a condition of sale that the Indians shall be employed. If the minister will make inquiry he will find that my statement is correct. It is a matter of complaint among the other lumbermen that they cannot get a look in.

Mr. OLIVER. I will make inquiries.

Mr. BENNETT. And let me know what quantities were cut last winter when you go into Supply again.

Mr. HERRON. Let me assure the minister that I had not the slightest intention of making political capital out of my remarks about the grazing land. There is no question about it but that there are Conservatives mixed up in the matter, and if I wanted to make political capital I probably would not mention it. I simply stated the fact that there was dissatisfaction on the reserve and that fact has been represented to me by men on whose word I can rely. If the minister investigates he will find that my statement is perfectly true. There were a great many transactions with reference to McEwan & Co., or whatever their name is obtaining that lease.

Mr. OLIVER. Name the transactions.

Mr. HERRON. There are persons living on the lower part of the Blood reserve who offered almost as high a rental for half the reserve as was given for the whole reserve.

Mr. LAKE. They offered more.

Mr. HERRON. There are two or three ranching companies who spent a great deal of time and money there and who were promised they would get leases of that land but they were ignored. I stated in this House last year that a certain man in Ottawa obtained a contract for supplying 600 head of cattle for the Blood reserve at $28 a head, when far better cattle could be bought on the ground for $19 a head and were offered to the government at that price. The minister will see that there are many things in connection with this business that political capital could be made out of much stronger than anything I have mentioned.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not suggesting that my hon. hon. friend (Mr. Herron) is talking politics ; I refer to the member for Qu'Appelle who butted into something he did not understand. If my hon. friend (Mr. Herron) has knowledge of any breach of the contract by the lessees I want to know it. If he knows there is anything wrong he should inform the House or the department of it.

Mr. LAKE. I am ready to admit that I know more about the question now since the hon. member (Mr. Herron) has spoken. The hon. member (Mr. Herron) knows that country thoroughly and is conversant with all its conditions and he states that the upper half of that reserve is better than the lower half, so that the offer of $3,000 per annum made for the lower half is a better offer on the face of it, the number of cattle not being stated, then the offer of $5,000 for the whole reserve.

Mr. OLIVER. You cannot arrive at a conclusion as to which was the better offer unless the terms of the offer are known.

Mr. LAKE. So far as I can see from the correspondence the department was putting these people off with the answer that they were not in a position to deal with the matter while they at the same time were making an agreement with outsiders to the exclusion of the settlers living in the neighbourhood. The minister professes to be in sympathy with the people living in the neighbourhood, but here were people living in the neighbourhood——

Mr. OLIVER. Some of these people in the neighbourhood were trying to exclude their neighbours.

Mr. LAKE. I have proven everything I started out to prove and the minister has plainly demonstrated by his answers that he is not conversant with every thing that has taken place in the matter.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Does the minister propose to handle the lands in the same manner as for the last ten years, namely, to sell them at an upset price fixed by the department or at private sale ?

Mr. OLIVER. The minister intends to handle the lands as they are being handled to-day.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The minister must know that out of 650,000 acres he has disposed of 500,000 acres at an upset price fixed by the department or at private sale. Some days ago I showed that the Indian lands have been disposed of at ridiculously low prices ranging from ten cents an acre up. I showed that about 650,000 acres had been disposed of for about $15,000.

Mr. OLIVER. Does my hon. friend suggest that the land was worth more than the department got for it ?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I say that the lands should be put up at public auction.

Mr. OLIVER. I understand that my hon. friend is a man of means. If these lands

are worth more than we are selling them for, and we are selling them to the first comer at an upset price, why does he not put some money into them ?

Mr. LANCASTER. Does the hon. minister want to disqualify the hon. member ?

Mr. OLIVER. Does my hon. friend, as a lawyer say that that would disqualify him as a member of parliament ?

Mr. LANCASTER. Certainly it would.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Members on this side of the House do not get a look into any of these sales. I can only say that in disposing of these lands by private sale at upset prices fixed by the department, the minister is acting most unfairly towards the Indians of this country. Since I made the remarks I did a few days ago, I have received letters from prominent men in different parts of the country, urging me to press on the minister the necessity of putting these lands up at public auction. It is time that the minister took an active interest in the Indian Department and investigated every part of it, because not only are the Indian lands being squandered, but the Indian schools are not being conducted as they ought to be. Instead of these people being elevated and enlightened, so as to be fitted to be citizens of the country, they are being left practically in darkness.

Mr. MILLER. When the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) spoke on this matter some days ago, I told him, and I will now say to the House, that in the northern part of the county of Bruce lands of the character he speaks of have been put up for sale at public auction at tax sales, and after being advertised for months in the newspapers have been sold at less than ten cents an acre. If the hon. gentleman desires to speculate in these lands, and the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) thinks there would be any danger of him being disqualified if he purchased from the government, I think I could take him to a neighbourhood where he could get Indian lands from private parties at less than ten cents an acre and where, in purchasing them he would not run any risk of being disqualified.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend from East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) has entirely misstated the position. What we have done in selling Indian lands is this : In the northern parts of Ontario, where land is sold at a fixed price to the first applicant, it is sold on settlement conditions ; and I think it is sound public policy to have that land brought under occupation whether the price be great or small.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How will that benefit the Indian ?

Mr. OLIVER. The Indian gets the price and the country gets whatever development the land may be capable of. It is not the fault of either the Indian or the purchaser if the land is not worth more or is not capable of development. There are small islands in the Georgian bay, which, having been valued carefully, and being valued at less than $100 each, are sold to the first applicant at the valuation, because we have not considered it worth while to hold an auction sale for lands of such small value. Islands valued at more than $100 are sold either by auction sale or by tender. Lands in the western country, which are valuable for agricultural purposes, are invariably sold by public auction ?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Why should the minister dispose of any of the lands of the Indians without putting them up at public sale ? The minister knows that he has disposed of scores of islands at a dollar apiece. What sort of valuation is that ? The men who pay a dollar apiece would no doubt gladly pay five or ten dollars apiece. A number of the islands might be put up at the same time at public auction. I think the minister is doing a very unfair thing towards the Indians in disposing of their lands in the way he does.

Mr. MILLER. I would suggest that the hon. member name some single instance and have it investigated.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am satisfied that the hon. member for South Grey knows full well that a great deal of this Indian land is worth more than ten cents an acre. What is the need of disposing of it if that is all that can be got for it ? When you find the department disposing of over 500,000 acres of Indian lands at private sale at upset prices fixed by the department, and disposing of quantities of islands in the same manner, you cannot help feeling that they have not been conducting the affairs of the Indians in a business-like manner.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. I observe that a part of this vote is for clothing. I suppose that would include clothing for the Indians on the Sarcee reserve. How many Indians are on that reserve at the present time ?

Mr. OLIVER. About 200.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. What is the area of the reserve ?

Mr. OLIVER. About three townships.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. When I brought this matter up in the House last session, I was told by the minister that the Rev. John McDougall had been negotiating with these Indians with a view to getting from them a surrender of their lands. Will the hon. minister tell me what success he met with, and whether or not the negotiations are being still carried on ?

Mr. OLIVER. We absolutely failed to get a surrender from the Indians. We have not yet been able to bring the negotiations to a successful conclusion.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. No effort should be spared on the part of the department to bring those negotiations to a successful conclusion. It is rather singular that the Reverend John McDougall has succeeded in obtaining surrenders in a great many other parts of the country but not in this. This reserve consists of some 7,000 acres, only three or four miles from the town of Calgary, and is very valuable land. It is far away beyond what these Indians require. They are practically making no use of the land and are keeping it closed against settlement.

Mr. OLIVER. I entirely sympathize with the view of the hon. gentleman, and the department is well aware of the facts. We have made two attempts to secure a surrender from those Indians and have failed. The lands are absolutely the property of the Indians, so that we cannot take them except with their consent. We have made every offer in reason, but this particular tribe has been known from time immemorial as the most intractable on the plains. We are not relaxing our efforts, but my hon. friend will perhaps agree that with Indians, as in the case of white people, if they have something you want, the more they know you want it the more they are likely not to let you have it. In negotiating with them, it is not good policy to keep continually urging them to make the surrender? It is better to make a liberal offer, and if it be not accepted cease all efforts for the time. If you keep continually urging on them to surrender their lands after they have made a refusal they will get an entirely exaggerated idea of their value, and it may become absolutely impossible to negotiate with them.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Some time ago the minister promised to let me have a detailed statement of the allowances made Mr. McDougall, amounting to $4,600.

Mr. OLIVER. I have that statement fully prepared, but cannot lay my hand on it at the moment. I will produce it before the end of the session.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I do not know exactly what all these supplies for destitute Indians amount to—$149,000 this year and $140,000 last year. Could the minister give the details?

Mr. OLIVER. I can give the amount to each agency and also the actual items, but the items in one agency are pretty much what they are in another, and it would take a long time to give them all. They consist of provisions and medicines and other necessaries, which we have to provide those Indians who are destitute or infirm and who are not cared for by their relatives. These supplies are all purchased by tender for distribution to the different agencies, and they are rationed out according as the circumstances seem to require.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What is the last item for?

Mr. OLIVER. That, generally speaking, includes salaries for the department, for those who are in the field. It includes, for instance, the survey staff whose headquarters are in Ottawa.

Mr. HERRON. I want to call the attention of the minister to another transaction with reference to leasing. It has been represented to me that there are applications at the present time for a portion of the Blackwood reserve for grazing privileges by some large stock companies in that country, and also by some of the smaller stockholders who reside in the immediate vicinity of the reserve. These latter have been asking me to draw the attention of the minister to the fact that these small cattle owners will be very glad to pay as much rent for the use of the Blackwood reserve as any big company owning large herds of cattle. After what the minister has stated with reference to the Blood reserve, I take it he is in sympathy with the smaller owners. I think if the owners of small herds are willing to pay as much rent as the large ranching companies, they should have the first privilege.

Mr. OLIVER. Some years ago there were a number of applications made for grazing rights of the Blackfoot reserve. We believed that the Indians had a right to be consulted in the matter, and these people were informed that if the Indians were willing to make a bargain with them for grazing rights, and if the bargain was on fair terms, the government would assent to it. But the Indians declined to enter into any arrangement, so none was made. In regard to the grazing rights to be acquired by settlers in the surrounding country, that is a policy that certainly appeals to me. It is somewhat difficult to carry out. Of course, as my hon. friend knows, nothing can be done in that matter except with the consent of the Indians. But my preference would be to give such advantages in grazing rights upon the Indian reserve to ordinary settlers who are living in the vicinity, if it can be done on fair terms to the Indians and with their consent.

Indians—British Columbia, $194,730.

Mr. FOWLER. Is there any intention to dispose of any of the Indian reserves in this province?

Mr. OLIVER. I think I have had the honour to make a statement to the House of the position in which the reserves stands in British Columbia. A question of title has to be settled before we can do any-

thing in the way of securing alienation of the rights of the Indians to the reserve in British Columbia.

Mr. FOWLER. At that time I think the minister stated that steps were being taken to have a friendly case argued.

Mr. OLIVER. This government has forwarded to the government of British Columbia a memorandum suggesting the submission of a case for adjustment, but so far that proposal has not been replied to. So we are in the unfortunate position that we cannot take any steps to secure the surrender while the title stands in its present condition. I am not sure, however, but that in one or two cases of a special nature the British Columbia government has expressed a willingness to waive its rights in that particular instance, and in such cases we have been able to go on and deal with the Indians. But the British Columbia government will not make any general waiver of their rights.

Mr. FOWLER. What reserves are these to which they have waived their rights?

Mr. OLIVER. There are two instances in which the provincial government has quit claimed to parties acquiring rights from the Indians ; one was a small piece of land on the reserve at Kamloops, called Deadman's creek, and the other was some place in southern British Columbia.

Mr. FOWLER. What was the amount of land at the Kamloops reserve?

Mr. OLIVER. About 4,000 acres. The lease from the Indians was for 50 years, that is for irrigation rights. But the quitclaim by the provincial governments is practically perpetual.

Mr. HERRON. Are there any negotiations going on in regard to the land on the south side of the Blood reserve adjoining the town of Cardston ?

Mr. OLIVER. Negotiations are going on, but they have not produced any result.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT. I wish to ask a question of the minister with regard to the Northwest Coast Agency, B.C. The former agent there, Mr. Morrow, it is claimed, neglected the agency and engaged in the superintendence of a sawmill. I believe that he was transferred to the Customs Department at Port Simpson, and the Indians claim that a bartender was appointed in his stead and put over them. Is that true and is he being continued in office?

Mr. OLIVER. Morrow retired four or five months ago and was replaced by a man named Laurenz. About the time Laurenz was appointed we received a communication from some of the Indians complaining in a general way, but the objections were not of so definite a character as to seem to warrant the department in acting upon it.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.). An item was left open for discussion of steamship subventions and subsidies. The vote for a subsidy to a line between Prince Edward Island and Great Britain was struck out. It has been reduced from year to year. Some years ago it was $20,000, last year it was reduced to $7,000 and now it has been struck out. The minister is aware of the great disadvantage under which the province of Prince Edward Island lies in shipping its butter, cheese, eggs and other produce to Great Britain ; it has to send these products to Montreal to be loaded on the steamers, which is a very round-about and unnecessarily expensive method. I suggested to the minister, I think last year, that if they could not succeed in getting a steamer to undertake this service they could have a tender built at a comparatively small expense, that goods could be shipped from the island on that tender, that the tender could intercept a subsidized steamer going from Montreal to Great Britain, and transfer the freight to her. These tenders are now built so that they can attach to a vessel running at full speed, and transfer their cargo to the steamer without her stopping. Telegraphic communication is now easy and inexpensive and the connection between the steamer and the tender could be easily arranged. In the same way a vessel from Great Britain for Montreal could be intercepted in the Gulf by the tender and goods for the island transhipped without loss of time or detention of passengers. I make the suggestion in all honesty to the minister, and I think when we are spending so much for steamship subsidies in all other parts of Canada, and I think this is a proper expenditure, a practical suggestion such as I have made should be favourably considered by the minister and his colleagues.

Mr. FIELDING. Any suggestion my hon. friend may offer in the good spirit he displays to-night is deserving of the most serious consideration. I would be inclined to think there would be some difficulty in inducing any established steamship company to undertake a service of the kind he suggests. It would seem to require co-operation of some of the steamship lines, and if any of them would indicate a willingness to take part the matter should be seriously considered. It is most desirable that the island should have every opportunity of shipping goods to Great Britain. We have had an offer on the statute-book for years, but unfortunately no company has been willing to take it up. I am sure the Minister of Trade and Commerce, under whose department this would fall, would cordially sympathize with my hon. friend's object and if there was any indication of a desire to do this by a company the matter would have his sym-

pathy and support. I would like to have an expression from some practical steamship man engaged in the Atlantic trade of his willingness to take up an enterprise of that character. I shall mention it to the Minister of Trade and Commerce and ask him to give it his serious consideration.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.). I am very much obliged to the minister. He has met me pretty nearly half way, but I would suggest to him that it would be the duty of the government to have that tender built. At the present time steamers running at full speed are loaded from a tender. I do not see any difficulty that would arise. It would place the province in a better position. Before these steamship subsidies were adopted the province had a steamer of its own which traded between Prince Edward Island and the old country but when you adopted the policy of subsidizing steamers from Montreal, Halifax and St. John, our steamer could not compete with them. We are under the disadvantage that our goods have to be shipped to Montreal and then reshipped to Great Britain. I do not think there is an instance anywhere in Canada where there is such a round about way of doing business as that which has been forced upon Prince Edward Island. It it not creditable to the government that that should be the case. When the minister struck out this item of $7,000, he said he would apply it in some other direction and I would like to know how he is going to apply it.

Mr. FIELDING. I think my hon. friend will find in the Supplementary Estimates, page 30, that we are providing an additional amount for steam communication between Prince Edward Island, Cape Breton and Newfoundland. I do not give that as a reason why we should not have this service across the ocean if the opportunity should come, but I hardly think it would be wise for the government to build a tender for that purpose without endeavouring to ascertain what steamship lines would co-operate with us in that business. Any measure which will enable the people of Prince Edward Island to share in the advantages of cheap and prompt transportation will have our heartiest and fullest support.

Department of Railways and Canals—to increase the salary of M. J. Butler, deputy minister and chief engineer, to $8,000 per annum from April 1, 1908, $500.

Mr. FOWLER. Explain.

Mr. GRAHAM. The item explains itself. This increase to Mr. Butler is not as large as it looks. The sum is $500. Under the new Civil Service Act the salary of a deputy minister is $5,000, and for anything over that we have to take special vote. Mr. Butler has been receiving $7,500 and it was understood that he was to have $8,000.

Mr. FOWLER. When and where was it understood he was to have $8,000? There has been no statement in the House to that effect.

Mr. FIELDING. Mr. Butler has been receiving $7,500 and that has been voted in the main estimates.

Mr. FOWLER. This proposition will make his salary $8,000.

Mr. W. WRIGHT. That will be $1,000 more than the salary of a minister.

Mr. FIELDING. Mr. Butler is a professional man of high standing and there is no doubt that in the case of professional men engaged in the higher ranks of the public service, the temptation is very strong to leave the service, and we must expect to pay them something like the figures they would be paid in private employment. Mr. Butler, I am quite sure, would get $8,000 readily from any of the big railways or contractors by whom he might be employed.

Mr. W. WRIGHT. It seems to be an anomaly that you should pay a deputy minister $1,000 more than the minister gets. The salary is high enough without any addition being granted.

Mr. GRAHAM. He performs a double duty; he is chief engineer as well.

Railways and Canals, chargeable to capital —Railways—Intercolonial Railway—diversion of public road to eliminate a crossing at rail level between St. Cyrille and Drummondville, $1,300.

Mr. FOWLER. I would like some explanation in regard to that.

Mr. GRAHAM. The amount is asked to divert the public highway between St. Cyrille and Drummondville in order to get over a level crossing. The part of the highway touching the railway is going to be deeded to the government by the municipality. We are getting rid of the level crossing and they are deeding the property.

Mr. FOWLER. Why should you make an exception in this particular case?

Mr. LAVERGNE. This railway was built after the highway. It was built along the roadway for nearly a mile. There are two level crossings, about 350 feet long, they are very dangerous and there have been many accidents. The government proposes to divert the roadway to another place and this diversion will involve a small expenditure. If the railway had been built a little farther away from the highway these accidents would not have occurred.

Mr. FOWLER. In the province of New Brunswick there are places where the railway has been built since the highway, where the highway and the railway parallel each other for a long distance and where there are many crossings. In my town there are level crossings and yet no step like this has been taken by the railway. I would like to know why this particular place was singled

out and whether it is the intention of the department to pursue this policy in other places as well as at this favoured place.

Mr. EMMERSON. It has been done in New Brunswick.

Mr. FOWLER. It certainly has not been done in my county.

Mr. FIELDING. It is not done for the convenience of the highway, but for the convenience of the railway. If a crossing is dangerous to life and property, and if, by a small expenditure, you can divert the highway and remove the danger, it would be the part of wisdom to do so.

Mr. EMMERSON. At Campbellton, N.B., there was a diversion of the highway, which the railway paid for.

Mr. FOWLER. I know a very dangerous crossing in my own constituency, and the minister might apply the same rule there that he has applied in this case.

Mr. FIELDING. If there is any case on the line of the Intercolonial where, for a small expenditure, you can divert the highway and do away with a dangerous crossing, it would be wise to do so in the interest of the protection of life, as well as in the interest of the protection of the government from claims for damages.

Mr. FOWLER. The Minister of Finance seems to labour under the misapprehension that I am opposing a policy of this kind. I am not. I merely wanted to know why this particular place was singled out while other places equally needing this protection have not been attended to. Is it the policy of the minister to do this wherever it is needed?

Mr. ALCORN. And if it is the policy of the minister, I would point out to him that the crossing at the Grand Trunk station in his own constituency is extremely dangerous.

Mr. GRAHAM. Unfortunately, the Intercolonial Railway does not run in my constituency, and I cannot apply the policy to it.

Diversion of line at Chatham and branch to wharfs, $40,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. Some months ago I visited Chatham, and this diversion of the line was strongly urged on me by the leading citizens. It is part of the old Canada Eastern and is on a heavy grade, and the station is two miles away from the town. By the diversion of the road for six miles we will save a considerable haul, get rid of a heavy grade, get down to the town and to deep water, reach one mill that turns out 4,000 carloads of lumber annually and another mill at deep water. I can recommend it to the House as a business proposition.

Mr. CROCKET. Will $40,000 complete?

Mr. GRAHAM. Oh, no. I want to make it clear that it will cost about $400,000, but this is all we can expend this year.

Improvements at Fredericton, $10,000.

Mr. CROCKET. I presume this is the initial vote for a new station at Fredericton?

Mr. GRAHAM. I visited the pretty little city of Fredericton, and I found there a very nasty little station which was not suited to the requirements of the capital of the flourishing province of New Brunswick. There was talk of our being able to join in a union station with the Canadian Pacific Railway, but that seems to be out of the question, and it is my opinion that we should have a proper station at Fredericton. We propose to spend $60,000 for a new station there. I ask for $10,000 now to get a start at it next fall, and we will go on with the work.

Mr. FOWLER. I draw the attention of the minister to another flourishing and beautiful town in New Brunswick which requires a new station. When the Minister of Finance was acting Minister of Railways he promised we should have a new station at Sussex, but we have not got it yet. Sussex is one of the principal towns in New Brunswick, and is a town in which a great deal of business is done on the Intercolonial. The present station is a disgrace to the town and a disgrace to the road. New stations have been built to replace old stations that are far better than the station at Sussex. It is a ramshackle wooden building, erected when the road was first built, and it should be replaced. I ask the minister if he will now put in the estimates an item to build a new station at Sussex?

Mr. GRAHAM. The matter will be considered. Although I would like to do so, I regret that I cannot make any more promises at present. We ought to have decent stations at places where we do business.

Mr. CROCKET. Can the minister say how much of the $60,000 is to be applied to the Fredericton station building itself?

Mr. GRAHAM. I cannot say at present. I went into this question with my deputy the day before he was taken ill, and I told him we wanted to have a decent station at Fredericton with surroundings that would conform to it. He said it would cost $60,000 as an approximate estimate. My own opinion is that before we complete the work and get the yards as we would like to have them it will cost more. We intend to put up a decent station at Fredericton.

Mr. CROCKET. Has it been decided yet whether it will be of brick or stone?

Mr. GRAHAM. No.

Diversion of line, Sydney Mines to River George, $25,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is somewhat like the Chatham proposition. On this piece of track there is a grade both ways. There is a very large traffic on that section, and to continue to do business hauling up grade both ways is out of the question. The diversion of this line, which would cost, I think, anywhere from $375,000 to $425,000, would put North Sydney and Sydney Mines on the main line, would do away with the operation of quite a length of branch, and would give us a comparatively level grade. After looking into the matter, I considered it a business proposition and decided to submit it to the House.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Are the highly paid engineers of the department satisfied with it ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Petit Rocher—spur track to wharf, $15,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. The Public Works Department have constructed a wharf at this point, and we want to get access to it by rail.

Mr. FOWLER. What will that cost ?

Mr. GRAHAM. The approximate cost will be about $30,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Is there any business done at Petit Rocher, or is it something like the wharf at Caraquet, where business is expected in the dim and distant future ? The hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon) gave us an explanation of that at one time. He said that at Caraquet there was no business yet, but he hoped that at some time there would be business. In the meantime that part of the wharf which did not drift out to sea was rotting away. The hon. member for Gloucester seems to have a great capacity for drawing grants from this government ; but the unfortunate thing is that in most cases the money is spent for useless works which can only serve the purpose of strengthing the hon. gentleman in his constituency, while the rest of the province suffers on account of the great pull which the hon. member seems to have with this government.

Mr. TURGEON. Surely my hon. friend knows the resources of Petit Rocher as well as I do. So far as Caraquet is concerned, he knows what I meant when I said that the harbour there could not be yet used by ocean steamers, as we could not get the railway company to build a spur to the wharf to afford the same kind of accommodation that this proposed spur will afford at Petit Rocher. It is true that the Petit Rocher wharf is not used by anybody yet, because it is not yet completed. But it will be completed and handed over to the government within the next two months, and there is an immense possibility of business there, especially in the shipping of lumber. The only way to make that district productive is to afford transportation facilities, and this spur will give accommodation to that splendid location that I have heard praised so much by our friends opposite.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. How long is the spur ?

Mr. TURGEON. About three-quarters of a mile.

To provide for survey to ascertain the best route for an additional line from Moncton, New Brunswick, or Amherst, Nova Scotia, to a point at or near Truro, Nova Scotia, $10,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. A few weeks ago a very important deputation waited on the government and urged strongly the wisdom of looking into the matter of having a link constructed from Moncton to Truro or from Amherst to Truro to shorten the line to Halifax and to get better grades. One idea was to have an eye to the increased traffic that will pass in the future over that portion of the Intercolonial Railway. This line would also serve a new country that is not now served. In order to find out exactly what the request meant, what benefits would be derived, and most of all what the proposed line would cost, I decided to put an amount in the estimates to survey the line.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is it intended to run north or south of the present line ?

Mr. FIELDING. South, by Parrsborough on the Bay of Fundy.

Mr. FOWLER. I read in the papers the other day that there was to be double-tracking from St. John to Hampton. Has the minister any information about that proposition ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I really have no information on that point. I did say the other day in a speech which I thought was a good speech that if we carried all the traffic to Moncton that we hoped to carry, there would be an ultimate necessity of double-tracking the line from Moncton to St. John as well as from Moncton to Halifax.

Mr. FOWLER. Was the minister only indulging in prophecy, or has he any present intention of doing that ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Not until it is needed.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I hope that the minister, before deciding on the direction of any new line of railway, will take into consideration the very much greater advantages that would be afforded by building a line from Moncton along the northern portions of the counties of Westmoreland and Cumberland to Pugwash. By so doing he will secure a line running through a country where much better grades can be

had than those of the present line, and he could utilize what is known as the short-line portion of the Intercolonial and obtain very much better advantages than could be obtained by building any new line along the Bay of Fundy. I have already called the minister's attention to this matter. I do not wish to elaborate the proposition I make at the time, but it is one that the minister will be bound to take into consideration before deciding on any such policy.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Before this item passes I wish to draw the attention of the minister to the fact that there is a better way of reaching the Atlantic sea-board than either by double tracking the Intercolonial or building a new line around by Parrsboro. Every one who is acquainted with the geography of Nova Scotia is aware that the Cobequid range of mountains have to be crossed between Amherst and Truro. On this part of the Intercolonial there are several very steep grades that lower the character of the whole line as a traffic road. It would be poor policy to build a line of railway across the continent at vast expense and with grades of one-half or one per cent and continue those steep grades between Moncton and Halifax. These can be altogether avoided by running the line north of Amherst and along the north shore to Pugwash, then to New Glasgow and Country Harbour. This would give us a splendid outlet on the Atlantic for the traffic of the Grand Trunk Pacific. I need not speak of the advantages of Country Harbour. This harbour is well known to be one of the great harbours of the world. If you made a list of say twelve of the greatest harbours of the world I will venture to say that you would be compelled to include Country Harbour in the list. I have not time at this late hour to speak of all the advantages of this route. By adopting my proposal you will get a level route and pass through the coal deposits of Pictou and open up a good country and reach the sea at a harbour that is 100 miles nearer Europe than Halifax. I hope that no action will be taken until my proposal is carefully considered.

Mr. McLENNAN. I would like to ask the minister whether he has given any attention to the very modest request I made the other evening. I observe a duplication of the Intercolonial Railway in the county of Cape Breton, a proposed duplication in Cumberland and Pictou and Colchester and a subway in the county of Pictou in the country district. I do not object to these, but I claim that the very modest requirements of the county of Inverness should receive a little more consideration. I noticed in the city yesterday Mr. Mann one of the Inverness Railway and Coal Company, and I hoped that the minister would call his attention to the matter of the joint user of the terminals at Port Tupper. I would like to know from the minister whether he has given attention to the advisability of either coming to an arrangement with that company or making some provision or other out of this item for increased accommodation by furnishing a modest shelter in the way of a station at Hawkesbury junction on the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. GRAHAM. In reply to my hon. friend, that is one of the questions which will have to be considered. My department is looking into the question to see if we cannot obviate the difficulty to which he refers.

Mr. FOWLER. Where are you getting your water supply for the Intercolonial Railway buildings at Moncton ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have not the information here and there is no Intercolonial Railway official present who knows anything about that special work.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Does the minister know nothing about the Moncton waterworks ?

Mr. GRAHAM. When the item comes up I shall be able to give the information, but regret that I have not got it at hand just now.

Prince Edward Island Railway—to pay M. J. Haney on his contract, amount of award in connection with Hillsboro bridge, $164,633.33.

Mr. GRAHAM. The amount of the claim was $390,000. Under the contract all work had to be certified to by the chief engineer but I was under this difficulty that the chief engineer was Mr. Butler, who is now chief engineer of my department. Consequently it would not do for him to certify to the work and I decided to appoint Mr. Collingwood Schreiber as engineer and arbitrator, as he was the chief engineer of the department at the time the work was done. He made an award of $194,000.

Mr. CROCKET. What does that make the total cost of the Hillsborough bridge ?

Mr. GRAHAM. $1,365,376.18 to June 30, last.

Mr. CROCKET. What was the department's estimate of the cost ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I had a long memo. about that. There was an estimate made but the work was absolutely changed. It was found in one place that it would not do to use the crib-work on account of its decayed condition and a new arrangement was made under which an embankment was used.

Mr. FOWLER. What was the contract price?

Mr. GRAHAM. It was on schedule price, the whole thing. It was found impossible to make it in any other way. This claim was to settle up the whole work. The contract was changed, the steel work was changed, and an arrangement was made

with the Hon. Mr. Blair and the contract was signed by the Hon. Mr. Sutherland. I think the offer for the work was 50 cents a yard, and the late minister gave a schedule price at 30 cents a yard. Some of this work was done in a greater depth of water than any work he had ever known to be constructed.

Mr. CROCKET. When was the bridge completed and accepted by the department?

Mr. GRAHAM. Nearly two years ago.

Mr. FOWLER. I fail to understand why, if this work was done under schedule prices, there should be a dispute. Why would this man claim $390,000 more than the department was willing to give him?

Mr. GRAHAM. The quickest way to answer that perhaps would be to give the claims made by the contractor, but it would take a long time to read them.

Mr. FOWLER. State their general character.

Mr. GRAHAM. For instance, he claims for additional work, materials on hand, interest account. Then he gives a list of claims for extra work, such as pneumatic caissons. His claim for interest was $82,907.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Why did he make a charge for interest?

Mr. GRAHAM. The account has never been settled up, and he made a claim for interest. If I had time to read the award the hon. gentleman would see that the claim was not allowed.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I would ask the minister to read the award.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will give a copy of the award to my hon. friend any time he wants it.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I think a copy of the award ought to be put on the 'Hansard.'

Mr. GRAHAM. The award was made by Mr. Collingwood Schreiber and is in the following terms:

Now know ye that I, the said Collingwood Schreiber having taken upon myself the burthen of the said reference, and having heard, examined and considered the witnesses and evidence on behalf of both the said parties concerning the said claims so referred to me as aforesaid, do make and publish this my award, of and concerning the same, that is to say, I award and determine that the said Michael J. Haney pursuant to the said contract and lease and the said agreement, has a just and valid claim and demand against His Majesty the King to the amount or sum of $164,633.33.

And I award that the said sum of $164,633.33 shall be paid by His Majesty to the said Michael J. Haney and shall be accepted and taken by the said Michael J. Haney as and for full satisfaction and discharge, and as a final end and determination in respect of the said claims so referred and the matters in dispute as aforesaid, and all demands upon and in respect of the same.

And as an accompaniment to this my award I do pursuant to the said agreement hereto annex my certificate, in duplicate, in the form of a chief engineer's certificate for payment covering the said amount or sum total to be paid to the said Michael J. Haney by virtue of the said agreement.

And I further award that each party shall bear and pay his own costs of and attending the said arbitration and the said Michael J. Haney shall pay the costs of this my award, that is to say, the sum of $223.75 being the amount due for stenographer's fees.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand this 21st day of February, 1908.

COLLINGWOOD SCHREIBER,
Sole Arbitrator.

Surveys of branch lines, $10,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Is there any intention to take over branch lines in the province of New Brunswick?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is a very large question. If I were the manager or president of a company owning the Intercolonial, I would at once proceed to see what branch lines would be of benefit to my main line, and try to get hold of them. Another announcement will be made before the close of the session on the question of branch lines.

To provide for survey and location of a line of railway from the Saskatchewan river to Hudson bay, $100,000.

Mr. LAKE. I see it is stated that the line is to be from the Saskatchewan river to Fort Churchill. I presume the railway has been completed to The Pas, on the Saskatchewan river, so the Minister of the Interior said the other day. I asked him for some information as to the condition of that line and he told me he would have to ask the Minister of Railways for that information. Would the minister give me some information in that respect.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have no positive information. I have been greatly rushed with business. I intended to-day to ask Mr. Mann about it. I am going to tell the proprietors of the road what condition it is in, and if it is not improved it ought to be referred to the Railway Commission.

Mr. LAKE. I understood that the Department of Railways sent out an engineer last fall to go over that line. He would have a report. I think he returned in the fall.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will look into it to see if there is a report.

Mr. LAKE. And would the minister bring it down the next time he goes into the estimates? The Minister of the Inte-

rior stated that the land grant for this railway had all been patented.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. This last spring has been very wet in the Northwest, and any one who is familiar with the lower Saskatchewan knows that for many a mile on either side the country is flat and boggy. It will require a great deal of work to get any road in good condition, more especially in a very wet spring such as we have had in the Northwest. No new railway in the Northwest was in a good condition this year.

Mr. HERRON. Has the government arrived at any policy yet with regard to the building of this road? Are they going to build it themselves, or let it out to a corporation?

Mr. GRAHAM. The one definite policy the government have arrived at is that this road will be built, and built immediately, by somebody. To ascertain what the probable cost of the road would be is the first necessary step, whether we shall build it ourselves or let it to somebody else. For that purpose I am having a party organized to start out very shortly to make a survey from the Saskatchewan river to the Hudson bay, to Fort Churchill probably, possibly, to some other point on Hudson bay. But before I take any steps in that direction we will have to have a survey made to see what it is going to cost, whether we build it ourselves or whether we get it done by somebody else.

Mr. LAKE. When will the parties start out, and how long will it take them.?

Mr. GRAHAM. A survey party will be organized instantly. They will be away from here shortly after we are. This road is going to be built by somebody and built immediately.

Mr. LAKE. Would the minister let this item stand until he can give us the information in regard to the condition of the railway to which I referred just now, and in regard to which I asked for information? Unless that bank is completed, and I understand the whole country has to be drained, it will not be possible to get to the Pas.

Mr. KNOWLES. I object to allowing the item to stand. Whether the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) is of that opinion or not, in my opinion the people of the west want the preliminary survey and the location of the route effected at the earliest possible moment. I extremely regret that as a representative of the people the hon. member would be a party to the delaying of the matter by having the item stand. More than that, I think it is not fair to say the vote is only for the making of a preliminary survey, because it is not only for acquiring the information which is essential, but likewise to locate the line which is to be built. As the Minister of Railways has said, the first step to be taken in the construction of the road by the government or by a company is to make the survey and locate the line, and the Minister of Railways says that is being done this year. I trust the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) will withdraw his objection and will not insist on allowing the item to stand, causing further delay. I also wish to respectfully correct the impression in the minds of the House that the banks of the lower Saskatchewan or the country in the vicinity of the banks is of a marshy nature. I have given some little study to this, and I might say there are 70 miles which are of limestone formation to the north of the river, which is the best formation on which to construct a railway.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The hon. member does not know that the railway approaches the river from the south.

Mr. LAKE. The hon. gentleman's remarks about holding this item up are absolutely unfair. He knows that perfectly well and knows that he is trying to make a little paltry political capital out of it.

Mr. KNOWLES. I rise to a point of order. The hon. member should not say that I am trying to make cheap political capital.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not think that is out of order.

Mr. LAKE. The hon. gentleman is perfectly aware, no one more so, that to ask this item to stand for another day will not affect the date on which the item is passed by the House, as all these items must be collected into a Supply Bill.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend surely does not mean to hold this item as a hostage until I bring down the information? This has nothing to do with the Canadian Northern Railway Pas line.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The greater part of the Pas line is fit for any sort of traffic, but there is no railway in that part of the west which has not been softened up by the heavy rains in this wet spring.

Mr. LAKE. If the minister will give the information I will ask him for it on going into Supply.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not wish to delay the item, and I hope the hon. member for West Assiniboia will not think I am doing so. I think it is utterly contemptible the tactics some hon. gentlemen seem to adopt at times for the purpose of making cheap political capital. There should be a sense of honour among gentlemen that will not, for the mere petty advantage they can make in that way, utterly misrepresent what another member says.

Mr. KNOWLES. Will the hon. member say whom he means?

Mr. LENNOX. I mean the hon. gentleman who has just risen.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not think the expression 'cheap political capital' is out of order.

Mr. KNOWLES. He said 'contemptible.'

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is a matter of taste whether it should be used.

Mr. KNOWLES. I submit the hon. gentleman is out of order in saying my tactics are contemptible.

Mr. LENNOX. I repeat the remarks very deliberately.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not think the hon. member is justified in using the word 'contemptible.'

Mr. LENNOX. I am pleased that I used it and will withdraw it in deference to your remark, because I think it necessary——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. LENNOX. I withdraw the remark in difference to the chairman. I have not changed my opinion one iota. I shall ask the minister for more definite information as to the policy of the government in this matter. The minister has not said whether the government will construct it as a national work or have it constructed by an independent company.

Mr. GRAHAM. I thought I made myself clear. The government have not come to a decision as to whether they will undertake the work as a government work or let it by contract to some great company. They have come to the conclusion that they will immediately ascertain by practical means what the work is likely to cost. Later they will decide the best means to secure its construction.

Mr. FOWLER. How long are the straits open?

Mr. GRAHAM. I should say from the information I have gleaned that navigation might be assured for four months in the year. Of course the bay is open longer.

Mr. FOWLER. The Ottawa 'Free Press' announced the other day in flaming headlines that the straits are open for navigation only about two months. Was that an inspired article?

Mr. GRAHAM. Oh, no.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. I do not think it is wise to confine this survey to the Pas route. I am of opinion that we can find a more satisfactory route from the main line of the Canadian Northern Railway, and that the survey should be commenced 100 or 150 miles south of the Saskatchewan river in the hope of finding a better line. I am told there is a high ridge 30 or 40 miles east that would give a better line than the Canadian Northern line from Erwood.

Trent canal—to pay damages to properties by flooding, $100,000.

Mr. FOWLER. What is that for?

Mr. GRAHAM. Owing to the building of the Trent canal and the construction of various dams certain lands have been flooded. We have had a man going through there and trying to value the damages. He reports that it will be necessary to put $100,000 in the estimates to provide for the damage that has been done to the property of various farmers along the line of the canal.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Why is there not more in for the construction of the canal and less for the buying up of this land?

Mr. GRAHAM. There is $1,000,000 in the main estimates for the Trent canal.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That is only a trifle you should put the whole thing in.

Mr. FOWLER. I would suggest that if you had acquired the right to flood these properties before you commenced it would have cost infinitely less than what it will cost now that the damage has been done.

Cornwall canal—repairs to break in bank west of lock 18, $150,000.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is it true that the department was notified upwards of a year ago by Capt. Donnelly that this bank was likely to give way? I have seen that statement made on the authority of Mr. Hiram Calvin.

Mr. GRAHAM. I never heard of it.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Would the minister look up and see?

Mr. GRAHAM. I will look into it.

Mr. FOWLER. I would like to ask the minister if he proposes to do this work by day labour or by contract?

Mr. GRAHAM. A portion has been rushed by days' work; for the balance we will advertise for tenders and award the contract to the lowest tenderer.

Carillon dam—dam across slides, $40,000.

Mr. BLAIN. I suppose the minister will allow one item to stand so that any one who is not here to-night may have an opportunity of discussing any of these items.

Mr. GRAHAM. We will allow item 457—Carillon dam—to stand.

Item allowed to stand.

Miscellaneous.

Railway Commission—maintenance and operation of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada (exclusive of an amount of $25,000 authorized by statute)..$13,000 00

To provide for the expenses of preparing plans for the reconstruction of the Quebec bridge..	$25,000 00
Attendance, repairs and alterations Governor General's cars..	2,500 00
Railways statistics including clerical assistance notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.	1,200 00
Expenses of Quebec Bridge Commission..	53,500 00
To pay a gratuity equal to two months' salary to the widow of the late Judge Killam, chairman of the Railway Commission.. ..	1,666 66
	$96,866 66

Mr. LENNOX. There is an item of $25,000 to prepare plans for the reconstruction of the Quebec bridge. Will that pay for the plans ?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is expected that it will. It may take more than that. I think it is a small estimate.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. You had better get the plans of the Forth bridge and use them for the reconstruction of the Quebec bridge.

Mr. FOWLER. Have you in mind any engineer whom you propose to employ to draw these plans ?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, we have not chosen an engineer. That is something that will have to be done with very great care so that we will be absolutely sure of our ground.

Mr. FOWLER. I quite agree with the minister that it is a matter that should be done with very great care, and the principal reason is that the government has already had a warning on account of the disaster that has occurred. I do not think that this estimate of $25,000 will be at all sufficient for the purpose. It will be necessary to ask for a subsequent vote, because if the government does its full duty in the premises, as it is building a bridge greater than has been, it will procure the services of the most eminent engineer that can be found in the world, and in order to get that man it strikes me that it will be necessary to go across the water. We have had an experience of American engineers and it has been a very unfortunate experience. To say nothing of the loss of money it has entailed great loss of life that is more deplorable than the loss of money. I hope the government will spare no pains to get the best engineering service that is available and I think it would be a wise economy to pay a price sufficient to get that service.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Comparing the frame work of the Quebec bridge with the framework of the Forth bridge, the one looks like a toy as compared with the other. The girders on the Forth bridge are 12 feet in diameter and I do not think there is one on the Quebec bridge in which there is more than an inch and a half of steel at any point. The part that is down and the part that is still standing are very flimsy looking. The chief engineer on the Forth bridge is no longer living, but other engineers who were engaged in the construction of that bridge are available and I think it would be wise to procure for this work the best engineering ability.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Have a Canadian engineer with them.

Mr. FIELDING. There will be no difference of opinion on that. The view of the government is that no matter what it costs it must get the best and most capable engineer that can be found. I am glad to hear the views expressed by hon. gentlemen opposite; so that, if a larger appropriation is needed we have only to ask for it.

Mr. LENNOX. I would like to ask whether it is the intention of the government to erect the bridge in the same place again or whether a new site is to be selected?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is one of the questions that will have to be considered. There will be a difference of opinion as to that. Some people think that it should be higher up the river. These are questions which will be decided by the engineer or engineers whom we engage.

Mr. LENNOX. I think there is a good deal in that and the sooner the government get to work to procure that engineer the better. I would like to ask the minister if this amount of $53,500 for the expenses of the Quebec Bridge Commission covers the total cost?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. And the matter is completed in every respect?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. HENDERSON. What business will be taken up on Monday?

Mr. FIELDING. The resolution respecting the provincial boundaries, some minor Bills and afterwards Supply.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.47 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, July 13, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

GENERAL LAKE'S MEMORANDUM.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia). On Thursday last I laid on

the table of the House a memorandum prepared by General Lake with reference to certain matters pertaining to the militia. I supposed then that the memorandum would become one of the parliamentary papers, but I understand now that it is necessary to make a motion for the paper. Therefore, with the consent of the House, I would move :

That an order of the House do issue to the proper officer for a copy of a memorandum by Major General P. H. N. Lake, C.B., C.M.G., Inspector General, upon that portion of the report of the Civil Service Commissioners, 1908, which deals with the military administration of the militia, and that rule 72 be suspended and the said memorandum be printed.

Motion agreed to.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). I desire to lay on the table the return to an order dated 13th January, 1908, moved by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) :

For a return showing the population of each town, village or other place in Canada in which any public building has been erected at the expense of Canada since January 1, 1897, or for a public building in which any public money has been voted, expended or appropriated since that date, together with a statement of the amount voted, expended or appropriated in each case, the total cost of each such building, the estimated total cost of any such building not yet completed, the purpose of each such building in each instance, the cost of the annual maintenance and upkeep thereof ; and so that the said statement shall show the information aforesaid by division of the said towns, villages or other places in the following classes: Those having a population not exceeding 2,000, 3,000, 4,000, 5,000, 6,000, 7,000, 8,000, 9,000, 10,000 ; also giving the names of all other towns and villages in Canada of each of the said classes in which no such public buildings have been erected up to the present time.

I may say that the hon. member for West Algoma (Mr. Boyce), and possibly other members made motions somewhat similar to the one in return to which this information is brought down. I think that this return will embrace all the information called for by these different motions.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton). Before the orders of the day are called, I would ask the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) when the railway subsidies will be brought down. I would inquire also whether he is aware that seven months and sixteen days of the session have elapsed and that we are presumably within five or six days of prorogation, and to ask respectfully whether, under these circumstances, these should have been brought down long ago ?—seven months and sixteen days.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I am aware that we have been in session for seven months and sixteen days. I am glad to hear that we are within five or six days of prorogation. I am not aware that these railway subsidies could have been brought down one hour earlier.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But the main point is, when are we to have them ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand that they are in to-day, are they not ?

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). I expect they will be down to-morrow. I expected they would be down to-day, but they are not printed.

THE WOOLLEN INDUSTRY.

Mr. BLAIN. I desire to inquire if it is the intention of the government to introduce this session any legislation for the relief of the woollen industry ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have just been told by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) that we may hope to close the session within five days ; and I do not think in those five days we can do more work than we have on the Order Paper.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to inquire from the proper minister—I suppose the Minister of Marine and Fisheries—when we may expect a return to the motion of the 10th of February last with respect to the lobster fishery in the county of Pictou ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I will make inquiries about it. I thought everything asked for has been brought down.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Possibly it has been brought down. Perhaps the minister will be good enough to inquire and let me know to-morrow.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

DOMINION GUARANTEE COMPANY.

Mr. R. A. PRINGLE (Stormont) moved :

That this House do not insist on their amendments to the Bill (No. 127) respecting the Dominion Guarantee Company, Limited, and that a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their honours therewith.

He said : I may explain that I find it will become necessary, in order to get over a little difficulty in connection with this Bill, to introduce a short amending Bill, and I shall ask leave of the House to that end. Perhaps this would be the time for me to state the reasons. When the Bill

was before the committee, the general borrowing powers were struck out. The Dominion Guarantee Company have erected a building in the city of Montreal, and so it has become necessary for them to borrow the sum of $55,000. The Bill legalizes and declares valid that mortgage, but does not give the company power to borrow the money that may be necessary in the event of their being called upon to pay off the mortgage. I shall ask leave to introduce the Bill and would request the House to give it its first and second readings that it may be referred to committee. I have the enacting clause of the Bill here, though I have not it in the form of a Bill.

Mr. PRINGLE. I now move for leave to introduce a Bill (No. 127) respecting the Dominion Guarantee Company, Limited.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I suppose this Bill is introduced by my hon. friend in consequence of the amendment which was made in the Senate to the Bill which he has just brought under consideration.

Mr. PRINGLE. Yes. I was under the impression that we could have made the amendment which was inserted here. The Senate refused to make it, considering they had not power to do so. So they sent the Bill back here, and in having the matter looked up by the officials, they advised me that the proper course was to introduce a short amending Bill instead of asking for this amendment.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend is aware that such a Bill at this stage is very irregular. At all events no harm will be done if we read it a second time and send it to the committee, where it can be considered. We can go no further than that to-day.

Mr. PRINGLE. That is all I ask, that it be sent to the committee.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first and second times.

QUESTIONS.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY — PICTOU BRANCH.

Mr. STANFIELD asked:

1. When the Pictou branch portion of the Intercolonial Railway was transferred from the Halifax and St. John district to the Sydney and Oxford district, were instructions given that the employees on the Halifax portion of the line would not be affected by its transfer?

2. Have any changes been made that have affected the employees on said portion of the road? If so, at whose solicitation, and why were not the instructions carried out, if any were issued?

3. If these changes were made, what advantage have they been to the line?

4. How much more has it cost the railway monthly since the change, such as paying employees who are taken off their trains before their trip is ended, and also paying them passenger time between Truro and Stellarton?

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

1. The late Hon. Mr. Blair, then minister gave instructions February 28, 1898, as follows: 'The Truro and Stellarton section is to be transferred to the Sydney and Oxford district, on the 1st March, but the same trainmen and enginemen, who have been working that road, are to continue to do so, if they so desire.' The above arrangement, was not satisfactory to the trainmen and enginemen at Stellarton, who requested that the matter be referred to the Brotherhood, which was done, and in March, last, the minister instructed the general manager, as follows:

2. That the Truro men who are at present manning trains on the Stellarton-Oxford district be transferred to that district, and in the event of any of these men not wishing to do so, an equivalent number of men should be transferred from the Truro district with equal rank; and that trains Nos. 17 and 18, from New Glasgow to Halifax, shall belong entirely to the Truro crew. In case of vacancies occurring, these trains shall be manned by Truro men, and that for all future purposes of promotion, the Halifax, Truro district and the Stellarton, Sydney and Oxford district be separated as distinct promotion districts; choice of men affected to be made at the next change of time or within thiry days from date. Crews of trains Nos. 17 and 18, are to be given train home and return at week's end, if business warrants as in the past. These instructions were carried into effect in April last.

3. The department was of the opinion that the changes would be in the interests of the railway.

4. There is nothing to show that it increases the cost of operating the railway.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—AMQUI STATION.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Blain—asked:

1. What was the amount voted to defray the cost of construction of the Intercolonial Railway station built at Amqui in 1904?

2. What amount was actually expended in the construction of the said station?

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

1. There was an appropriation of $12,550 for increased accommodation at Amqui, voted in 1904-5; but this appropriation provided for other work in addition to building a station.

2. The amount expended in building the station at Amqui, was $6,460.50.

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURE FOR COUNTY OF NICOLET.

Mr. TURCOTTE asked:

1. What is the total amount of the grants of public moneys for the county of Nicolet from 1878 to 1896?
2. What is the total amount of the grants of public moneys for the county of Nicolet from 1896 to this day?

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

1. $141,667.07.
2. $230,083.72.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—CONTRACT FOR STEEL RAILS.

Mr. BOYCE asked:

1. What quantities of steel rails have been contracted for by the National Transcontinental Railway Commission for use in the construction of any part of the railway between Winnipeg and Moncton, during the year ending June 30, 1908?
2. With what firms or corporations, respectively, have such orders been placed, and at what rates, respectively?
3. What quantity of rails imported from foreign countries for use in the construction of such railway were admitted into Canada free of duty?

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

1. 130,371 gross tons.
2. With the Dominion Iron and Steel Company, Limited, of Sydney, as follows:

	Per Ton.
Delivery free at Quebec..	$34 00
" "	35 00
" Port Arthur or Fort William..	34 50
" Moncton	35 85
" Edmunston. ..	37 60
" Lévis..	35 00

With the Algoma Steel Company, Limited of Sault Ste. Marie:

	Per ton
Delivery free at Port Arthur or Fort William..	$34 00
Delivery free at Junction T. and N. O. Railway..	40 00

3. None.

FLYING RED ENSIGN ON MERCHANT VESSELS.

Mr. SINCLAIR asked:

1. What is the authority for flying the red ensign with the Canadian coat of arms on the flag on board merchant vessels registered in Canada?
2. Does section 73 of the Merchants' Shipping Act call for the national colours without defacement or modification on all merchant vessels?
3. Is there any official warrant or order varying this rule? If so, when was the same issued?

Mr. GRAHAM.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1. Admiralty warrant, February 2, 1892.
2. Yes, with the exception of ships registered in the Dominions of Canada and New Zealand and the Commonwealth of Australia.
3. Answered by No. 1.

BOUNDARIES OF MANITOBA.

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

Whereas petitions have been presented to the government and to this House from the legislative assembly of Manitoba, praying for an extension of the boundaries of the said province northward and eastward, and for an additional subsidy to the said province in lieu of the ownership of public lands in the territory to be so added,

Be it resolved,

That it is expedient that the prayer of the said petition should be acceded to, and that upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed to by the said legislative assembly and by parliament, the boundaries of Manitoba be extended as follows:

The northern boundary to be the sixtieth parallel of latitude; the western boundary to be the present eastern boundary line of the province of Saskachewan to the said sixtieth parallel; the eastern boundary to be the present eastern boundary as far north as the northeast corner of the province, thence on a straight line to the most eastern point of Island lake, and thence on a straight line to the point where the eighty-ninth meridian of west longitude intersects the shore line of Hudson bay.

And be it further resolved:

That whereas notwithstanding the extension of territory above described, the ungranted lands of the Crown in the territory so to be added to the said province will still continue to be administered by the government of Canada for the purposes of the Dominion; and the said province will not have the public land as a source of revenue.

It is just and equitable to recognize the increased cost of civil government which such extension of territory will occasion to the province, and in view of the premises, to make to the said province an increased allowance by money payment, the amount of which should be the subject of negotiation between the government of Canada and the government of Manitoba.

And be it further resolved:

That, upon the legislature of the province of Ontario consenting thereto, it is expedient to extend the boundaries of the said province, upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed to by the said legislature and by parliament, so as to include all the territory to the north of the said province lying between the extended boundaries of Manitoba above described and the waters of James bay and Hudson bay.

And be it further resolved:

That, upon the legislature of the province of Quebec consenting thereto, it is expedient to extend the boundaries of the said province,

upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed to by the said legislature and by parliament, so as to include all the territory to the north of the said province now known as Ungava, and extending to the waters of James bay and Hudson bay, and the entrance thereto.

He said: The resolutions to which I now call the attention of the House provide for the extension, upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed to by the respective legislatures therein mentioned and by parliament, of the boundaries of Manitoba, Ontario and Quebec, out of that portion of the northern territories which lies north of the same. This extension has been asked for by the legislature and executive of the province of Manitoba, and by the executives of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. Here the question may be asked, whether it is desirable, or even possible, to create a new province or provinces out of the territory which lies north of the provinces of Quebec, Ontario and Manitoba. Simply to state the question is to suggest the answer. It has never occurred to any one, that out of that territory which extends north from the present frontiers of Manitoba, Ontario and Quebec, it were possible to form anything like a provincial organization. The conditions both of climate and soil preculde the possibility that there can ever be in that section of our country a population of such density as to suggest the desirability of forming a new province. Ungava, which is the largest of these territories, is known to be absolutely barren for agriculture; the same may be said, I think, of the section of country which extends north of the boundary of Ontario. With regard to the section which extends north of the province of Manitoba above Lake Winnipegosis and Lake Manitoba, there is a portion which is known to be reasonably fertile and reasonably fit for agriculture, in the valley of the Saskatchewan but immediately beyond that, it is pretty generally admitted that the country is not fit for agriculture. In every one of these territories there is some possibility of timber and forest production. The resources in minerals are very promising, but like all things of this kind, until they have been actually tested and developed, they are uncertain. Under such circumstances therefore there is only one of two courses to follow. One is to continue to adminster this territory as we are doing at present; and the administration at the present time is practically nil, it simply provides for the administration of justice in case of crime committed, and some cases of a similar character, because there is practically no population in that territory. The other recommendation is to hand over this territory to the provinces which now claim it, and whose geographical form is such that it may be brought within the purview of their provincial and municipal organizations. Of these two courses before the government, the more reasonable, the more practical and the more expedient in the interest of all parties appeared to be that these respective territories should be annexed to the provinces of Manitoba, Ontario and Quebec, so that there might be the usual provincial and municipal administration as their development takes place. This course was contemplated, I may say by the fathers of confederation, because in the British North America Act of 1871, suggested by this parliament and the government of that day and passed by the British parliament, provision was made not only for the creation of new provinces out of the general Dominion territory but also for the extension of the provinces now existing. I call the attention of the House to section 3 of that Act which reads as follows:

> The parliament of Canada may from time to time, with the consent of the legislature of any province of the said Dominion, increase, diminish or otherwise alter the limits of such province, upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed to by the said legislature.

We are therefore to-day just carrying out the intention which was embodied in the Act. The case of Manitoba seems to be particularly pressing. Manitoba has the smallest territory of all the western provinces and it is a matter of public notoriety that there is in Manitoba a sentiment of disappointment, almost akin to irritation, that the province has not been as liberally endowed as the adjacent provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan which were carved out of territory out of which the boundaries of the province of Manitoba could have been increased. We all sympathize with this sentiment and there is no reason that I can see why this desire for increased territory should not be gratified. There is a more important consideration and that is that at the present time we are taking measures and asking parliament to vote an appropriation for the construction of the Hudson's Bay Railway; that is to say, of a railway which is destined to connect the existing systems of railways on the prairies with Hudson bay. This railway is not so much intended to develop local traffic as to provide an outlet to the sea-board for the ever increasing products of our western provinces. It has therefore been thought advisable, not only advisable but I should say necessary, that immediate steps should be taken to provide for this new territory, municipal and provincial organization since it is probable that following the construction of this railway population must set into that territory and, therefore, the requirements of civilized man should be provided for in the way of administration and otherwise. These are the main reasons which have prompted us to ask parliament to assent to this resolution which I have placed on the table.

In 1905 the province of Manitoba made a strong appeal to this parliament to have its boundaries extended but it seemed to the

government at that time wise and prudent, before acceding to the request, that the adjacent provinces of Ontario and Saskatchewan, which, perhaps, might have also a claim to the territory which was sought by Manitoba, should have an opportunity of being heard. We therefore extended an invitation to the several provinces to meet us and discuss this question. A conference took place in November, 1906, at which all the respective governments that I have just named were represented. The Dominion government was represented by the Prime Minister, the Minister of Justice and the Minister of the Interior; the Ontario government by Mr. Whitney, the premier, Mr. Foy, the Attorney General, and Mr. Matheson, the Provincial Treasurer; the government of Manitoba by Mr. Roblin, the Premier, Mr. Rogers and Mr. Campbell, the Attorney General, and Saskatchewan by Mr. Walter Scott, the Premier, and Mr. Lamont, the Attorney General. The province of Saskatchewan, at that conference, through its representatives, asked to be allotted the territory which extends north-eastward of the provincial boundary to the shores of Hudson bay. After giving due consideration to this claim on the part of the province of Saskatchewan, it seemed to us, that, as between the claim of the province of Saskatchewan and of the province of Manitoba to have the territory which lies north of Manitoba and west of Saskatchewan allotted either one way or the other, the weight of argument was certainly in favour of Manitoba and we could not grant the prayer of Saskatchewan. We therefore had to ignore it. We are prepared to admit the claim of Manitoba to have its boundary extended northward up to the 60th parallel of latitude. But a difficulty arose as between the provinces of Manitoba and Ontario as to the extension of the boundary eastward. The claim of Manitoba was that its territory should be extended eastward, north of the Albany river, that is to say, between the Albany river and Hudson bay, to a meridian line drawn from the confluence of the Mississippi and Ohio rivers. Perhaps some hon. member may ask: Why bring the line of the confluence of the Mississippi and Ohio rivers into this question? The older members of the House will remember that this line was exhumed out of old documents at the time of the controversy between Sir John Macdonald and Sir Oliver Mowatt as to the boundary line between Ontario and Manitoba. It is not necessary to go into that old controversy to-day but let me say at once that if the prayer of Manitoba had been granted and if its boundary had been extended over the northern boundary of Ontario between the Albany river and the waters of Hudson bay as prayed for, the eastern boundary of Manitoba and the western boundary of Ontario in this new territory which is to be allotted would have been brought into the vicinity of the longitude of Fort William, Port Arthur and Lake Nepigon. The government did not think it would be advisable to agree to such a claim as that.

On the other hand, the province of Ontario, represented on that occasion by Mr. Whitney, Colonel Matheson and Mr. Foy, urged that the boundary of Ontario should be the Churchill river, that the boundary of Manitoba should be a continuation of the present boundary of that province northward until it reached the Churchill river and then that the Churchill river should be the boundary between the two provinces. As the two provinces could not agree upon their respective claims it became the duty of the government to give to the matter its very best consideration and to endeavour to arrive at a conclusion which would commend itself to the judgment, not perhaps of both parties, but of all fair minded men. We could not agree to the claim of the province of Ontario that the Churchill river should be made the boundary for one very obvious reason which will, I think, commend itself to all those who do me the honour of listening to me. It is expected that the new railway to Hudson bay will have its terminus at Churchill; in fact, it cannot have its terminus anywhere else. Churchill is known to be the best of the harbours on Hudson bay and perhaps the only harbour. The only rival harbour possibly is the harbour at the mouth of the Nelson river but I understand, although I speak subject to correction, that, as between the two harbours, Churchill is by far the preferable one. At all events, I think it is admitted that the mouth of the Churchill river should be the terminus of the railway. If the terminus of the railway is to be at the mouth of the Churchill river it is reasonable to expect that a town of some proportions must eventually grow up at the mouth of that river, and if you have the two provinces separated by the Churchill river, Manitoba on the one side and Ontario on the other, and a town growing up upon both sides of the river, it is manifest that complications would arise and that the progress of the city might be materially retarded for the necessity of having legislation either from one province or the other. Therefore, it is far preferable, far more convenient and far more suitable in every possible way that the city be either in one province or the other.

Taking all these things into consideration we believed we could not grant the prayer of the province of Ontario to extend its boundary to the Churchill river. After giving the matter the best consideration we could we came to what we think is a fair conclusion and one which will be acceptable to all reasonable men, namely, to fix the boundary of Manitoba from the north-east corner of the province of Manitoba extending it over the height of land between

the water system of the Hayes river and the Nelson river on one side and the water system of the Severn river on the other side. That was the idea which actuated us when we came to approach the subject and to decide upon it. Our first intention was to make the height of land between the Hayes river on the one side and the Severn river on the other, the boundary. But when we came to put this line upon the map we found that serious complications might arise if we were to say ipsissima verba that this height of land should be the boundary because we found that the height of land between the Hayes river and the Severn river did not extend all the way to the shore of Hudson bay but that it was met some distance from the shore by another height of land. The height of land between the Hayes river and the Severn river runs north and south, but at some distance from Hudson bay that height of land is met by another height of land which runs east and west. Therefore, while adhering to the same idea we had to express it otherwise and we determined that the boundary should be a straight line from the northeast corner of the present boundary of Manitoba to the east end of Island lake and thence to a straight line to the point where the eighty-ninth meridian of west longitude intersects the shore line of Hudson bay. This practically adheres to the height of land as the boundary so far as it can be done, but we do not put it in so many words for the reason wherein I have stated.

I am aware that the boundary we have laid down has been disappointing perhaps to both parties. Judging by what I have seen of statements made by the premier of Manitoba he expresses disappointment although I do not believe it would be possible for the government or for parliament to concede in full the claims of Manitoba. I have seen some flaming articles in some newspapers stating that the rights of Ontario have been sacrificed in as much as the two harbours of Churchill and Nelson have been given to Manitoba. Well, Sir, I think the province of Ontario has enough of wealth and of territory and of glory to enable her to willingly concede to the sister province what little advantages there may be in that. Moreover, the traditions of history would seem to indicate that the Churchill and Nelson rivers should belong to Manitoba. They were the avenue of the fur trade in the olden times when the fur trade was all the trade there was, and if we were to take away from Manitoba what advantage there may be in this, I think Manitoba would be entitled to complain on sentimental grounds if not on other grounds. At all events I submit these reasons to the fair consideration of the House and I think they will impress themselves on all those who will give this matter impartial consideration.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What will be the respective areas of the provinces ?

Sid WILFRID LAURIER. The new territory which is to be added to Manitoba will be about 180,000 square miles in round numbers. I had a precise calculation made on the basis of the height of land, but it is sufficient to observe the boundary now adopted will give to Manitoba added territory of about 180,000 square miles. The present area of Manitoba is 73,732 square miles and with the area to be added, her total area will be about 253,000 square miles. The territory of Ungava which is added to the province of Quebec is 180,000 square miles (water) and 266,000 square miles (land), or a total of 456,000 square miles. I have not the figures with regard to the province of Ontario, but I believe the added territory is in the neighbourhood of 140,000 square miles.

I have the figures as to the population which may be in the territory now being added to Manitoba. I made no inquiries as to the population of the territory to be added to Ontario or Quebec because I believe it is admitted that in this territory there is no white population. The population of the territory to be added to Manitoba, according to the last census, is as follows :

Memorandum re population of the parts of Northwest territory added to the Province of Manitoba under the resolution of 1908, as shown by the census of 1901.

	Indian and Half-breed.	White	Total.
Parts of the District of Keewatin containing :—			
Black River..	..	2	2
Cross Lake..	55	2	57
Gods Lake....	368	..	368
Island Lake....	525	..	525
Nelson House..	280	7	287
Norway House..	230	18	248
Oxford House..	339	6	345
Fort Churchill..	89	6	95
Split Lake..	263	3	266
Warren's Landing..	18	6	24
Yankee Point..	12	1	13
York Factory..	242	5	247
Totals from Keewatin..	2,421	56	2,477
Parts detached from Saskatchewan district by the Act of 1905, containing :—			
Cedar Lake....	118	..	118
Grand Rapids....	133	11	144
Moose Lake....	174	..	174
Mossy Portage....	5	..	5
The Pas..	793	20	813
Totals from Saskatchewan..	1,223	31	1,254
Making a total for the new area added to Manitoba of..	3,644	87	3,731

There is another consideration which must engage the consideration of the government and of the House. We had always understood that the province of Manitoba in making this claim for the extension of her territory was asking for the ungranted

Crown lands, and in fact I remember that at the opening of the session my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Roche) reminded me that the province of Manitoba wanted to have, as he pointedly remarked, her lands. But in the petition which has been sent by the legislature of Manitoba to the House during the present session the province has taken an altogether different attitude. In that petition the province asks, not for all the ungranted Crown lands, but for a money allowance in lieu of lands. It must be remembered that in this matter the Dominion is not a free agent. The constitution of the province of Manitoba gives the lands, not to the province, but to the Dominion. The terms under which the province of Manitoba has been admitted into the union are exactly the same in that respect as these under which the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta have been admitted. The province of Manitoba therefore asks that it should be given the same treatment as has been given to the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta. The claims of Manitoba in this respect are in my estimation somewhat exaggerated. These claims follow :

That supplementary and in addition to the prevailing provisions as to the annual allowance of the province by the Dominion for cost of government, a per capita allowance of 80 cents a head of the population, there be inserted in any Act of the parliament of Canada extending the boundaries of the province as above set forth, the following provisions respecting capital account and in lieu of lands, such provisions in every respect being similar to and identical with those respecting said matters as are contained in certain Acts of the parliament of Canada, passed in the year 1905, creating the new provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta.

The memorial then goes on to say :

Inasmuch as the province of Manitoba is not in debt, it shall be entitled to be paid and to receive from the government of Canada, by half-yearly payments in advance, an annual sum of four hundred and five thousand three hundred and seventy-five dollars, being the equivalent of interest at the rate of five per cent per annum on the sum of eight million one hundred and seven thousand five hundred dollars.

I may say at once that this claim of the province of Manitoba to be given a certain allowance in lieu of public debt will not strike this House as at all tenable. Manitoba is not a new province. It has been a province now for more than forty years. It has received an allowance on account of public debt, as all the other provinces did when they came into confederation. The House does not perhaps remember at the moment the reason for the allowances on account of debt made to the provinces when they came into confederation. At the time of confederation the debt of the united provinces of Upper and Lower Canada amounted to $67,000,000, and of this amount the Dominion assumed $62,100,000; that of Nova Scotia was $8,000,000 and that of New Brunswick $7,000,000. The Dominion assumed the debts of these two provinces. It was found that the debt per head of the population was larger in the provinces of Upper and Lower Canada than in the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick; and there was a provision introduced in the British North America Act to this effect :

In case the public debts of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick do not at the union amount to $8,000,000 and $7,000,000 respectively, they shall respectively receive, by half-yearly payments in advance from the government of Canada, interest at five per centum per annum on the difference between the actual amounts of their respected debts and such stipulated amounts.

That is to say, the government of the Dominion having assumed the debts of these four provinces at the amounts stated, it was provided that if they did not correspond to an equal standard, the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick should receive compensation from the treasury of Canada to bring them to a parity with the other provinces. In 1884 or 1885 another arrangement was made whereby the government of the Dominion assumed the debts of Ontario and Quebec to the amount of $5,000,000 and gave equal treatment to all the other provinces of the Dominion, giving them a special allowance to bring them up to the standard with regard to the allotment of the debt. When the province of Manitoba was taken into the Dominion, that province was given compensation for debt—because it had no debt at that time—similar to what was given to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. When British Columbia was taken into confederation, the same thing was done with respect to that province. In fact, when any other province was taken into confederation it was given a special allowance in lieu of debt. But I do not think that the province of Manitoba has any claim whatever at the present time in that regard. It is true the public debt is much larger today than it was when Manitoba was admitted to the Dominion, but Manitoba has had the benefit of its share of that debt, which has gone into the construction of public works. So that there is no reason to depart from the arrangement that was made when Manitoba entered confederation. Then the province of Manitoba puts forward another claim in these words :

As an additional allowance in lieu of public lands, there shall be paid by Canada to the province, annually by half-yearly payments in advance, for five years from the time this Act comes into force, to provide for the construction of necessary public buildings, the sum of ninety-three thousand seven hundred and fifty dollars.

In view of the fact that grants were made to the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta for public buildings at the time they were taken into confederation, Manitoba asks that it should also be given a special grant for public buildings. I have only to say in answer that Manitoba has received more than once from the Dominion treasury grants for public buildings. But it seems to us that it is not unfair or unreasonable, since we are retaining the control of the Crown lands, that we should do for Manitoba what we have done for Saskatchewan and Alberta—indeed, what we have done for Manitoba herself, because on more than one occasion, as I can show, the Dominion has granted to Manitoba a special allowance in lieu of public lands, because it did not have them as a source of revenue. Therefore we are disposed to think—and we submit and commend it to the House—that Manitoba should receive compensation in lieu of the public lands, but what is to be the amount of this compensation, whether or not we should adopt the basis which was adopted for Saskatchewan and Alberta, is a question which at this time I do not think it would be fitting to discuss. The government simply ask that that matter should be left for negotiation between the Dominion government and the Manitoba government.

I have looked at the claims of Manitoba at the present time. I have my own opinion of them, but I do not think it would be advisable to-day to express this opinion. I think it is preferable to leave the matter at large, so that the negotiations which are to take place between Manitoba and the Dominion should not be prejudiced in any way by any opinion I might express at this moment. We simply declare that we are prepared to meet the province in a fair spirit.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Will the right hon. gentleman say whether the Hudson Bay Company comes into the calculation in any case?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The Hudson Bay Company does not come into consideration in this matter; it has nothing whatever to do with it. With regard to the claims of the province of Ontario, they will be found in a sessional paper brought down last year, No. 64a, which gives a full account of the conference that took place here in November, 1906. The province of Ontario asked to have its territory extended to the Churchill river. To this extent we cannot recognize its claim, but we have suggested both to Ontario and Manitoba what seems to us a reasonable settlement for their respective claims. In proposing this resolution, it will be observed that we are not asking for any concrete legislation, we are not asking parliament to be bound fast and hard to any proposition. We simply propose this as a reasonable settlement and basis upon which parliament ought to proceed in increasing the boundaries and territories of the provinces therein mentioned. If the boundary which we have suggested to Manitoba is not acceptable to that province, nothing can come out of it. We are confident, however, that on mature consideration it will be found difficult for either Ontario or Manitoba to suggest a fairer or more reasonable boundary than the one proposed in each case.

Barring this exception, we are prepared to grant the claim of Ontario. We think it is legitimate and perfectly reasonable to that extent, and that it will be conducive to the best administration of that part of the territory we are prepared to give to Ontario, that it should be included at once in that province. One has only to look at the geographical condition, one has only to take a glance at the map, to realize that the territory we are asking parliament to grant resepectively to Manitoba, Ontario and Quebec, geographically forms part of each of these provinces.

With regard to the province of Quebec, the claim is a new one. It has not been brought to the attention of the House before. It has been brought to the attention of the government by a memorial from the executive council of that province, which I shall lay on the table. This is dated 9th November, 1907:

In submitting to the House of Commons the Act to establish the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, the Prime Minister of Canada declared as follows:

'Manitoba has asked to have her territory extended to the shores of Hudson bay; and this is a prayer which seems to me to be entitled to a fair hearing. The province of Manitoba is not, however, the only one whose territory could be extended towards Hudson bay. The province of Ontario would have the same right; the province of Quebec would also have that right; and the new province of Saskatchewan also.'

The governments of the provinces of Ontario, Manitoba and Saskatchewan are pressing on the Dominion government their respective claims for a share of the territory of Keewatin and of the shore of Hudson bay, and the government of this province submits that it has no desire to share in such partition, and will agree to what may be decided on this matter by the government of Canada.

On the other hand the government of the province of Quebec is entitled to a portion of the shore of Hudson bay, and supports its claim thereto by the following facts:

The country lying beyond the northern boundary of Quebec forms geographically part of the territory of this province. The country in question is wholly isolated from all other parts of Canada, being separated from them by a wide expanse of sea, and offering to other provinces than Quebec neither advantage nor interest.

For the province of Quebec the annexation

of this undeveloped region is necessary, with a view to the protection of the timber, fish and game, over a considerable extent of the actual territory of the province.

The natives who occupy this region in coming south to hunt in the province of Quebec are the occasion of the most disastrous forest fires, as has been shown by Dr. A. P. Low, of the Geological Survey, and other explorers. Having caused this havoc they return to their own region, where they are beyond reach of the regulations made by the government of Quebec for the protection of its timber.

It is precisely the same with regard to the preservation of fish and game.

It is obvious that in view of its geographical position the region in question has everything to gain in becoming a portion of the province of Quebec. The government of this province is in fact better situated than that at Ottawa for administering and developing the natural resources which this district may contain. So far as the government of Quebec is concerned, the work of protecting and administering the territory would be but an extension of the system now existing immediately to the south, while in the case of the Dominion government it would be necessary to organize a special system which could have no important results save at relatively heavy expenditure.

Moreover, the enlargement of its boundaries can be claimed by the province of Quebec as compensation for advantages given the provinces of Ontario, Manitoba and Saskatchewan by the extension of their respective territories to the western shore of Hudson bay.

For these reasons it is deemed proper to request the Dominion government to annex to the present territory of the province of Quebec all that country to the north of the northern boundary of this province and extending to the Hudson straits lying between the bay of that name and the Atlantic ocean, and including the skirt of land which is supposed to belong to Newfoundland extending along the shore of the ocean, and, on the western side, the archipelago and islands adjacent to the mainland, as well as the following islands and groups of islands: Ottawa, Sleepers, Baker's Dozen, Belchers, North Belchers, King George, Mansfield, Charles, all the islands of Ungava bay and the Button islands.

I am aware that if this territory is added to the province of Quebec, that province will be by far the largest of the Dominion. The Ungava district, land and water, contains no less than 456,000 square miles.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Does that include the islands which the province of Quebec ask for in that memorial?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, it does not. If the territory of Ungava, which includes 456,000 square miles, were of the same character as to soil and climate as the valley of the St. Lawrence, we would not ask to have it added to the province of Quebec, but would make it another province. The conditions, however, are such that it is not possible to expect any large influx of population into that country. In fact, we cannot expect any influx of population there at all unless there should be the discovery of very large mineral deposits. Ungava has been known to civilized man for more than three hundred years. The French explorers knew it and explored it; French missionaries visited it, but no settlement has taken place, and there are no white people there except a few traders and hunters and trappers connected with the Hudson Bay Company and with a new rival to that company—the Revillion Company. Outside the traders, hunters and trappers, I am not aware that there are any civilized men in Ungava. No development of any kind has taken place in that territory. Recent explorers assert that its climate and conditions are such as not to invite civilized settlement unless there should be discoveries of minerals. Under the circumstances, it seems to me that the prayer of the people of the province of Quebec, that this territory should be added to that province, is not unreasonable. I am aware that some nervousness has been expressed more than once on the floor of this House regarding any extension of territory to the province of Quebec, because that province is the pivot on which representation must take place. In 1896, by one of the last Acts of the late government, one, however, that we fully endorsed and carried out, the boundaries of the province of Quebec northwards were readjusted. and by this readjustment it is asserted that an addition was made to that province of 118,000 square miles.

I have heard this referred to more than once on the floor of this House as being an invasion of the rights of the other provinces on the ground that probably it might have an effect on the distribution of the right of representation of the provinces. The point would have been taken with some degree of reasonableness if there had been any possibility at that moment—as there was not—of there being a population in that territory. But I am free to say, and everybody knows—it is a matter of general notoriety—that in the 118,000 square miles which are said to have been added in 1896 to the territory of Quebec, there is not one single voter, indeed not one single white man. And, in the new territory to be added to Quebec, under these resolutions, there is nothing of that kind to be expected. If the territory were of such a nature that it was reasonable to expect that there would be an influx of population there, the doubts which have been expressed more than once on the floor of this House as to the effect of this annexation would have to be considered. However, such as they are, I do not suggest that they should be minimized or ignored. I think it is a fair consideration to be brought to the attention of the Quebec legislature this nervousness expressed in some quarters, especially in the maritime provinces, that, possibly, the change

of conditions may have an effect upon representation.

Mr. FOSTER. In making his calculation of 456,000 square miles territory of Ungava to be added to Quebec, has the right hon. Prime Minister taken into consideration the Newfoundland strip? If so, how has he got at the calculation of area?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have taken the calculations as I understand them to be made by the statistician. The strip of Newfoundland is not taken into consideration. No human being can say to-day where the boundary line is between Newfoundland and Canada. The matter is very much involved. It is now to be referred to arbitration, an agreement with the government of Newfoundland having been reached to that effect. If I remember well, it is to be left to the arbitration of the Privy Council. But I have read the memorial of the province of Newfoundland upon that and also the views presented by the province of Quebec; and their views are so much at variance that I would not presume to give an opinion. At all events, I do not know whether this includes the strip of land of the Labrador coast. I cannot say as to that.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there not a danger of complicating the matter if you give a definite territory out of Ungava to the province of Quebec and do not know the amount of territory that Newfoundland may ultimately be adjudged to own?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That difficulty will no more arise now than a similar difficulty arose in 1881, when the boundaries of Manitoba were extended to the frontier of Ontario. This is a matter that is to be settled by judicial authority. But whether the territory continues to belong to Canada or is given to Quebec, at the present moment it does belong to Canada. We have taken the precaution to ask the province of Quebec to be a party to that arbitration, because it is interested in the boundary wherever it may ultimately be decided to be. In 1881, when the Act was passed extending the boundary of Manitoba to the frontier of Ontario, the contest was removed from Canada to Ontario and Manitoba—they were the parties who fought the issue. In the same way, if we allow this territory to go to Quebec, Quebec will become interested in the question. Then, though we retain our sovereignty, I think they should have a say and become a party to the question.

Mr. E. N. LEWIS (West Huron). In arranging all these matters, are precautions being taken to safeguard the immense forests there and, to that end, to establish forest reserves such as will be necessary for the future of the country, following the lead of the United States where immense sums of public money are now being spent in forest reserves?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. One of the reasons why Quebec has asked for this territory is because that province is in a better position to take care of the forests than we are. They can follow trespassers and otherwise enforce regulations. This extension is advocated as one of the methods of preserving the forest, and that is one of the arguments put forward by Quebec.

Mr. LEWIS. Why not federal forest reserves?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is another consideration. But it is not germane to the case I have now in hand. As I have said, this preservation of the forests is one of the points made by Quebec in favour of placing this territory within its jurisdiction. I think that it is admitted that at the present time the province of Quebec and the province of Ontario are taking reasonable precautions for the protection of their forest —not as much as they should do, I believe, but they are advancing in this respect and constantly improving their methods. Returning to the point with which I was dealing, the effect of this annexation of territory upon representation, I must say that I sympathize with that view of the question; it is a view that must not be forgotten. But, for my part, I cannot see that any immediate, or even future, danger is threatened. It has never been contemplated, and cannot be seriously contemplated, that there will be any great influx of population into that territory. But, even should there be an influx of population, it will be time to consider the question and see what safeguards should be adopted in order to preserve the balance of representation. More than that, I intend, for my part, when the matter is referred to the government of Quebec to draw the attention of that government to the objections which have been advanced more than once on the floor of this House against the increase of the territory of Quebec on this ground. I have reason to believe that these objections will be given a fair hearing and full consideration.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton). I have very little to say on this occasion. The difficult part of the question which has been presented to the House is left entirely open by the remarks of the Prime Minister this morning. I do not understand that the resolution which has been proposed is to be the basis of any Act to be passed this session; it is merely a resolution which defines the boundaries and leaves everything else absolutely open. I observe that that is the view taken of it—apparently an inspired

view—by representatives of the government press, as the following will show:

With regard to the request of Manitoba for an additional federal subsidy in lieu of the ownership of public lands in the territory to be added, as in the cases of Saskatchewan and Alberta, the resolution provides that this question should be dealt with later, on terms to be mutually agreed upon by the provincial legislature and the federal parliament. The question of the provision for separate schools in the new territory is also left over, and the contentious details in this respect will be one of the big problems of the next session of parliament. The actual extension of the boundaries is thus postponed till next year, but the resolution paves the way, in so far as it determines the actual territory to be added to each province.

I thought it worth while to place before the House this expression of opinion which I find in the Manitoba 'Free Press' and the Toronto 'Globe' as to the motives which have influenced the government in merely bringing down the suggestion of boundaries and leaving the terms and conditions absolutely open for negotiations between the federal and provincial governments. We were promised in the speech from the Throne that legislation would be passed this session on the subject. That legislation, apparently, is not to be passed. That is due to one of two causes, either the government has not come to a conclusion as to the terms and conditions upon which it is willing to make the extension of the boundaries of the provinces, or it has come to a conclusion which it does not think expedient now to announce to the House.

So far as the lands and forests in the northern country are concerned, the Prime Minister appears to consider that the province of Quebec, or the province of Ontario, would be better able to deal with them than the federal government. I do not understand why a principle of that kind, applied to the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, would not be equally applicable to the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta.

With respect to the strip adjoining Newfoundland, there is very little information before the House to enable us to form any opinion. One would suppose that when it is necessary to have the assent of the Governor General and precise information upon going into Committee of the Whole upon a matter dealing with half a million acres of land, it would be equally necessary, and certainly quite as desirable in this case, to have laid uopn the table of the House some map so that we could intelligently comprehend exactly the extension of the areas which is being proposed. The mere enumeration of those boundaries in the resolution of the Prime Minister gives us very little information indeed. Nevertheless, the House is asked to go into Committee of the Whole without having any map placed upon the table and without anything more than the very general statement made by the Prime Minister as to the disposition of a territory amounting in all, I suppose, to a million square miles. It may be that this matter will be open at another session. Properly speaking, I suppose the House will be bound by the terms of the resolution which we are asked to pass to-day. If that is the intention, I desire to say, in the first place that we have not enough information before the House to enable us to consider it intelligently; and in the next place, I think it would be proper that we should have gone into Committee of the Whole for the purpose of that debate, which cannot be obtained in a discussion on such as is proposed to-day.

With respect to the Newfoundland strip, it would have been wise to consider the possible entrance of the colony of Newfoundland into this confederation, and it might have been well to consider whether some portion of the territory which is proposed to be added to the province of Quebec should not be reserved for that eventuality, and whether some part of that territory at least could not be better administered by the colony of Newfoundland as a province of this confederation than it could be administered by the province of Quebec. In saying that, of course, I would have regard simply to the convenience and efficiency of administration. If it can be better administered by the province of Quebec, then it is eminently proper that it should be added to the province of Quebec; if, on the other hand, it could be more effectively and conveniently administered by the island of Newfoundland as a province of this confederation, it would be better to have it administered in that way. The Prime Minister has given us no information on that subject, nor has he apparently taken into consideration the possibility, and indeed the hope, that the island of Newfoundland may at no very distant day become one of the provinces of this confederation, and in that way round out into one great Dominion all the British possessions in the northern part of this continent. I have nothing further to say with regard to the resolution to-day, except again to express the regret that it has not been brought down earlier, that the government was not in a position to deal with the whole matter at the present moment, and that all the questions which have been alluded to in the comments of the government press are not brought before the House for its information and for determination at this session, as was proposed in the speech from the Throne.

Hon. DAVID TISDALE (Norfolk). I wish to say just a word in expression of my own views on this resolution. I do not think there is any present necessity for the disposition of the 400,000 square miles as proposed in this resolution, especially in view of my very strong desire to see the colony of Newfoundland enter this confed-

eration. I cannot concur in the view that this Dominion is not capable, and is not prepared to incur the expense, of looking after the timber and other natural resources in that vast territory, at least until we know something more about it than what is before the House.

Mr. G. W. FOWLER (King's, N.B.). I cannot allow this resolution to pass without raising my voice in protest, as representing a constituency in the maritime provinces, against this very large addition of territory to the province of Quebec. Quebec, as we know, forms the unit of representation, and if an addition is made to the territory of the province of Quebec it will no doubt have an effect upon the representation from the other provinces. In the provinces of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island we have suffered with respect to this matter already. It is impossible for us, owing to our geographical position, to have any territory added to our provinces, while the other provinces, these large western provinces, are getting additional accessions of territory. Of course this view of the question is not so important to the other provinces as it is to the lower provinces. If a provision were made that the maritime provinces should have restored to them the same representation that they had at the time they entered confederation, I would be satisfied to see an addition of territory made to these other provinces. But as it is, I must protest as a member from the maritime provinces, against any addition to the territory of Quebec unless provision is made to restore to the maritime provinces the representation which they had when they entered confederation.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I think it would not be well to assume that this addition to the territory of the province of Quebec will necessarily place the maritime provinces at any disadvantage. There is a question in regard to that matter which I take it for granted is still at large. When the moment comes for dealing with this matter more definitely, and in a legislative form, that question should certainly be considered. We in the maritime provinces, cannot get any addition to our territory, as my hon. friend has well said. The difficulty then that occurs to the people of the maritime provinces is this: The population of Quebec establishes the unit of representation for the whole Dominion. Now if there should be a large increase of population in the new territory of Ungava, and that population were included in the population of the province of Quebec in establishing the unit of representation, that unit would necessarily become much larger, and that unit, applied to the small provinces, might lead to a further diminution of their representation that would be regarded as a very serious matter. That is a difficult point to deal with. I do not wish to do more to-day than to say that I regard that as an open question. One way in which I hope it might be dealt with would be that the unit should be established upon the basis of the population of Quebec as it now exists, and that for any additional population that might come from this territory of Ungava, Quebec should receive additional representation, in other words, it would lead to some enlargement of the total representation. But even though the maritime provinces would still have their proportion, if the effect of that enlarged territory of Quebec would be that they suffered a further dimunition in their representation, even though mathematically you might say they still retained their proportion, I think it would undoubtedly lead to much dissatisfaction and discontent.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not exactly understand the hon. gentleman's proposal. How would you deal in that case with the additional population within the present area of the province of Quebec, because you could not allow that to go unrepresented?

Mr. FIELDING. Whatever the population is within the present area of Quebec, would of course be the basis establishing the unit for the whole Dominion. It was contended by the representatives from the maritime provinces, when this question came up at an earlier period, that the province of Quebec had already received an enlargement of its territory. The answer to that was that there was no enlargement, but merely a definition of a territory previously established.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think I misunderstood the hon. gentleman. He said the present population of the province of Quebec. He meant, I presume, the population within the present area of the province of Quebec.

Mr. FIELDING. Quite so. If I said that I did not correctly express what was in my mind. I mean the population of Quebec as it might be from time to time within the territorial limits of the province as now established, and that would necessarily involve that for the population coming into that new territory Quebec would have to have additional representation; so that she would never lose the proportion as it now stands. Hon. gentlemen will see that if the population of Quebec were to increase very largely throughout this augmentation of territory, and if the unit of representation were thus made larger, and if the population of the maritime provinces increased but little, the effect would be that while mathematically we would still have that proportion which the constitution establishes, it might be that the maritime provinces would suffer some further diminution of representation. Take the case of Prince Ed-

ward Island, formerly its representation was six, now it is four and if you should have to reduce it to three or two it would be small comfort for the good people of Prince Edward Island to be told that by the law of mathematics they still had their same proportion. I think that it would be the more obvious and reasonable course for the government to defer action in order that all parties may be consulted to see if they would consent to such an arrangement. I throw this out, as my own idea, as a possible means of a solution of what might otherwise be a rather embarrassing question.

Mr. J. W. DANIEL (St. John City). I think it would be better, rather than to wait until a difficulty like that referred to arises, to make provision so that it will not arise. This matter is a very important one, especially, as has been stated, to the people of the maritime provinces. We have already lost representatives for the reason that the original charter of confederation has been broken by subsequent Acts of the imperial parliament at the request of this parliament. Now, we are told that we should wait to see if we are to lose any more. The right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) says that there will be no population in Ungava and those portions of the territory that it is proposed to add to the province of Quebec. The Prime Minister is hardly in a position to make that statement. It has been stated by some, in regard to the last addition made to the province of Quebec, that the population would not be affected, that it was a sterile country. We have had others say that this was by no means a sterile country, that it was a country capable of maintaining a large population. If the country that was last added to Quebec is not of that character, what possible excuse is there for this country going to the expense of building the new Transcontinental Railway through it? We are building an immense railway, an expensive railway through this country which is stated to be sterile and not capable of maintaining a large population. One or the other must be wrong; either the statement that it is incapable of maintaining a large population must be wrong, or else it is extremely wrong and criminal indeed to build a railway which has nothing more before it than that. I have already, on one or two occasions, spoken on this subject and I do not wish to go into it again. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) stated, in his speech just now, that the boundaries of Quebec were not enlarged, that they were simply adjusted. I call his attention to the fact that the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth), in his speech last session, allowed that when the Confederation Act was passed the boundaries of Quebec were understood to be those that the maps of the period and the departmental publications of this government such as the census, gave. The census gave the area and the maps gave the delimitation of the boundaries of Quebec at that time. I do not think the Minister of Finance or anyone else is justified in making the statement that the province of Quebec was not enlarged at the time the boundaries were changed in 1898. As a representative from the maritime provinces I certainly protest against any addition to the area of the province of Quebec unless satisfactory arrangements are made to qualify the effect on the provinces that are affected thereby and more particularly the maritime provinces. I do that as a duty and also because the Minister of Justice at the last session stated that the maritime provinces must have been quite satisfied with what went on when the subsequent changes were made in the British North America Act or they would have protested against them. New Brunswick protested at the time Saskatchewan and Alberta were brought in. No heed was paid to its protest and I take this opportunity of protesting again. Whether heed will be paid to our protest I do not know, but it is our duty to make it. I do not think it is right, equitable, or just that the maritime provinces should be robbed of their representation by changes in the charter to which they gave their consent and by changes which have been made without their consent and without their having been consulted.

Mr. O. S. CROCKET (York, N.B.). Mr. Speaker, I did not think that after all the discussion that has taken place in this House on the question of the representation of the maritime provinces the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) would have ventured to propose a further extension of the boundaries of the province of Quebec without so much as suggesting that the wrong which was entailed upon the maritime provinces by the last extension should be first righted. It is not necessary for me, in view of what has been said by my hon. friend for Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler) and my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Daniel) and at any rate there is no time at this stage of the session to speak at length upon the subject. It is well understood by all hon. members of this House that Quebec is the pivotal province by which the representation of the maritime and all other provinces of Canada is fixed and that if the population of the province of Quebec is increased by the addition of any territory the representation of the maritime provinces is correspondingly reduced. I do not think that I can put the case very much more stronger than it was put in the words of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) when he was discussing in the New Brunswick legislature, in the session of 1905, the injustice

which was done to New Brunswick by the extension of the boundaries of Quebec in 1898. At page 33 of the Debates of the Legislative Assembly of New Brunswick in 1905 we have these words as spoken by the Minister of Public Works who was then the attorney general of New Brunswick :

The boundary line of Quebec was well recognized, and is laid down in Arrowsmith's map, published in 1815. It is referred to in the work of Bouchette, the surveyor general of Lower Canada, which was published in 1832. This is a book of the very highest authority, and it shows that the northern boundary of Quebec was long recognized to be the height of land which divided the waters flowing into the St. Lawrence from those into Hudson bay. Now, it must have made a very great difference in the willingness of the people of New Brunswick to join the confederation if Quebec had then been as large as it is now. I submit that when our people entered into the union, they agreed to go into the confederation with Quebec as it was, and that the boundaries of that province ought not to have been altered without our being consulted and our interests safeguarded.

As already stated by the Premier the Imperial Act of 1871 provided that when the area of a province was extended the rights of the other provinces should be properly guarded. Yet, in 1896, without this legislature being consulted, the late Dominion government agreed with Quebec to extend that province to Hudson bay thus adding to it a territory which will soon be traversed by the Grand Trunk Pacific and which in time will become populous. The Bill to carry out this agreement was introduced on the 2nd of June, 1898, by Mr. Sifton. It was introduced in blank and treated as a mere formal matter. On the 8th of June, it was read a second time and passed. So far as the records of parliament show, there was no debate whatever on the subject, and this large area was added to Quebec without the maritime provinces being consulted. It does seem to me that in view of the legislation, which has already taken place so seriously affecting our interests, and in view of what is now being done in connection with the legislation for the Northwest Territories, this government is but doing its duty in asking the legislature to express its views and to endeavour to undo this great wrong.

At the conclusion of that debate a resolution was passed by the legislature of New Brunswick unanimously affirming that a great injustice had been committed against the province of New Brunswick by reducing its representation. As the representative of one of the constituencies in that province I cordially join in the protest already made against any further extension of the territory of the province of Quebec unless there be a distinct understanding that the rights of the maritime provinces with respect to their representation in this House shall first be safeguarded. It would only be upon such an understanding that I as one member of this House would assent to the terms of the resolution now before us.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.). As a representative of the province of Prince Edward Island I also desire to raise my voice against this legislation. I agree most heartily with what has been said by the members from New Brunswick. The province of Quebec at present is the size of a pretty large kingdom. Some years ago more than half its original area was added to that province, and by this proposal another kingdom in extent is to be given it. To whom do these lands belong that we so cheerfully give away? What right has this government or any government to alienate the property of Canada and give it to any province without a consideration in return? This is part of the Hudson Bay Company's territory ; it was bought and paid for by the people of Canada generally ; paid for by New Brunswick and Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island as well as the other provinces. What right has this parliament to hand over this territory unless we get something in return for it to recoup the public treasury the amount which these lands cost the people of Canada? Years ago two millions of money was borrowed to acquire these lands and adding interest they stand to-day as costing us $10,000,000 if not more. This is the land you are giving to these provinces for nothing. Ontario some years ago got a very large increase in its territory. I do not know that I would raise my voice against adding to the territory of Manitoba, because her area as compared with the other provinces in the west is so small that she has been dubbed the postage stamp province. I do not know that the maritime provinces would raise any objection to increasing the area of Manitoba, but I protest strongly against the public domain being given away to the other provinces without some quid pro quo to the maritime provinces which cannot have their areas extended. Look at the preponderating influence over the smaller provinces which this extension of area will give to the larger provinces in this parliament. We saw how that resulted about a year ago when the subsidy question was brought before the House. So much did the large provinces receive under that Subsidy Act that although Quebec came here saying she was in debt and she wanted money to tide her over her difficulties, she has now a million dollars surplus. Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island got a mere trifle under that Subsidy Act, and now you come to parliament and you propose to give those larger provinces the public domain without any compensation. The Prime Minister told us that this territory would not be settled for years to come, but we do not know the value of these lands. There may be millions and millions of acres of mineral lands worth incalculable wealth there. Before the House proceeds in this we should know exactly what we are giving away and how much

of the wealth of the country we are divesting ourselves of. The question of representation in the maritime provinces as bearing on the increased territory is also a great hardship to us. I tell the government that if they want to adhere to the terms of confederation and to maintain Quebec as the pivotal province on which representation is based the proper thing to do in arriving at the basis of representation is to take the province of Quebec as it stood at confederation. I think the Prime Minister will agree with me that that would be a fair proposition. We came into confederation on the understanding that the basis of representation would be on Quebec as it then stood and not on the population you would give to Quebec by adding thousands of square miles of territory. After what has been said here to-day the government should hold their hand; find out what these lands are worth and find out what we should get in return for these lands for which the whole Dominion of Canada paid. Is it right that this territory should be thrown away without our knowing what its value is?

Mr. FOSTER. Can the Prime Minister now state the area that will be added to the province of Ontario?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I cannot find it in my notes, but I am pretty sure it is about 140,000 square miles.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). Mr. Speaker, I deem it my duty to make a few remarks to the House in consequence of my hon. friend the member for York, N.B. (Mr. Crocket) having quoted some remarks which I made while I was a member of the legislature and of the government of New Brunswick. I stated at that time, that in my opinion the boundaries of the province of Quebec had been enlarged pursuant to the provisions of the statute of 1871. I think there can be no doubt whatever that the northern boundary of the province of Quebec at the time of confederation was the height of land separating the waters which flowed into the St. Lawrence from the waters which flowed into Hudson bay. That is very clear from the treaty which was made between Great Britain and France. Under that treaty the land which was watered by the rivers flowing into Hudson bay remained under the jurisdiction of the Hudson Bay Company, while the land which was watered by the rivers flowing towards the St. Lawrence was given over to France. There can be no doubt whatever that the boundary line was the height of land. If I am correct in that, as I think I clearly established before the New Brunswick legislature, there is, to my mind, no question but that the territory which was defined as belonging to the province of Quebec in 1896 was new territory, and that therefore the boundaries of Quebec were enlarged beyond what they were at the time of confederation. I argued then, and I maintain now—as, of course, my own individual opinion—that in fixing the number of representatives at 65 from the province of Quebec, the province was taken as it existed at the time of the union. I had to do with the carrying of the question of representation to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council; but I may say that New Brunswick did not lose its representation by reason of any question which arose with regard to the added territory. There was no such population in the added territory as would alter the representation, but we lost by reason of the addition to Canada of the new territory which is now the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. It was the rapidly increasing population of those sections of the Dominion which prevented the province of New Brunswick from retaining the representation which it had at the then last preceding census.

Having made these remarks, Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that, as I understand it, there is nothing in the resolution now before the House which in any way commits the House upon the question of representation. The terms upon which the boundaries of Quebec shall be enlarged are left open, to be taken up between the government of Canada and the government of Quebec. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister has stated that this government will feel it to be its duty to make a representation to the government of the province of Quebec on the subject of representation.

Mr. CROCKET. Might I ask the hon. minister a question? Are not the terms stated to be such terms as may be agreed upon by this parliament and the legislature of Quebec?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Quite so.

Mr. CROCKET. There is no provision for safeguarding the interests of other provinces affected. I would like also to call the minister's attention to and get his opinion upon section 3 of the Act of 1871, which says:

> The parliament of Canada may from time to time, with the consent of the legislature of any province of the said Dominion, increase, diminish or otherwise alter the limits of such province upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed to by the said legislature, and may, with the like consent, make provision respecting the effect and operation of any such increase or diminution or alteration of territory in relation to any province affected thereby.

It seems to me that there should be some provision made in this resolution with respect to that; because, if this resolution passes, it will be declared as the opinion of this parliament that it is expedient to ex-

tend the boundaries of the province of Quebec upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed to by the legislature of Quebec without reference to the other provinces.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend must see that it is upon terms and conditions to be agreed upon by the legislature and by this parliament. Therefore, it will be quite open to this parliament to say to the legislature of Quebec: We will agree to extend the boundaries, but upon the condition that the old province of Quebec shall be the pivot of representation, and that, with regard to the added territory, it shall stand exactly in the same position as the other provinces.

Mr. LENNOX. But New Brunswick would have no say except as represented by this parliament.

Mr. PUGSLEY. And if I understood for a moment that this parliament was committing itself in any way on the question of representation, I would hesitate before being a party to the measure before the House. But I understand that it is entirely open to this parliament to safeguard the interests of the other provinces with respect to representation. My own opinion is that it would be a proper and generous thing on the part of parliament and the larger provinces to agree that the representation of the smaller provinces should be restored——

Mr. DANIEL. Would the minister allow me a question? He said that there was nothing in this measure to affect the representation. I would like him to say whether, in his opinion, it is possible to increase the area of the province of Quebec without affecting the representation of every province in the Dominion?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does not my hon. friend see that all this resolution does is simply to commit parliament to an expression of an opinion as to what would be the proper boundaries of the different provinces? It does not in any way determine the terms and conditions upon which the boundaries are to be enlarged. It expressly provides:

That, upon the legislature of the province of Quebec consenting thereto, it is expedient to extend the boundaries of the said province, upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed to by the said legislature and by parliament.

Mr. CROCKET. And without any stipulation with respect to its effect upon the representation of the other provinces.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It seems to me that my hon. friend does not wish to understand the meaning of this clause. It expressly reserves to parliament the right to stipulate as to the terms and conditions upon which the boundaries shall be enlarged. I was going to say, speaking for myself individually, and as a representative of the maritime provinces, that I would hope that when these boundaries are extended, and when this proposition is crystallized by an Act of parliament, the larger provinces, including the province of Quebec, would be generous enough to agree that the representation of the smaller provinces shall be restored to what it was at the time of confederation.

Mr. HAGGART. Would you have power to do that without an alteration of the Imperial Act?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is very clear that the British North America Act will have to be altered; but I presume that an expression of opinion from the various provinces through their legislatures, and the consent thereto by this parliament, would be all that would be necessary in order to have the imperial parliament make such an alteration. But of course that is only my individual view, which I put forward as a representative of one of the maritime provinces. But failing that, I would feel, while not pretending to any great knowledge of constitutional law, even if there were no provision made with regard to representation, that when we come to interpret the law—and that would arise when the next census was taken and the question of representation would again come up—Quebec, for the purposes of representation, would mean Quebec as it existed at the time of confederation. If Newfoundland were to come into the confederation as a part of the province of Quebec, how absurd it would be to contend that Quebec would then mean the added territory of Newfoundland.

Mr. LENNOX. Has it not been so decided?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, it has not been so decided. All that was decided in the representation case to which I have just referred was that under the terms of the British North America Act it was contemplated that Rupert's Land should be brought into the confederation, and that the word Canada, whenever we came to interpret its meaning, would be Canada as it might exist from time to time. But that is a very different question from the question of what would be the province of Quebec for the purposes of representation. Apart altogether from the legal view, I would hope that if the representation of the smaller provinces might not be restored when we come to consider definitely the terms of the extension of boundaries, it would be provided, so that there would be no doubt about it, that for the purposes of representation the province of Quebec should mean that province, as it existed at the time of confederation, and that the added portion of the province should have its

additional representation based upon population just the same as in the case of the other provinces.

At one o'clock, House took recess.

House resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). At this late stage of the session I do not propose to claim the attention of the House, even on so important a resolution as this, for more than a few minutes. I think the government are certainly deserving of serious condemnation for their procrastination in bringing down even this resolution—to say nothing of the Bill that was promised—not only in the dying days of the session but in its very dying hours. When we look at the speech from the Throne delivered last November and see that amongst the Bills promised to be brought down this session is one for the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba, and yet we find that far on in the eighth month of the season, the Bill is not introduced but we have only a resolution declaring that certain boundaries shall be carried into effect. I think I put it mildly when I say that such procrastination on the part of the government in so important a matter is certainly deserving of censure. I do not think that the excuse given, or the reason assigned by the government, that the legislature of Manitoba, had, at its last session, varied its demands to a certain extent in regard to these boundaries is one that will appeal to the members of this House, or to the country, as being sufficient to justify this procrastination. We must take into consideration the fact that the latest memorial of the legislature of Manitoba I had the honour to present four or five months ago. And surely in that time, on a matter which, no doubt, has engaged the serious attention of the government in the past, there was no reason to postpone action until the very last week of the session. I desire to give briefly the historical facts of this boundary question: Successive legislatures of Manitoba have dealt with this matter, and always in a non-partisan and non-political way, so that resolutions passed relating to the boundaries of the province of Manitoba have been, almost without exception, passed unanimously. Manitoba entered confederation in 1870, with an estimated population of 17,000 and having at that time an area of 13,500 square miles. It is true that we had some addition to our western boundaries which increased our territory to 73,700 square miles, a large proportion of which is water. That area was afterwards enlarged in the manner that I shall advert to in a few moments. The first resolution passed in the legislature of Manitoba, subsequent to confederation asking for an extension of boundaries was passed in 1873, and an Act received the assent of the Lieutenant Governor in 1873 praying for the further extension of our boundaries. So far as relates to the eastern territory, it asks practically the same amount of territory as in the recent resolution passed by the legislature and presented in the form of a memorial to this parliament. This request of 1873, had it been carried into effect, would have given us a port on Hudson bay and also a port on Lake Superior. So far as I can judge, the people west of the great lakes are, territorially in sympathy with and are united in interest with, the west. I believe that the people, in their ideas, are decidedly western. I had the honour to address a meeting in the city of Port Arthur four years ago and nothing that I said seemed to meet more the approbation of the electors than the declaration of my opinion that that part of the country, now in Ontario, was essentially western country and should have been left to the province of Manitoba. And I believe the feeling of the people thus indicated has not changed to the present day. The request of the legislature of Manitoba, if granted, would have given the province of Manitoba an area of 279,000 square miles. The second resolution passed by the legislature asking for an extension of boundaries was passed on April 26, 1875, and practically endorsed the resolution of two years previous. Then, on February 13, 1880, Mr. Greenway, leader of the opposition in the legislature, moved that a memorial be presented to the Dominion parliament asking for the extension of Manitoba's boundaries and that a deputation should proceed to Ottawa to lay the case of Manitoba before the members of the Dominion government. This resolution was passed unanimously and a deputation was sent east to interview the government. As a result, a Bill was introduced into Canada called the Campbell Bill. Sir Alexander Campbell was a minister in Sir John Macdonald's government. He introduced in the Senate a Bill providing for the extension of Manitoba's eastern boundary to harmonize with a line drawn due north from the junction of the Ohio and Mississippi river, which would run in the neighbourhood of Port Arthur and up to Hudson bay. This, had it passed, would have given Manitoba an additional 154,411 square miles. But this measure was taken exception to by the then Ontario government. Sir Oliver Mowat claimed that a portion of the territory—only a portion, however—was wrongly handed over to Manitoba and in reality belonged to Ontario. As a result, there was an appeal to the Privy Council of Great Britain. That was not decided till the year 1884. The result of that appeal was that there were some 39,000 square miles handed over to the province of Ontario. This was a part of the 154,411 square miles which was, by the Campbell Act, handed over to Manitoba. There was also 40,000 square miles in Keewatin recognized as undisputed territory, and lying north of what was then considered the northern boundary of On-

tario. The Ontario legislature agreed unanimously that it should go to the province of Manitoba. Now, I would point out that the Privy Council not only decided the western boundary of Ontario, but its northern boundary as well. I think that anybody who will read the resolution and the despatches that passed between the government of Ontario and the Secretary of State of the Dominion, and the Bill passed by the imperial government, will see that the northern boundary of Ontario was Lac Seul, Lake Joseph and the Albany river—all south of that line was to be in the province of Ontario. In 1901 a resolution was passed unanimously by the Manitoba legislature, moved by the present Judge Myers, then a representative of the constituency in which I reside, and seconded by the member for Dauphin. In 1902, the present leader of the Manitoba government moved a resolution seconded by the then member for Dauphin, the present member for Dauphin in this House (Mr. Burrows) that the boundaries of Manitoba shall be extended northward to Hudson bay and also to include a portion of Assiniboia. Folowing that there was action taken in the sessions of 1905, 1906 and 1907, all asking for much the same thing, at any rate asking for the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba. And up to this time, not one inkling had the people of Manitoba or of Canada that the province of Ontario laid any claim to territory in Keewatin not given them by the decision of the Privy Council in 1884. Up to the time of the introduction of the Autonomy Bills introduced in 1895, no claim was made by any public man or by the legislature of Ontario by any resolution upon one acre of land in what was known as the undisputed territory. On the contrary a resolution had been passed as I have said, by the legislature of Ontario, declaring that they welcomed the addition of this area in what was known as the undisputed territory to the province of Manitoba. It was only this 39,000 square miles adjudicated upon by the Privy Council and handed over to the province of Ontario that Ontario claimed, and that province appeared to be perfectly satisfied, and stated in so many words that that boundary was established now and forever. I do not blame the premier of Ontario for the action he has taken. No public man occupying the position of premier of so important a province as Ontario could ignore the invitation practically extended to him by the Prime Minister of Canada to claim a portion of this territory which formerly the legislature of Ontario had declared to belong to the province of Manitoba.

Now the Prime Minister, when he was introducing his Automony Bill, stated that this territory was a very important portion of the Dominion of Canada, that Ontario had something to say, that Manitoba had something to say, that even Saskatchewan should be consulted, nay, he even went further, and said that the province of Quebec was entitled to take part in the disposition of the territory of Keewatin. Now what on earth has Quebec got to do with Keewatin? The hon. gentleman himself recognized the absurdity of calling in the province of Quebec as to the disposition of this portion of Keewatin, and he afterwards withdrew from that ground, properly taking into consideration that in the year 1898, not 1896 as stated by the Prime Minister, a Bill passed this parliament, agreed to by the province of Quebec, interfered with by no other province, giving a portion of Ungava to the province of Quebec. Manitoba was not asked to a conference with regard to the division of Ungava and an addition to Quebec, Ontario was not invited, and by an arrangement made between this parliament and the parliament of Quebec, an Act was passed by this government in the year 1898, giving Ungava to Quebec. The Prime Minister does not seem to agree with that.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The resolution was passed on July 6, 1896.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). But it was in 1898 that the Bill was passed introduced by the then Minister of the Interior. But the point I desired to make was that no person was invited to the conference, no other province at that time. Why should Quebec be asked as to the disposition of Keewatin, as the Prime Minister suggested in 1905? However, he retraced his steps so far as that province is concerned, and he did call a conference of the premiers of Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Ontario. Of the result of that conference and of the policy of the government, we have been left in entire ignorance up to this moment, up to the time the Prime Minister made his speech to-day, and he divulged but very little, even of the proceedings of that conference, in his speech to-day. I think it would have been an act of courtesy to the premiers of those provinces who came here and sat in solemn conclave with the Prime Minister and his colleagues, that the Prime Minister and his colleagues should have notified them what decision the government had come to as a result of that conference. The Prime Minister of Saskatchewan, I believe, has been interviewed, and has stated that he knew nothing of the result of that conference, that he had received no intimation. Certainly the Prime Minister of Manitoba has publicly stated the same, and so has the Prime Minister of Ontario. But that conference was held, and as a result the Prime Minister comes down to-day with a resolution, not a Bill. We do not know when a Bill will be produced before this House. But in my opinion the government, seeing some embarrassment in store had a Bill been presented to parliament, desire to place themselves in a position that they may make a double-faced appeal to the country. This resolution provides for no speci-

fic thing. A Bill would have had to provide for the granting of certain powers and privileges in regard to the people resident in the portion of the territory that will be added either to one province or the other. So the Prime Minister, in the dying days of the session, has introduced a resolution merely, and with the object no doubt of allowing his followers to go before the people and to explain what they are going to do after the elections—because this is a sure precursor, in my opinion, of an election between now and another session; and true to their old time policy, they will make one appeal to a certain class of people, for instance, as to educational matters, and another and entirely different appeal to another class of people of different views. This has been an embarrassing question in the way of bringing down a Bill, and therefore a resolution is substituted.

Now the Ontario government passed, in 1882, as I say, a resolution approving of the undisputed territory being added to the province of Manitoba. This resolution was passed on March 9, 1882:

That the extension of Manitoba by the federal Act of last session receives, so far as the territory added is undisputed, the hearty approbation of the inhabitants of Ontario.

The disputed part is that part that was won by Ontario in an appeal to the Privy Council; the undisputed part was that lying north of the Albany river, and the legislature of Ontario gave their hearty approval to that being given to the province of Manitoba. But on the invitation of the Prime Minister of Canada they have now put in a claim for this very same territory that the legislature of Ontario claimed should properly belong to Manitoba. It is true that the province of Manitoba, through their legislature, has made a somewhat different appeal in their latest memorial, to that submitted to this parliament in days gone by. But there has been a reason. The Prime Minister has quoted myself as saying that in giving any additional territory to Manitoba there should be a provision for handing over the public lands to that province, and that is very true. Our claim has always been that the public lands shall be handed over to the province. But we recognized, taking into consideration that the two new provinces, Alberta and Saskatchewan, were refused the power, there was no possibility of Manitoba getting that power at the present time and it would be somewhat of an anomaly if the province of Manitoba had not jurisdiction over all the public lands, having a divided authority, one portion of the land being administered from Ottawa and the other portion from Winnipeg. We recognized that anomalous position, and we therefore asked for the same terms and conditions that were accorded to the new provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. In that I am in accord with the legislature of Manitoba, and it is my desire, as a representative of that province, to back up her policy on the floor of parliament.

Now Ontario has been increased in area since confederation from 109,480 square miles to 260,862 square miles, not taking into consideration what is proposed to be added at the present time, which, as the Prime Minister says, is in the neighbourhood of 140,000 square miles, which would make Ontario in the neighbourhood of 400,000 square miles. The province of Quebec has been increased since confederation from 193,355 square miles to 351,873 square miles, the second largest in area at the present time in the Dominion of Canada. By this resolution there will be added to it, in round numbers, 466,000 square miles which will make the province of Quebec of the enormous area of 817,873 square miles. It is an enormous area, out of all proportion to the other provinces, and I think that some greater respect should have been shown to approximate uniformity in the area of the provinces. But as a result of this proposition, while Ontario and Quebec have these large additions, Manitoba has 80,679 square miles less than she had in 1891. Now that is a very serious condition for the province of Manitoba to be in. She has that much less than in 1881 was acorded her by the Campbell Act. The two new provinces have in the neighbourhood of 250,000 square miles, with a population less than the province of Manitoba to-day. In 1881, when this addition of territory by the Campbell Act was given to Manitoba, and which was taken away afterwards by the decision of the Privy Council, Manitoba's area was 62,260 square miles. But Manitoba has increased since confederation from 13,500 square miles to its present area of 73,732, an increase of only 60,232 square miles, while her population has increased from 17,000 to close on 400,000. So I think she has been very unfairly treated, and deserves better consideration at the hands of this parliament.

I am not going to discuss the financial question at all. Apparently, however, the government have made up their mind not to accede to the request of the memorial presented to this parliament by the legislature this session, otherwise they would have brought down a Bill giving the same terms as had been accorded by the Autonomy Bill to the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. But, inasmuch as it is to be left to negotiations to be carried on between representatives of the Dominion government and representatives of the provincial government and as I have every confidence that our provincial interests will be safeguarded in that respect by those in authority at the present time in the province of Manitoba, I am not going to enter into a discussion of the financial aspects of the matter farther than to enter my protest that the province has not been fairly dealt with in not hav-

ing the memorial acceded to and in not being given the same terms as those that are accorded to the sister provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan.

As far as the lands are concerned, I have already referred to that feature of the case. The new provinces were refused their lands, Ontario getting this additional territory, will get the land and everything else. On the other hand, Manitoba, not being handed over the land, the financial aspect of the case will have to be taken into account to compensate the province for the retention of this land by the Dominion government, and I trust that when the representatives of the provinces and the Dominion meet once more the Dominion government will see its way clear to do justice to the province of Manitoba on the question of finance.

I desire to say a word with reference to the fact that no Bill has been presented. There is absolutely no excuse, no justification why we should not have had a Bill presented to this House so as to submit it to the next legislature of Manitoba for consideration.

Mr. TALBOT. Why did you waste so much time on the Manitoba Election Act?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). If the hon. gentleman will consult his leader he will know that the time was not wasted. The time was utilized to very good purpose, because we succeeded in convincing the Prime Minister, the hon. gentleman's leader, if we did not convince the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot), that he was on the wrong tack and he had the wisdom to accede to the request made by members of the opposition from the province of Manitoba. When the new Northwest Territories Bill was being passed in 1905 a strange thing happened that I have referred to before in this parliament, and it was this: Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, then Minister of Justice, in forming the new Northwest Territories, specially omitted the district of Keewatin from the new territories, and he gave us his reason for so doing. It had been under the jurisdiction of the Lieutenant Governor of Manitoba for upwards of twenty-five years and it was known that there was no necessity for adding that to the territories which he was forming by the Act then before the House. They were allowed still to remain under the jurisdiction of Manitoba. That Bill passed parliament in the session of 1905, but a strange thing happened. Within four days after the closing of parliament, by a proclamation, Keewatin was added to the new Northwest Territories. What for? No satisfactory explanation has been given to the people of the country up to the present time why this was done. But, the people of Manitoba know why it was done, and that is the reason why there has been no Bill introduced to extend the boundaries of Manitoba at this session. The Prime Minister pointed out that the new provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan must have their educational systems continued as they existed in the Northwest Territories under the old Northwest Territories Act. He made his whole plea on constitutional grounds. In order to have the same educational powers conferred upon the district of Keewatin, after parliament closed in 1905, by proclamation of the Governor in Council, he added the Keewatin district which had been especially exempted in the Northwest Territories Act so as to fasten that same system of education upon that added territory. He is now face to face with another school question that he has not the courage to grapple with prior to an election, and he is going to allow his supporters to go out amongst the people and tell those who are in favour of separate schools: It is all right; Sir Wilfrid Laurier was in a very embarrassing position, it was immediately prior to an election, but after the election he is going to give separate schools to the people of the Territories; whilst his other supporters who are not in accord with that view, such as the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Jackson), will tell a different story. The hon. member for Selkirk for the last four or five years has been telling the people of Manitoba that the boundaries were to be extended. On two different occasions he gave public expression, if reported correctly in the Winnipeg Liberal paper, to the idea that the boundary of Manitoba was to be extended northward and eastward. It is because of that very same action of this government in issuing that proclamation and bringing into effect the old Northwest educational clauses in connection with the school difficulty that the government have been procrastinating, dilly-dallying with this question and postponing it. They are going to the country with every pledge of their party unfulfilled, face to face with this question that they dare not grapple with, and they are going to try to hoodwink the people by telling two different stories according to the views of the people with whom they are dealing. That is in my opinion an objection that I wish to give expression to on the floor of parliament. I am not going to occupy any more of the time of the House. This is a very important resolution, and I would have liked more time to go into the details, but I recognize that in the dying days of the session it is not wise to monopolize too much time with any one question. But, as a final appeal I may say that my province, even under the present resolution, is not receiving the justice that it should receive, that the Prime Minister has not dealt fairly with

the province, that he has not dealt courageously with this whole question, that it should not be treated in the double-faced manner in which it has been treated, that, sooner or later, he, or some one following him, will have to face the difficulty, and if it has to be faced it might as well be faced and fought out in the first place as in the last, and that the people of Manitoba will not be satisfied before they can see the provisions of a Bill submitted to parliament and passed upon by the representatives of the people in this House.

Mr. W. D. STAPLES (Macdonald). Mr. Speaker, I am sure that hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House will join with me in extending their heartiest congratulations to the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) upon the rapid strides that he has made towards extending the boundaries of Manitoba. Just think of it; he has led the government for twelve years and in the twelfth year and in the eighth month of a long and tedious session, he has had the courage to introduce a harmless resolution for the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba. During these twelve years the right hon. gentleman has been besieged by delegations, resolutions and memorials from the province of Manitoba urging him to take some action. Here are we to-day with a resolution which practically provides for nothing in my opinion. There was a time when the boundaries of Manitoba should have been dealt with, should have been extended and that time was on the 21st February, 1905, when the right hon. gentleman introduced the Bill for the creation of the new provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta. That was the time when action should have been taken for the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba. The same reason prevails to-day for action not being taken as that which prevailed in 1905. Where did you find the Liberal contingent from Manitoba on that day? If the hon. gentlemen who sit behind the right hon. Prime Minister had done their duty in 1905 when the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta were being created, the boundaries of Manitoba would have been extended, not only eastward and northward, but westward as well. If the hon. members for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway), Dauphin (Mr. Burrows), Selkirk (Mr. Jackson), and Portage la Prairie (Mr. Crawford), all supporters of the old Greenway government, gentlemen who sat in the local legislature for years and were parties to the petitions and resolutions that were sent down here asking for the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba, had taken action at that time, had stood out for the rights of Manitoba, we would have had our boundaries extended and have had all the consideration that the province of Manitoba is entitled to.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE.

It is true that at that time the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) thumped his desk and flurried around for a while, but he soon came back to the Liberal fold quite satisfied that things should go on as they were. I trust the Liberal members from the province of Manitoba will now rise in their seats in this House and protest against the procrastination displayed by the government towards the province of Manitoba. It is their duty to insist on the Prime Minister, even at this late hour, bringing down a Bill. It is true that we have been here for eight months, and it has been a long and tedious session, but as one of the representatives of Manitoba, I am prepared to stay here in the interests of the people until we crystalize into legislation that which the people of Manitoba are entitled to. I say to the right hon. gentleman, the Prime Minister: Bring on your Bill. If that Bill proposes to give us our lands, well and good; if it proposes to give us a monetary consideration in lieu of lands, let us know it.

Mr. BURROWS. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Staples) want the government to submit to parliament an arbitrary measure and force it on the governments of the different provinces without consulting them?

Mr. STAPLES. The Prime Minister knows right well what the people of Manitoba want, for he has it before him by memorial and resolution. I can tell this House that nothing will be gained by delay, because neither the present government of Manitoba, nor any Liberal government that may succeed it, will be satisfied unless justice is done the province, and delay will not remove the points of contention. We might just as well deal with the question now as in the future. But what the right hon. gentleman wants is to have this resolution dangled before the eyes of the people as a subterfuge until after the next election, and I presume his followers from Manitoba are satisfied with that. The right hon. gentleman has told us that the province of Manitoba has changed its point of view, and that while formerly they insisted on having their lands now they do not so insist. The right hon. gentleman knows very well that the province of Manitoba has taken this action because he has time after time announced that he could not give the lands to the province, and so they ask, for the present, at all events, that they shall be treated as the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta have been treated. As to what may be the attitude of Manitoba when there is a government in power at Ottawa disposed to do justice to that province I am not prepared to say now. For the present we ask that we shall be treated at least as favourably as Alberta and Saskatchewan. And, even though the Prime Minister has announced

that we are within five days of the end of the session, surely he has courage enough to bring in a Bill which will deal with this question from the viewpoint of a statesman. I see the Prime Minister shakes his head. I protest against the delay; I say this resolution is nothing more than a fake intended to stand off the people until after the election. I want to tell the right hon. gentleman and those who sit behind him that the people of Manitoba will not stand for any such treatment as that, and he will find at the next election they will enter their protest at the polls as I have entered my protest in this House. The right hon. gentleman has the British North America Act before him; he knows the wishes of the people of Manitoba, and all they ask is that they be dealt with under the terms of the constitution. I repeat, in conclusion, that this resolution is merely intended to give the Manitoba Liberals something to go on the stump with, and in that light it is a subterfuge and nothing more.

Mr. JOHN STANFIELD (Colchester). In view of the fact that this proposal of the government is to give additional territory to the provinces of Ontario, Quebec and Manitoba, I think it is a fitting time for the people of the maritime provinces to ask that some safeguards be provided against the ruthless cutting down of their representation in this House of Commons. I am strongly of opinion that no justice can be done the people of the maritime provinces until their representation in this House is restored to that which it was before 1896. I do not think any member of this parliament will deny that the people of the maritime provinces are entitled to the representation which they understood they would have when they entered confederation, and with that end in view I move:

That the proposed resolution be amended by adding thereto the following paragraph:

Be it further resolved that the extension of the boundaries provided for by this resolution should be accompanied by such conditions as will prevent such extensions prejudicially affecting the representation of any province in parliament.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queens, P.E.I.). I have great pleasure in seconding the resolution moved by the hon. member for Colchester. The House will observe that the resolution proposed by the right hon. the Prime Minister opens with this paragraph:

That it is expedient that the prayer of the said petitions should be acceded to, and that upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed to by the said legislative assembly and by parliament, the boundaries of Manitoba be extended as follows:

The northern boundary to be the sixtieth parallel of latitude; the western boundary to be the present eastern boundary line of the province of Saskatchewan to the said sixtieth parallel; the eastern boundary to be the present eastern boundary as far north as the northeast corner of the province, thence on a straight line to the most eastern point of Island lake, and thence on a straight line to the point where the eighty-ninth meridian of west longitude intersects the shore line of Hudson bay.

And then with reference to the terms

And be it further resolved:

That, upon the legislature of the province of Quebec consenting thereto, it is expedient to extend the boundaries of the said province, upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed to by the said legislature and by parliament, so as to include all the territory to the north of the said province now known as Ungava, and extending to the waters of James bay and Hudson bay and the entrance thereto from the sea.

The provisions of the resolution respecting Manitoba, Ontario and Quebec are practically the same, with the exception that the lands to be granted to Ontario and Quebec are to be given absolutely to these provinces without condition, whereas the lands added to Manitoba are to be retained in the possession of the Dominion government and disposed of by them as may be thought proper, while the province has simply the power to administer the civil government in the territory. However, in lieu of the lands Manitoba is to receive a monetary consideration. The wording of these resolutions is copied in effect from the first lines of section 3 of the amendment of the British North America Act of 1871, which reads as follows:

The parliament of Canada may from time to time, with the consent of the legislature of any province of the said Dominion, increase, diminish or otherwise alter the limits of such province, upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed to by the said legislature.

These are the exact words of the resolution as introduced by the Prime Minister. There is another clause in this section of the Act which has been omitted from the resolution, and I call the attention of the Prime Minister to the fact that this clause is permissive. It is permissible to this government to extend the limits of any province; it is not imperative. Neither is the second part of this section imperative; it is simply permissive; and if this resolution should pass without the amendment which has been moved by the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Stanfield) I believe that the condition which is incorporated in it could not be considered by this parliament or by the legislatures of Manitoba, Ontario and Quebec in the final settlement of this matter. That condition reads as follows:

And may, with the like consent, make provision respecting the effect and operation of any such increase or diminution or alteration of territory in relation to any province affected thereby.

Why did not the Prime Minister, in drafting this resolution, include that portion of section 3 of the Act of 1871 ? There is no doubt that such a clause should be incorporated in this resolution, if the increase of territory does affect in any way the status of the other provinces of this Dominion. Here we have an addition of territory given to the province of Manitoba of 180,000 square miles, to the province of Ontario of 140,000 square miles, and to the province of Quebec of 466,000 square miles. Whose property is this ? Has it any value ? Where is it ? As has been stated by the leader of the opposition, we have had no maps placed on the table of this House to show the members where this land is. We know in a general way that there is a lot of land lying to the north of the province of Quebec, but we have no evidence of the value of that land. We have no evidence of the value of the land to be conceded to the province of Ontario. Before this resolution passes, I think the Prime Minister or some member of his government should inform the members of this House, in order that they may vote intelligently on this matter, what the value of this property is. Is it worth $1,000,000? Some years ago the United States of America bought some territory in Alaska from the Russian government, paying a very small sum of money for it ; it was not considered of very great value. Since then that territory has developed rich mines, worth, it is stated, a billion dollars of money. What may be the effect of the exploration of this great country to the north ? I understand that Ungava and Keewatin have never been explored ; and it may be that when these lands have been explored within the next twenty or twenty-five years, they may become of incalculable value to the provinces to which they are granted by this parliament. These lands are owned by the whole Dominion of Canada ; and if they have a value at the present time, the government which is introducing this measure should be able to tell parliament what their value is and to some extent what their prospective value is. Without that information this resolution should not pass. If the other provinces are affected by this resolution, they are affected not only in a monetary way, but also in their representation in this parliament. Quebec, the pivotal province on which the representation is based, will receive this large addition of 466,000 square miles to its territory. This land may within the next few years be teeming with population. You know that years ago it was stated that Manitoba and the Northwest would never be inhabited ; yet I believe that within a very few years the greater part of the population of this country will be living in those western provinces. It may be that a million will be added to the population of Ungava and Keewatin within the next twenty or twenty-five years. The effect of that will be that the representation in this House of the maritime provinces, whose territories cannot be increased, will be greatly diminished. As was stated by the Minister of Finance, the possibility is that within twenty or twenty-five years, as a result of the increase of population in these new territories, the representation of the province of Prince Edward Island will be diminished to only one. In view of these considerations, we should have conceded to us the representation which we had when we joined the union. I would say further that if these lands, which are to be added to the territories of Quebec, Ontario and Manitoba, are of any value, all the other provinces which are in any way interested in them, or which are in any way affected by these additions, should receive a proportionate share of the money value of the lands. That should be conceded to them in the final settlement of this matter, when the Bill comes up in parliament at the next or some future session, in accordance with the resolution and the amendment which are before the House.

Mr. GEORGE W. FOWLER (Kings and Albert). Mr. Speaker, while I am in favour of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Stanfield), I think that it does not go quite far enough in the direction of meting out justice to the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, better known as the maritime provinces. These provinces had a certain representation at the time of confederation. The fathers of confederation in their wisdom thought that there was no danger of our population not keeping pace with the population of Quebec, or falling so far below it that a portion of our federal representation would be lost. Unfortunately that has not proved to be the case ; and but for the fathers of confederation resting upon that idea, some such provision would have been inserted in the British North America Act with reference to those provinces as was afterwards inserted with reference to British Columbia when that province came into confederation, namely, that the representation of British Columbia in the federal House was not to fall below what it was at the time the union was consummated. A similar provision should have been inserted with regard to the maritime provinces; but unfortunately it was not. The principle reason why in the last census the maritime provinces did not show an increase proportionate to that of the province of Quebec is that many people from the maritime provinces, perhaps more largely in proportion than from any other part of Canada, have gone to the Northwest and are helping to build up that country.

When we contribute to the west, as we are

doing, the bone and sinew of our country, our best and most enterprising young men—because it is the enterprising who leave home to seek their fortunes in the west—and when we thereby find our representation diminished in this parliament, it seems unfair that we should suffer both the loss of these young men and the consequent decrease in our representation, and be given nothing in return. I would have been in favour of a resolution which would provide that when the boundaries of these provinces—I am not confining my remarks to the province of Quebec—but when the boundaries of any province are enlarged, provision should be made that to the maritime provinces should be restored the same federal representation which they had at the time of confederation. That would put us on a fair basis. I want the House to distinctly understand that I have no desire to discriminate against the province of Quebec in any shape or form; my sole desire is that the equilibrium established at confederation should be maintained. That is an important question which is bound to be agitated in the future. It is important to the eastern provinces that the present representation of the east at least should not be disturbed.

I understand from what the right hon. gentleman has said that while Manitoba is to have its territory extended it shall not receive the new lands in fee. They are not to be Crown lands of the province but are to remain subject to the control of the Dominion parliament, whereas in the case of Quebec and Ontario the lands given them are to become Crown lands of the province and be administered by these provinces. And in order to make up to the province of Manitoba for the loss of authority over these new lands, and put it on an equal footing with Ontario and Quebec, it is to receive a money grant. Evidently the First Minister regards these lands as belonging, in the first instance, not to the Dominion but to the several provinces which they adjoin. But surely they belong to the Dominion as a whole. They were purchased by the Dominion. They form part of the purchase by the Dominion at the same time we bought out the Hudson Bay Company. If that be recognized, how is it that Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and British Columbia are to receive no compensation? Suppose the government were to bring down a resolution to increase the money subsidies now given Ontario, Manitoba and Quebec, and that the province of British Columbia and the maritime provinces were to be left entirely out of the reckoning, would that be considered just and equitable to these other provinces? Well, what is the difference between a money and a land subsidy? Surely these lands are worth something. Surely this territory of Ungava, some 466,000 miles in extent, is of some value. As was pointed out by my hon. friend from Queens, P.E.I., (Mr. McLean), the territory purchased by the United States from Russia, known as Alaska, was not considered of much value at the time of its purchase. The United States paid only $5,000,000 for it, but it would take a great many times that amount to purchase it back from the United States to-day—not on account of the desire of the Americans not to lose any territory but because of the very great money value of Alaska itself. What reason have we to expect that Ungava shall be less rich in mineral wealth? If it should turn out to be as rich in this respect you are by one stroke of the pen adding to the province of Quebec a tremendous extent of valuable territory and leaving the poor little provinces down by the sea without any compensation at all for the loss they suffer as part of the Dominion. I am surprised that the members of the government from the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and British Columbia did not oppose this thing in council. Perhaps they did; but if they did, I am still more surprised that they did not carry their opposition into effect and refuse to accept such a proposition at all and resign from the government rather than see the provinces they represent suffer such an injustice. We form a part of confederation, we are assisting in bearing the burdens of Canada—why then should we be singled out? The two leading povinces of Canada, Quebec and Ontario, are to be given this additional territory. Manitoba has been spoken of as the postage stamp of confederation. But let me remind you that that province is considerably larger than the three maritime provinces taken together. It is larger by one-fourth at least. It comprises 47,000,000 acres as against 32,000,000 acres for the maritime provinces. Yet those three provinces, each much greater in extent and resources than the maritime provinces, are to have all this given them and we are to get nothing. Nothing for the maritime provinces; nothing for British Columbia—though this is not so hard on British Columbia because that province is very large in extent, and until this addition was made to Quebec, it was the largest in Canada. But the three little provinces down by the sea are to get nothing. Yet they have always cheerfully borne the burdens of confederation, they have always stood for the policy that would build up Canada, they have not been narrow or provincial or 'little Englanders' in any respect. And it does seem to me, in view of what they have done in the past, that their claims should in justice and equity be considered. If you are going to take from the Dominion territory which belongs to the Dominion and give it to these other provinces, you ought to give us compensation. And as there is no way in which you can enlarge our territory, that compensation must take the form of a money grant. I am surprised that the representatives in the government from the province of British Columbia, and more

particularly from the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, have not stood up and demanded that their provinces should be given equal justice at the hands of this government.

In point of fact, I do not see the particular necessity of a step of this kind. I do not see why there is any particular need, in the first place, for the Dominion of Canada divesting itself of this territory. I do not see any particular need for adding this territory to the already overgrown provinces of Quebec and Ontario ; but since the government have determined to do so, then let the other provinces have fair play and equal justice. Do not do something which will affect the representation from these provinces as it must be affected by the addition of this additional territory to the province of Quebec. That our representation must be affected is a proposition which needs only to be stated to be admitted. This territory of Ungava will no doubt in the near future become inhabited. There is, I believe, vast mineral wealth lying undiscovered in that territory.

I believe there is a vast mineral wealth lying still undiscovered in that great territory. There are great fisheries on the coast to be developed. Taking all these things into consideration you are adding very largely to the province of Quebec territory which will be inhabited and so will affect the unit of representation as applied to the small provinces. As I said, I have no wish to discriminate in any way against the province of Quebec. It is unfortunate that when members from other provinces speak on behalf of their provinces some supersensitive members from Quebec think that their province is affected. It will be seen that I am looking at this matter from the eastern standpoint. I am looking forward to the time when, by reason of the great growth of the west the representation from that section will have largely increased ; and, in order to preserve the equilibrium between east and west, it will be important that the representation of the maritime provinces should not fall below the figure of to-day. To recapitulate ; I am in favour of this resolution for the reasons I have stated ; but I say to the government that they are not acting justly by the maritime provinces in not giving to them some compensation to weigh against the large increase in material wealth which they are adding to the three great provinces I have named.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. With regard to the suggestion of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) that it would have been preferable to leave this matter open, I must say that my observation leads me to an entirely different conclusion. Nothing is so likely to create bad blood between neighbours as these boundary questions. At the present time, I am sorry to say, our relations with Newfoundland in regard to boundaries are not as satisfactory as they ought to be. I stated this forenoon that we have provided for an arbitration to determine the boundaries between Newfoundland and Canada, Canada in this matter being interested for herself and for Quebec. This step was rendered necesary because Newfoundland has given concessions in a part of the disputed territory alleged to be encroaching upon the rights of Quebec. A lawsuit was entered in the province of Quebec to test the legality of the concessions given by Newfoundland. Rather than have this private litigation going on, parties holding rights from either one government and from the other going before the courts with their claims, we appealed to the government of Newfoundland to have an arbitration to determine where the boundary is. It is particularly desirable that we should eliminate this question in view of the possibility, which we hope some day will be realized, that the question of Newfoundland entering confederation may be brought forward for practical decision. I am sure I simply voice the feeling of every Canadian when I say that if the time comes when the Newfoundland people are willing to enter confederation we will extend to them a very cordial welcome. When that time comes as I hope it may, there will be a multitude of questions to be determined—questions of finance, questions of education and many others. And it will be all the better if, at that time, the question of boundary shall have been removed by the decision of arbitration. Therefore, I cannot agree with the leader of the opposition——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The right hon. gentleman has certainly misunderstood me. I did not make the slightest objection to the settlement of the boundary. It was an entirely different matter to which I was referring.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What was it, then ? I failed to comprehend.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I said that it might be an inducement to Newfoundland to enter confederation if some part of that territory were left to the administration of that province.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. But what would be an inducement to one member of confederation might be the reverse of an inducement to the other. The province of Quebec might have something to say to that. As far as that goes, it is preferable in every way that the claims of Quebec and the claims of Newfoundland should be settled so that neither party may have any doubt as to the matter.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it in respect of the present boundaries or possessions of the province of Quebec that the dispute is to be settled ? Or is the delimitation of the

whole boundary between Newfoundland and Canada ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is in respect of the whole boundary.

Mr. FOSTER. Not simply Quebec ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No. But my hon. friend remembers that the lower part of the territory belongs to Quebec and the upper part to Canada, so that Quebec and the Dominion are both interested. In a matter of this kind, Canada would have the right of eminent domain and might dispense with the consent of Quebec. But, as Quebec would be brought into the dispute, she should be given the opportunity to do the best possible for her own interest. My hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Staples) says that we should have brought in a concrete Bill. But, even though we had brought in a Bill and it had been passed by King, Lords and Commons, or, as we would say, by the Governor General, the Senate and the House of Commons, nobody would be more bound than by this resolution. A Bill passed by this parliament upon this matter would not be binding upon Manitoba. We must have the consent of Manitoba to anything we do here in order to make it effective. We propose here certain boundaries for the province of Manitoba. These may be, or may be not, satisfactory to that province ; if that province does not accept the Bill, the Bill is null and void.

Mr. STAPLES. Then, why did not the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) open negotiations four months ago with the government of Manitoba in order that we might arrive at a conclusion ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Well, we have done a good many things in the last four months. And I must say I was taken by surprise when I saw the last memorial of the province of Manitoba, altogether going back on what was understood to be her contention. They were understood to claim that they should be given land instead of money, but now they propose a money consideration. We had to look into that and it involved a good deal of work. We had to go into the whole history of the financial transactions of this government with the government of Manitoba, and they are pretty voluminous. I think that no less than seven or eight times during the time that Manitoba has been in confederation, the financial terms of the province have been altered. So, we have some anxious work to do in order to reach a conclusion. I find that in 1870, in 1873, in 1876, in 1879, in 1882, in 1884 and 1885, the financial arrangements of Manitoba were altered and that on every occasion Manitoba was given better terms. We had to look into all these things so that we could see whether the present proposition of Manitoba could be entertained. At last we concluded that it would be safer to negotiate with Manitoba. We could have got nothing by a Bill, and therefore we have taken the best course by thus calling attention to their claim and asking what should be given. We have to deal with the province on its claims and satisfy those claims, as we hope we shall be able to do. When this is done the subject will be ready for legislation. But now the discussion has taken another turn in the position which has been taken by hon. gentlemen from the maritime provinces. My hon. friend from Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler) has taken the position that the policy we have adopted is unfair to the maritime provinces, and that they are entitled to some compensation, because the territories which were acquired in 1869 in the Hudson Bay district were paid for by the Dominion of Canada, and that if we dispose of them, we should give some compensation to the maritime provinces. Well, the question is not new, it has been raised before, and it has received no solution such as the hon. gentleman now desires. Those territories were acquired in 1869, and in the year following, the parliament of Canada carved out of them a certain domain for the province of Manitoba. But no compensation was asked by the maritime provinces. Later on when we appropriated a certain portion of that domain for the new provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, we made the same disposition.

Mr. FOWLER. Would not the right hon. gentleman see a distinction between the carving out of this territory a new province and adding out of this territory to the provinces forming part of confederation when Nova Scotia and New Brunswick came in?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Does the hon. gentleman believe it makes any difference? The basis of our national life is a federative system. This country is covered by provinces, that is the idea which we have always had before us. That has been the case in the United States. The United States purchased territory from France, Louisiana and from other countries. Since that time her policy has been to turn those territories into states, forming now the American Union. This is the object we aim at. For my part, I regret that the climatic conditions are such in this new territory that it cannot be created into new provinces. I wish we could form a new province on the Hudson bay, I wish we could form a new province out of the Mackenzie river territory, I wish we could form a new province of Ungava. But while it is a wish I devoutly entertain, every man must see that such a thing is impossible. No man, I am sure, from the maritime provinces pretends that we could form new provinces out of that territory. If, then, that terri-

tory cannot be turned into new provinces, does it not seem to my hon. friend that the best way to deal with it is to annex it to the existing provinces? We must come to that conclusion. We cannot desire that at one end of this Dominion we should have provinces and at the other end a large unorganized territory. Is not that the goal to which we should aspire, that every inch of Canadian territory should ultimately be under provincial organization? That has been the policy of the United States, until to-day I think all their territory has been turned into states.

Mr. FOWLER. The Prime Minister refers to the United States. Is it not a fact that no portion of their territory was cut up into states until it had a population sufficient to warrant its erection into a state? The territory was not added to states already existing, but when it had a sufficient population it was created into a state.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The conditions in the United States were such as permitted that policy to be adopted. If we had the same conditions we would create more provinces. Oklahoma was the last state which has been introduced into the union. I believe they have no more territory to be turned into states. If our conditions were the same we would follow the same policy.

Mr. FOWLER. They have Alaska yet.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, and we have the Yukon, but I do not know that I would turn the Yukon into a province; I think I would rather annex it to the province of British Columbia. Moreover, I do not think that the climate and soil in the Yukon are such that we could make it into a province. At all events, that is my opinion. You cannot hope, with the territory you now have in your hands, to make it into new provinces; and if that is so, the policy should be to bring this territory under the supervision and jurisdiction of the provinces to which geogrannically it belongs. That is the view we take and the policy we are pursuing at the present time. Can anything be more reasonable than that the territory which to-day lies north of the province of Ontario should belong to Ontario? Is it not in the best interests of the country that Ontario should have the administration of that territory? And if that be so, the hon. gentleman will have no objection to this resolution going into effect. Now, with regard to representation——

Mr. FOWLER. Before the hon. gentleman leaves that part of his subject, I would like him to say a word as to compensation to the provinces.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I must say that, so far as I am concerned, I can see no force in that plea. The fathers of confederation, and those who sat here in 1870, when Manitoba was organized, saw no force in it. I do not believe, moreover, that this territory was added to our domain in order that it should be parcelled out among the other provinces which, at that time, formed the Canadian confederation. We must deal with the conditions as they exist. At the time of the federation of the older provinces, Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick retained their own provincial domain and control of their own public lands. That has been the policy ever since. When we came to form the prairie provinces the question of immigration became very important, and from 1870 to 1895 we followed the policy that this parliament should retain in its own hands the public lands in those provinces in order the better to pursue the policy of immigration. In respect to the older provinces, we had turned over to them control of the public lands which were added to their territory. The territory which is now wild and unsettled was annexed to the provinces from time to time; we annexed certain portions to Quebec, certain portions to Ontario and certain portions to Manitoba. But if that same policy were to prevail, and the northern portions of that country were to be annexed to Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, then I would unhesitatingly give them all that land, because the policy of immigration which we have in hand would not be prejudiced by such a course. Therefore, I cannot see the force of the objection of my hon. friend. But a more important question, a more practical question, is that of representation. However, I do not see any immediate danger in it. My hon. friend stated a moment ago that the maritime provinces had lost some of their representation in this House. But if that is so, and we all deplore it, it is not in consequence of anything that has been done by this parliament, it is not in consequence of any accretions to the territory of Quebec. If the maritime provinces have lost a portion of their representation it is in consequence of the development of the Northwest. If the Northwest had not been developed, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick would probably have the same representation here to-day that they had years ago. But although the maritime province men have good reason to deplore the changing conditions, their objection should not lie to this resolution, but they should consider the broader question whether, in view of the great development which is taking place in the Northwest, it would not be advisable to revise the basis upon which representation is established.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Allow me to ask the right hon. gentleman a question? Does he contend that the development of the Northwest reduces the actual representation of the maritime provinces?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the last census it prevented New Brunswick and Nova Scotia from preserving their previous representation.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I put this to my hon. friends from North Toronto and from Kings and Albert: If, at the last census, we had eliminated the whole of the population of Manitoba and the Northwest Territories, would not the diminution of the representation of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia have been less than it is to-day? I have not the figures under my hand, but I remember that the subject was closely considered by the Hon. Mr. Blair at that time, and he came to the conclusion that if the population of the Northwest had been eliminated altogether the representation of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick would have been larger than it is to-day. But I have simply to say this, as one of the representatives from Quebec: At the time of confederation Quebec was made the pivotal province, around which the representation of the whole Dominion revolved. But that gives no advantage to the province of Quebec, it is a matter of entire indifference to the province of Quebec. But, if it is to us a matter of total indifference and it is a matter not of indifference but of great interest to the maritime provinces, for my part, I would not be averse to selecting another mode of representation. On this matter I feel very strongly that we should not have any province harbouring the feeling that there had been an injustice done to it. The basis of representation adopted at the time of confederation was believed to be just and equitable and nothing could be more detrimental to confederation itself than the existence of such a belief, and if we are in a position to remedy that belief there is no reason why the question should not be tackled at the proper time. But, I would observe to the hon. member for Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler) that he has attached undue importance to the addition which is said to have been made in 1896 to the area of the province of Quebec and that he has attached undue importance to the extension which it is proposed to make to the province of Quebec to-day. My hon. friend knows that at the present time, in the added territory, there is not one voter. It may be that there will be some voters at the time of the next census. If it be true that the boundary of Quebec was the height of land, which is the opinion of the Minister of Justice, then probably it is quite certain that the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific will bring a population into that part of Quebec which will, to some extent, although not materially, affect the unit of representation. I do not think it will affect the next census. I do not think it is possible that it will do so, but in the future it may have some effect. But, in so far as Ungava is concerned, it will be many generations, I am afraid, before the population of Ungava will have to be taken into consideration when we have to determine what shall be the unit of representation in this House. I wish it were otherwise. I wish I could say to the House that I believe that there would be a large population in Ungava, and if there were to be a large population in Ungava I would have no hesitation in saying to my compatriots in Quebec: Do not hesitate to disarrange the basis of representation so as to give satisfaction to the other provinces. I do not think the amendment which has been moved is at all justified by the circumstances of the case. The contingency is too remote. I would say more; it is not advisable at this moment to burden this resolution with conditions. The conditions should be left altogether open. I call the attention of hon. gentlemen to these pregnant words in the resolution:

> That, upon the legislature of the province of Quebec consenting thereto, it is expedient to extend the boundaries of the said province upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed to by the said legislature and by parliament.

These words cover everything. They cover the very subject in hand. At the next session of parliament, if the government see fit to present a concrete resolution from the legislature of Quebec offering to take advantage of this resolution, and hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House say it is not sufficient, that they have the right to insist that some provision should be made for another basis of representation, then we can refuse our assent to the resolution of the Quebec legislature. As far as I can see it there is no necessity for inserting such an amendment as has been moved by the hon. member for Colchester.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.). Mr. Speaker, this is an important question, no doubt, and one to which the government has given some attention. Parliament has not had the opportunity of giving it the same amount of consideration and for my part, as a member of parliament from the maritime provinces, I would feel reluctant to vote for the resolution as it stands were it not for the fact that my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), and other members of the government have declared that when this matter comes again before parliament at a subsequent session we will be just as free to consider all the details as we are to-day, that we will be free to amend, accept or reject the whole of it, and details will be the question of the representation of the smaller provinces. The

suggestion was made by a member of the government, I think the Minister of Finance, that possibly an equitable arrangement, in so far as the representation of the smaller provinces is concerned, would be that the population of Quebec, for the purposes of representation, would be counted in accordance with the dimensions of the province at the time of confederation. That would be one way of preserving a reasonable representation for the maritime provinces, because there is an apprehension that in consequence of the enlargement of the area of the province of Quebec there is danger that our representation will be materially reduced. A provision of that kind might perhaps save it. I personally think that a provision of that kind would be somewhat complicated, and I would very much prefer that when this matter is under consideration we should take steps to have placed in our constitution a provision somewhat similar to that which is in the constitution of the Australian Commonwealth that there shall be a minimum representation from every province; either that or that a condition should be inserted that the representation from the maritime provinces would not fall below what it was at the time of confederation. I do not think that a provision of that kind in the constitution could possibly do any harm to any province or any individual in any province. I do not think that the larger provinces of the Dominion could object, and it would certainly satisfy the maritime provinces. The representation even under these circumstances would never be unduly large. I am satisfied that confederation would not have been possible if the men who arranged the basis of confederation had ever looked forward to the time when the representation of the smaller provinces would be so reduced that we would practically have no voice in the great council of the nation. But, as the statement has been made by my right hon. friend the leader of the government that the amendment moved by the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Stanfield) and seconded by the hon. member for Queens (Mr. McLean) is at the present stage unnecessary, and that we will be just as free in a subsequent session when this matter comes up for final consideration to consider all the details of the question and particularly the detail of representation as we are to-day, I do not see the necessity of inserting this amendment, and for these reasons I shall vote against it.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou). Mr. Speaker, I desire to say a word or two if the House will pardon me. Without going into a discussion at great length of the whole argument of the hon. member for Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler) I would like to say that I listened to him with a great deal of attention, but I fail to appreciate wherein he has given the House any logical or reasonable argument from a legal or constitutional standpoint that would convince any hon. gentleman that because the boundaries of any particular province may be increased therefore any right of compensation flows to any other members of confederation. It seems to me that the proposition of creating a new province is one which would give just the same rights to the older members of confederation as would an accretion to the boundaries of any of the existing provinces, and no one has ever asserted that in the former case any such right has arisen. I rise not so much for the purpose of discussing that point as to refer to the amendment which has been moved by the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Stanfield). I desire to say in reference to that point that the hon. member's amendment is entirely outside of any question that is involved in the resolution before the House. It is absolutely nugatory and can have no effect of any kind whatever. No amendment such as that which he proposes to be introduced into this resolution can be held either by the Dominion government or any of the provincial governments to be of any value or to limit their powers or to give to any of the provinces increased rights in regard to the matter of representation. The question of what the representation of the maritime provinces in this parliament shall be, cannot depend on any conference that may take place between the federal government and the provincial governments of Manitoba, Ontario and Quebec; it must depend upon legislation that may be subsequently passed by the imperial parliament. If as it is anticipated the result of this resolution will be to increase the area of Manitobe, Ontario and Quebec, then a condition will arise in the smaller provinces which this parliament would be bound to recognize and to ask the imperial parliament in view of the changed conditions to create increased representation for them.

Mr. CROCKET. The hon. gentleman contends that the representation of the provinces would depend altogether upon legislation of the imperial parliament, and that being so how does he justify the statement of the Prime Minister that when this legislation comes before the House it is to be passed upon terms and conditions agreed to by the provinces and by this parliament, and that these terms and conditions will cover representation as well as other matters, and hence there was no need of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Colchester.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I did not understand the Prime Minister to make any statement with regard to that. Of course the result of this conference may produce conditions under which this parliament may

be called upon to ask the imperial parliament to deal with the question of representation. But the hon. gentleman knows full well that any conference between these provinces and the Dominion cannot increase or lessen our representation in any degree.

Mr. CROCKET. I agree with the hon. gentleman, but he is in contradiction with the position taken by the Prime Minister who said that when this parliament dealt with the matter it could and would adjust the representation.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I did not so understand the right hon. gentleman and I am quite sure my hon. friend (Mr. Crocket) did not so understand him.

Mr. CROCKET. I certainly did so understand him.

Mr. LENNOX. So did we.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I am sorry my hon. friend takes that view, because I did not understand the right hon. gentlemen to make any such statement. There can be no doubt at all about the constitutional principle that the imperial parliament alone can increase the representation of any province in this Dominion, and no doubt the imperial parliament would act upon the request of the Dominion parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. But that is an entirely different matter from what we are now discussing, and every hon. gentleman must see that the amendment is entirely outside the point.

Mr. LENNOX. Not quite.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. My hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) knows very well that the representation of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island cannot be affected in the slightest degree by anything that the provincial governments of Manitoba, Ontario and Quebec may say, and that this parliament alone by address to the imperial parliament subsequently can deal with that question. Now as to the point that the representation of the maritime provinces has been affected prejudically by the increase of the electoral unit of the province of Quebec, I think hon. gentlemen will find that the decreased representation which came to the maritime provinces in 1901 did not come as a result of the increased unit of representation in Quebec, but as a result of the tremendous increase in population of western Canada. As a result of the readjustment which had to be made under section 51, subsection 4, a reduction of the representation of the maritime provinces was brought about chiefly because of the increased population of the west.

Mr. DANIEL. Is it not a fact that the increased unit of representation caused by the increase of population in Quebec was also a large factor in the loss of our representation?

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. As a matter of construction of the statute both these conditions must concur before representation can be decreased.

Mr. DANIEL. But you only referred to the increase of population in the west.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I was endeavouring to point out that the suggestion that the increase of the electoral unit in Quebec must necessarily decrease the population of other provinces, is not absolutely correct, because in addition to that you must have an abnormal increase in the population of western Canada so as to bring about a proportionate diminution of the population of the other provinces.

Mr. LEMIEUX. As a matter of fact the increased population of Quebec has taken place within the old boundaries of that province and not within the area of any territory which has been added to Quebec since confederation. My hon. friend from Beauharnois will corroborate that.

Mr. HAGGART. Every one knows that.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. The statement of the Postmaster General is absolutely correct. The population of the province of Quebec has increased and the electoral unit has increased but that is not due to increased territory; it is entirely due to natural causes.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. We must approach this question from the standpoint that the diminution of representation which took place in 1901 was not alone due to the increased population in the province of Quebec, but that there must also be considered in it the abnormal increase of the population of the west, which was a very potent factor. Now, if I correctly apprehend the decision given by the courts with reference to the proper interpretation of section 51 of the British North America Act it was, that the population of Canada for the purpose of the computation to be made under section 51 subsection 4 was to be deemed to be made up not merely of the population of the four original provinces, but also of the provinces which now constitute confederation, and in that computation there was not to be considered the population of the territories. The consequence is that by the addition of territory to the provinces of Manitoba and Ontario, in the next computation which takes place in 1911, the population of Canada, for the purposes of this computation, will be increased by the additional number of people who may be within the territory thus added to these provinces.

To that extent the representation of the smaller provinces will ultimately be affected. I think this House will be bound, in

all fairness, at that time to take into consideration this question and to ask that the imperial parliament should review the question of representation all over the country. But that is not a question which this conference can deal with. This parliament alone, when the Act founded on the deliberations of this conference is introduced, will have to deal with the question of representation, in the light of the changed conditions that will result from the increase of the territories of these three provinces. It does not appear to me that this amendment is at all appropriate when it asks 'that the extensions of boundaries provided for by this resolution should be accompanied by such conditions as would prevent such extensions prejudicially affecting the representation of any province in parliament.' I do not think that parliament at this time should be asked to come to any such conclusion, because nothing that can be done by that conference will affect the representation directly. It seems to me that all the rights of any province in this regard will be well protected by the resolution which I propose, because it deals with the conditions as they are, and parliament should keep itself in line with constitutional and legal principles. I therefore move in amendment to the amendment:

That under any legislation to be introduced to give effect to the foregoing resolution, nothing shall be done or provided to impair the representation of any province in this House.

I move that resolution because I submit that this House should give notice to the parliament that is afterwards to deal with the result of this conference, where we stand with regard to this question of diminution of representation; and we treat this question as it should be treated by recognizing the right of this parliament alone eventually to deal with this question. It seems to me also that we who come from the smaller provinces of the Dominion can fairly expect that when parliament comes to deal with this question and to legislate definitely and certainly upon it, parliament will recognize the changed condition resulting from the tremendous development of the Northwest, which was never foreseen by the fathers of confederation, and which necessarily affects this whole question of representation, and that the time will have arrived, in 1911, when we may fairly expect a complete review of this whole question of representation, with the result that after the next census justice in this respect will be given to the smaller provinces of the Dominion.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). Mr. Speaker, as one coming from the province of Ontario, I wish to say that while that province does not get, by the proposition before the House, all the territory which it thinks it ought to get, it will accept that territory and the responsibilities that go with it. The province of Ontario does not believe that we have to-day reached the ultimate bound of civilization towards the north. The province of Ontario has accepted the view that there is a great and rich country to the north, and, while other people are talking about it, the province of Ontario is to-day building a railway to Hudson bay, and we hope to see an Ontario port on Hudson bay. The province of Ontario accepts all these responsibilities, and hopes to build up a great new northern Ontario in the added territory. I would like to see the other provinces take the same view. I believe that the province of Manitoba now receives the advantage of the extension of its boundaries to Hudson bay, and that it will go ahead and develop the country that is occorded to it. As to the question of representation, I was glad to hear the Prime Minister say to-day, what I have long contended for in this House, that while the British North America Act is a solemn document, it is not so sanctified that it cannot be reviewed by this parliament; and if it can be shown that the smaller provinces have not the representation which they think they ought to have, I believe that parliament is big enough, I believe that my own province and all the other provinces are big enough, to revise the constitution of the country and give a fair representation to the smaller provinces. I agree with what has been said here to-day, that it would be proper and fair, and in the line of harmony, to provide that the representation of the maritime provinces in this House should not be less than it was originally at confederation. We are all surely big enough to take that view. As to the amendments before the House, I would like to see the amendment moved by the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Stansfield) accepted. It is simply an amplification of the proposal made by the government. If that view of it is taken, we shall have an expression that will represent the opinion of the whole House. The last amendment is on almost the same line; and if you can find a way to have a resolution that would meet all the interests in the House it would go a long way towards the settlement of this question. With regard to that northern country of ours, we do not know what is there; but the province of Ontario, in so far as it will exercise jurisdiction over it, will do whatever it can to develop it. Hudson bay, as has been said, is going to have much to do with the future development of this country. I hope that in a short time we shall have not only a railway from Ontario to Hudson bay, but one from the Northwest, and that the country lying south of Hudson bay will be developed and settled and the possibilities of mining, fishing and other industries in that country will be worked out and that these industries will be proved to be sources of wealth to the whole country. Again I would appeal to the House to see if there is not a way in

which the resolution can be made unanimous, and in that way meet the views of all sections of the country.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Mr. Speaker, the amendment to the amendment in its present form does not seem to be very relevant, as it is not prefaced by the necessary words to make it an amendment to the original resolution. However, that is a matter for the hon. gentleman who has moved it and His Honour, the Speaker. Might I ask if the government propose to accept the last amendment ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to say, in the first place, that I do not see the difference in meaning between the amendment proposed by my hon. friend from Colchester and the one proposed just now. The right hon. leader of the government told us distinctly in the course of his remarks that he could not accept the amendment of the hon. member for Colchester, because the resolution as it stands leaves the terms and conditions for future consideration and that it was not necessary or desirable to confine the terms of that resolution in any way.

Now when a similar resolution of exactly the same purport and meaning—so similar that it will be a question for the speaker whether it can be put as an amendment to the amendment—when the same thing, having exactly the same effect is proposed, my right hon. frind forgets his declaration and is quite ready to accept it. No doubt the only real reason is that the first amendment was moved by my hon. friend from Colchester (Mr. Stanfield) and the second has been moved by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald). If there is any other reason I would like to hear what it is. Let us look for a moment at the two amendments. The first is as follows:

That the proposed resolution be amended by adding thereto the following paragraph: Be it further resolved that the extension of the boundaries provided for by this resolution be accompanied by such conditions as will prevent such extension prejudicially affecting the representation of any province in parliament.

That amendment is harmful and cannot be accepted by the government. It confines the terms of the resolution, and the terms of the resolution should be left wide open for the future expression of parliament at any other session. Let us look at the other amendment which is acceptable:

That all the words in the said amendment be struck out and the following substituted: And under any legislation to be introduced to give effect to the foregoing, nothing shall be done or provided to impair the representation of any province in this House.

The difference between those two amendments is exactly the difference between tweedledum and tweedledee. The right hon. gentleman cannot accept tweedledum but he is perfectly willing to accept tweedledee.

As regards the observations of my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) touching the reduction of the representation of the province upon ascertaining the population in each province by a decennial census, it does not seem to me that he expresses the situation with absolute accuracy. What happens is this. In the first place the unit of population is ascertained by dividing the population of the province of Quebec by the number of its representatives, 65. In that way you obtain the unit of population. Then you proceed as follows. You apply that unit of representation to the population of every other province as ascertained by the same census. You may find that the representation of some province will be reduced by the application of the unit of representation. You do something more, not by way of reduction but by way of preventing the reduction of the representation of any such province. You take subsection 4:

On any such readjustment, the number of members for a province shall not be reduced unless the proportion which the number of the population of the province bore to the number of the aggregate population of Canada at the then last preceding readjustment of the number of members for the province is ascertained at the then latest census to be diminished by one-twentieth part or upwards.

So that subsection 4 is not a provision for the reduction of the representation of any province but a saféguard against such reduction. If it were not for that purpose, you would apply simply subsection 1 and there would be no need for subsection 4. But the proviso I have pointed out is a safeguard in certain cases against the reduction which would be brought about by the application of the unit of representation. It is idle to say that the reduction of representation in any province of Canada is brought about in the way that has been suggested. It must be brought about by the application of the unit of representation as ascertained in the province of Quebec; and this subsection 4 does not operate to further reduce but operates in certain cases to prevent any such reduction. That is my appreciation of its meaning and I think it is the correct one.

My right hon. friend the First Minister, in replying to some very brief observation which fell from me this morning, said that to leave unsettled the boundary question between Newfoundland and the province of Quebec or any part of Canada might lead to bad blood. I quite agree that it is proper to have that boundary line ascertained

by some tribunal with the approval of both parties. But he seems to think that that affected my suggestion of this morning. It does not affect it in any way. What I suggested was that inasmuch as we hope and believe that Newfoundland will at some future time be brought within the limits of confederation, it might be advisable, both from an administrative point of view and as an inducement to Newfoundland to enter confederation, that we should leave certain portions of that territory to become part of Newfoundland as a province of confederation and to be administered by the province of Newfoundland. My right hon. friend thought that would not be practicable because it might lead to dissatisfaction in Quebec. I do not see why it should. He has already suggested that if this area were habitable, if it were likely to sustain a large population, he would have been prepared to create it into a new province. Well, if the province of Quebec would be willing, as we may presume from his remarks, to have this territory created into a new province, is there any objection to have a portion only of that territory kept as an inducement to Newfoundland to enter confederation. If there be no dissatisfaction in the one case, I do not see why we should assume that there would be in the other. I looked at it merely from the standpoint of convenience and efficient administration and also from the other very desirable standpoint of our bringing Newfoundland some time within the bounds of confederation.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald).

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to have your decision, Mr. Speaker, as to whether or not there is any material difference between the two amendments—that of the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Stanfield) and that of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald)—which makes the last amendment in order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The amendment itself, proposed in the first instance, does not seem to stipulate in what manner the preventing of any reduction in the representation of any province, consequent upon the enlargement of the boundaries of any other province, should be arranged for. It is a little indefinite in that respect. Whereas the amendment specifically states that this shall be provided against in the legislation introduced to extend the boundaries. It is a rather fine point but I am not prepared to rule that the amendment to the amendment is out of order.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You will find that the resolution itself calling for an extension of the boundaries is the foundation for legislation, and consequently the amendment of the hon. member for Colchester, which provides that such extension be accompanied by such conditions as would prevent it prejudicially affecting the representation of any province in parliament, is about as definite as anyone could possibly desire.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I desire to suggest a verbal amendment—in the third paragraph of the resolution, to insert the words 'of Manitoba' between 'boundary' and 'as,' making it read 'the eastern boundary to be the present eastern boundary of Manitoba,' and so on.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

DOMINION GUARANTEE COMPANY.

Mr. R. A. PRINGLE moved:

That that part of rule 102 relative to the posting of private Bills and also rule 88 relative to fees be suspended in connection with Bill (No. 211) to amend the Act of the present session intituled an Act respecting the Dominion Guarantee Company, Limited.

He said: This new Bill is, in effect, an amendment of the Bill passed this session, but under the circumstances, it is necessary to follow in the form of having a new Bill.

Motion agreed to.

THE GEORGIAN BAY CANAL.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). Before the government orders are proceeded with, may I ask the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) if we could have printed copies of the Georgian Bay ship canal report. I understand that the report is in manuscript. If it could be printed it would be very useful. I need not tell the hon. minister that not merely members of parliament but many people outside desire to see this report.

Mr. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). As the report contains quite a large number of maps, it is desirable to print these with the report, and it will take from six weeks to two months before these can be completed. I have an additional typewritten copy of the report which I shall be glad to lay on the table so that hon. members desiring to see it may have an opportunity to do so before the House rises.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. But the minister does intend to print the report?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. But it will take six weeks to print the maps.

Mr. LANCASTER. Could not the report be sent out first and the maps afterwards?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think it would be better to keep them together.

Mr. BERGERON. Will they be sent to members during the recess ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, I will give instructions to that effect.

CANADIAN ASSOCIATED PRESS.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 201) to assist in maintaining an independent and efficient service of telegraphic news from Great Britain for publication in the Canadian press. He said : The object of this Bill is to extend for a period of two years the subsidy granted to the Canadian Associated Press. Perhaps that is, technically, not exactly the situation. The subsidy was allowed on a sliding scale for five years, aggregating $60,000, and thus averaging $12,000 a year. The promoters of the enterprise applied for a renewal of the subsidy on the basis of $12,000 a year for five years, an equal sum to that given before, but under a different arrangement. After consideration we thought that all would be done that was necessary for the moment if we assured the promoters of the enterprise of the continuance of the subsidy of $12,000 a year for two years. During that time, it may be that some other arrangement will be made, which, perhaps, will give more general satisfaction. I think that, on the whole, the service rendered has been regarded as satisfactory, though it has not been above criticism. However, after considering it, we have asked parliament to grant this for two years.

Mr. FOSTER. What has been done ?

Mr. FIELDING. I can tell my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) what has been paid, but that is about all I can tell him. The results of the expenditure are seen in the press day by day.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the minister no report on the subject ?

Mr. FIELDING. I have a communication from the president of the Canadian Associated Press, Mr. J. Ross Robertson, which, if my hon. friend wishes, I will read. When the deputation came to me and asked a renewal of the subsidy, I asked them to put in writing a statement of their views. I received, in response, this letter. It was marked 'Personal,' but I do not think it was intended to be other than a public letter :

Toronto February 18, 1908.

Hon. W. S. Fielding,
Minister of Finance
Parliament Buildings,
Ottawa, Canada.

Dear Sir,—In accordance with your request made at the conclusion of the interview on Friday last with the deputation from the Canadian Associated Press, I beg to transmit to you in writing, the facts and figures then presented. In placing the matter before you I said :—

This deputation as you are aware is here with the object of discussing the future of the Canadian Associated Press and its relation with the government under the agreement entered into five years ago—which agreement expires at the end of next June.

The agreement was in brief that the government pay towards the expenditure of the Canadian Associated Press, for the years 1904-5-6, a sum not exceeding $15,000 a year ; for 1907 a sum not exceeding $10,000 a year and for year ending June, 1908, a sum not exceeding $5,000.

At the outset, I just want to refer for a moment to the past work of the Canadian Associated Press.

The work that the association has done during the four and a half years of its operation, has been most satisfactory to the membership, and I believe, meets with the approval of the government.

When the association was formed, it was settled at its first meeting that its purpose was to handle all Canadian news originating in Great Britain or the continent of Europe—and this class of news only. But, when the London office of the association had been in running operation for some months, on special occasions, other news of interest to Canadians was made part of the service with results that met with not only the entire approval and satisfaction of the members of the association, but elicited from newspapers not in the association, most favourable comment.

Among this class of news referred to, was news from Australia and New Zealand, that affected Canada—especially in matters concerning tariffs, which was particularly of value to Canadian manufacturers.

Then the British parliamentary election results were collected by our agents and cabled to the association. These were the only detailed returns of the elections sent to this continent by cable, for the American associated press only handled results in prominent constituencies, and generally only gave a meagre service.

It will also be remembered that the proceedings of the Colonial Conference in 1907 were very fully reported, for the Canadian Associated Press was favoured with exceptional advantages which enabled it to cover this event better than any other news service that uses the cables.

It is worth noting that the fulness of the British election reports and the Colonial Conference service by the association, was most favourably commented on by some of the leading British newspapers, and by Canadian correspondents of British newspapers resident in Canada.

The way that the Canadian Associated Press covered the British elections was a recognition of the fact that this country has national and imperial news interests that are not served by the American Associated Press.

It is a pleasure to know that members of the government at Ottawa also expressed their satisfaction with the manner in which both of these events were handled by the London office of the association.

It was particularly gratifying to hear citizens of Montreal and Quebec, speak in commendatory terms of the interesting cables con-

cerning the sad death of the late Hon. Raymond Prefontaine in Paris—an event which was followed with a closeness commensurate with its interest to a large section of the Canadian people.

The proceedings of the Alaska Commission were also fully reported by our service. It was a satisfaction to note that our reports on all these three events were wired from Toronto to leading American journals that had not been favoured by the American service, with such full reports. I think that the Alaskan Boundary report showed the enormous national value of having the views of Canada's representatives in London fairly and adequately reported to their constituents at home.

The immense sporting constituency of the Canadian press has also been well served, for every sporting event of importance, including results of every principal race run in Great Britain and of leading athletic sports, especially football games, are cabled as they occur. In fact, every sporting event of moment in Great Britain is promptly covered. Not only were there events in Great Britain covered, but also reports of sporting events in Australia in which Canadians were interested by reason of Canadian competitors taking part.

The satisfactory manner in which the London manager of the Canadian Associated Press handled the mission of the hon. Rodolph Lemieux to Japan deserves special mention. It was thought by some members of the press that this event should have been covered direct from Tokio, but to do so would have involved an expenditure of not less than $2,000. It would have involved the expense of a special agent and cables would have cost at the press rate, forty-seven cents a word—we covered the assignment from London by careful selection and compilation of the ample cable reports of the London daily press, at the cost of Atlantic cabling which did not amount to over three cents a word delivered in Canada to each paper of the association. These reports were very satisfactory.

Then our cattle and market reports are a new and important feature added to our service. We had great difficulty at first in getting satisfactory reports. Our London manager, however, personally interviewed the leading cattle firms in Great Britain and Ireland, with the result that the association receives reports from two of the leading cattle firms free of all cost for the information, and at a cost only of the cabling to Canada.

The cattle dealers of Canada have expressed their great satisfaction with the accurate and ample reports that are so forwarded. These reports also permit the farmers to know exactly where they are at in relation to the old country quotations that are the basis of the export price for cattle.

Our cable service also supplies the cheese quotations which are of vital interest to the Quebec and eastern Ontario cheese producers.

Our service is now confined to twelve papers in Toronto, Montreal and Ottawa. Two papers in Winnipeg that were members had to withdraw some months ago owing to increased rates imposed for general news service by the Canadian Pacific Railway. These papers were perfectly satisfied with our service, but the large increase in the price of their general telegraph service compelled them to withdraw. This withdrawal is, I understand, only temporary and in the near future, the service will be renewed under an arrangement that will give all the daily papers west of Winnipeg to the coast the opportunity of receiving through the Western Associated Press the service at a much lower rate than the Canadian Associated Press could forward it direct.

I understand they have now come in.

I desire to also call your special attention to the fact that all the cables received by the Canadian Associated Press after publication in the papers of the association are either wired to daily papers not in the Canadian Associated Press or are sent as plate matter to hundreds of daily and weekly papers published in Canada, so that the Canadian Associated Press reaches all the people of Canada by indirectly serving tens of thousands of readers who do not see copies of the papers that belong to the Canadian Associated Press. This feature has been impressed on me by the reading of our cables in scores of provincial weeklies and in the dailies of the smaller towns that are not of our membership.

Now, Sir, I have tried to cover in summarized form all the points which I think clearly show that the Canadian Associated Press has made good in its efforts to carry out the purpose for which it was organized.

Under the present agreement, the limit of the amount to be paid by the government was $60,000. But the amount earned by the service only involves the sum of about $50,000.

The association suggests that the same amount be granted, but that instead of $15,000 for three years and $10,000 and $5,000 respectively for two years, the limit be $60,000 for five years, payable at the rate of $12,000 a year—or whatever portion of that amount is earned by the association. It is, of course, to be borne in mind that the members of the association have expended an amount equal to that paid by the government.

Permit me to state that the work of the association has been carried on with a close regard to thorough business principles and that our expenditure has been most carefully guarded. We have endeavoured to get the best possible value for the money we expend and we have tried to serve the country in our association so as to give a comprehensive, prompt and efficient service.

You will, as an old newspaper man, recognize the difficulties that have to be faced by any man who undertakes to manage such a service as ours. It is a difficult matter sometimes to please everybody, and it is a pleasure to know that some who were inclined to criticise us in the beginnings of our work have now nothing but good words for the efficient manner in which our news service has been conducted.

It is for the government to decide whether the public end it tried to promote by the original terms of the agreement with the Canadian Associated Press has been served.

If so, the Canadian Associated Press is willing to continue and extend its work somewhat on the lines of the present agreement. If not the Canadian Associated Press will have to continue its work on other lines. I do not doubt that the minister is as familiar with

the good points of the Canadian Associated Press service as I am.

We have now come to a point where we must be governed by your decision as to the lines on which we are to work in the future. If you favour the principle of co-operation between the government and the press of the country in the supply of old country news concerning Canada, the association is prepared to do its utmost to extend its membership and if possible add to the service which will make it even more acceptable and useful than it is at the present time to the people of the Dominion.

I think the foregoing covers all the points that I spoke of at the interview.

Yours truly,
J. ROSS ROBERTSON,
President.

This contains as full and comprehensive a statement of the work of the association, and the manner in which it is performed, as we could hope to have. I am aware there has been some criticism. I have been disposed to be lenient in my judgment of the service, because I know from my own experience that it is not always easy for a journalist to get information which seems to some persons to be important. It takes all sorts of people to make up the newspaper world, and many of the items which are cabled by the Associated Press will perhaps be regarded by some as of not great importance, and what one reader would regard as of particular importance is regarded of much less value by another reader. Making allowance for that, I think the service on the whole has been useful, and for the present at all events we are disposed to give them a helping hand to the extent of this appropriation for the two years.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to ask the minister two questions. What newspapers constitute the association? I believe the number is twelve, but which are the newspapers? In the second place, as this has now been going on for five years, has the membership been decreasing or increasing? Another question is, What is meant by the expenditure of dollar for dollar, and what do the government take in as items of dollar for dollar, and how do they get at those items?

Mr. FIELDING. With regard to the first question as to the names of the papers, I think they are chiefly papers of Montreal and Toronto. I find the memorandum furnished me does not give me the names, but probably it is only those papers in large communities which can afford to become partners in the enterprise, and the less important papers have to take the news from them. I think I may say that it is the papers of Montreal and Toronto chiefly, although I believe at one time some other papers were included. As to the other question, it was understood, and we accepted the statements of the president of the association in the matter—I do not think we require anything but their own certificate—that they must satisfy us that the cable service they are receiving costs them twice the amount, that is to say that we divide the dollar equally in helping them to pay the cost of the cable, on the principle of helping the man who helps himself. If they pay a dollar, and they must show us that they have done so, we give them another dollar for their news.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the object of helping the association?

Mr. FIELDING. We will discuss that in committee.

Mr. BERGERON. It is on the principle that I ask the question. I have great respect for Mr. Robertson, who is a very prominent newspaper man. It looks as if we were financially helping a few gentlemen to the detriment of a great many other newspapers. I understand there are some newspapers which do not belong to the association and they are prepared to get their despatches in a different way. We are voting money to the detriment of those gentlemen who do not belong to the association. I have heard a great many criticisms of the reports which have been sent to Canada since we have been paying this money. There are despatches that may interest some people but other things are looked for and a great many people are dissatisfied. I will mention an instance which comes to my mind and which occurred last July. It was about three days before we could procure any news about the Bisley team and the report with regard to the shooting for the Kolapore cup was sent in such a mixed up way that nobody could make anything out of it. It seems to me that the government should have nothing to do with this matter. I do not see why we should pay money out for this purpose. Another consideration is that this system may be unfair to the opposition in the House. These newspapers may be prompted to publish despatches in such a way as to favour the government. I do not understand why a government which is so much opposed to protection should go out of its way to spend money to help gentlemen who can perfectly well take care of themselves. The principle is bad.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I understand that there are twelve subscribers and that there is only one subscriber west of Ontario—that is in Winnipeg—and none east of Quebec. I think that if this $12,000 is to be paid the government might make some effort to bring other newspapers into this association.

Mr. FIELDING. How?

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. They should devise some scheme. Twelve newspapers receive this bounty of $12,000. Every one of these papers is rich, and I think that the government should see that the eastern and

western papers should get some benefit from the voting of this large sum of money.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the minister if he can give the House any information as to how this is operated in London. Have they correspondents all over the world, or all through the empire, and do these correspondents give their news direct or is there one man in London who culls the papers and gives what he thinks is best for Canada? I would like to ask also whether there has been any offer from other agencies, or from any agency, which has correspondents all over the empire looking to the giving of further correspondence, telegraphic and otherwise, from the seat of each event, gathering it, and putting it into the news columns of this association? I have heard some very strong criticisms in reference to this service. The service does not appear to have met with public approval. I do not know what the reason is. Is it that they have one or two persons in London and that we are dependent entirely upon that sort of culling of the general news of the world?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think that the Canadian Associated Press pretend to keep correspondents all over the world. They have one or two correspondents in London who have, I believe, access to the sources of news there. As to just what those sources are I am not clear; at all events, they are able to send very correctly all the news which they believe it is suitable to send, some of which, I admit, has been the subject of criticism. My hon. friend asks whether any proposition has been made by any other body. I have not had presented to me any proposition in the form of a written document, but I have had communications with representatives of the famous Reuter agency whose service is world-wide, suggesting that perhaps they could give a service which would be as good as or beter than that which is being given. My answer was that that was a matter which the government could not undertake to control and that we did not propose to organize such a service.

Mr. BERGERON. We pay.

Mr. FIELDING. We pay but we do not want to have anything to do with the management of it. My hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) suggests that the service might probably be too favourable to the government. I have taken the position that the government should have nothing to do with the management of it. When people have written to me complaining of the nature of the telegrams which have been sent and suggesting that the government should do this, that or the other thing, my answer has been that the government did not undertake to dictate to this service. All we do is to help the Canadian press to get this service. We have been given to understand that they desire this service, but if they do not want it we do not desire to dictate to them or to interfere with its management. We do not desire to say what shall be the nature of this service, and least of all would we say how it should deal with any matter affecting the government.

Mr. BERGERON. Last April, when the bond issue of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway was being put on the money market, that same association telegraphed over here that the whole issue had been subscribed, when as a matter of fact only eighty per cent had been taken up.

Mr. FIELDING. I presume that my hon. friend must have some reason for making that statement or he would not make it. But we will not assume any responsibility for what may be cabled to Canada. We say to the leading journalists of Canada that we would like to help them to get a better service, and if they will form their own organization, select their correspondents, adopt their own regulations and make their own arrangements, we are content that they should do so, but we do not want to have anything to do with the management. Whether they send news favourable or adverse to the government is a matter entirely for them to say. The gentlemen who are connected with the concern in London are not known to have any undue regard for the government, but I would not suggest that they have in any way acted unfairly. My hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. A. A. McLean) says that this does not do any good to the papers of the west or the east. We cannot insist on the papers in the west or the east coming into this association. It costs money to come into this association. Newspapers have to pay out their own good money to come in. They have to pay the tolls, and if a paper at Charlottetown, Halifax or St. John is not willing to pay the tolls we cannot say to the members of the association that news must be supplied to these papers for nothing. The few papers which do remain in the association have to assume a very serious financial burden. If there were any discrimination, if there were any wrong done to a paper at Charlottetown, Winnipeg or anywhere else, we would not permit it, but in view of the fact that the service is open to them upon the same terms as to other papers in the Dominion of Canada, I think that is all we can ask. As to the general purpose of the service I am satisfied that it is a good one. Everybody must admit that the news which we got from the mother country and the European news generally, but particularly that which came from Great Britain, and which came

to the American Associated Press, was prepared for American readers and was coloured with the bias that too often enters into the minds of American correspondents. When the press of Canada had to rely for their news upon sources of that character, what wonder was it that we occasionally received very curious accounts of what was going on over there with regard to matters with which we ourselves were concerned. There were only two papers in Canada which were in a position to have reports of their own. The Toronto 'Globe' and the Montreal 'Star,' if I remember rightly, were the only two papers which had a regular cable service of their own. I suppose that if they consulted their own individual interests they would have preferred that this arrangement should not have been made, because they were, you might say, in the position of monopolists. They were rich, so to speak, and could afford a service. But, that was not sufficient. We wanted the press generally to have the news of the motherland and we wanted a service which would not be tainted by the anti-British feeling which we found characterizing the news which came to us from time to time by way of the United States. I think that that purpose has to a measurable extent been fairly well accomplished. Under this arrangement we have received, I think, a larger volume of English news of interest to Canada than we have ever received befor. The worst that can be said of the service is that occasionally there is an item which does not seem important enough to cable. I have heard men say: What rubbish that is to pay sixpence a word for, but while it was rubbish to one man there were probably some other man, or more likely some women who were deeply interested in that class of news. I do not think the service is perfect. There is some room for criticism, but I think the gentlemen connected with it have honestly endeavoured to give a fair and impartial service, and I am rather disposed to give them a good word and to hope they will do better in the future if they can.

Mr. W. F. McLEAN (South York). The association is absolutely non-political and non-partisan, and the papers connected with it are of both political parties. They have two men in London who have access to the sources of news, who get early copies of all the London papers and have access to the despatches of some of the news bureaus, so that a good and early service is obtained at a comparatively small cost. The news that has been sent here has been of a Canadian character. It was a matter of regret that previous to the establishment of this association the Canadian papers got most of their news through the American association. That news was often anti-British and anti-Canadian and especially intended for consumption in the American market. An arrangement was made the other day by which a new association in the west becomes connected with this association, and it will get the news. It is true that newspapers who desire to take the news must pay a portion of the cost, but they have to pay for other news, and why not pay for this?

Mr. FOSTER. Do they get a decreased rate?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. There has been a rate made so that most of the western papers can come in. It is hoped that arrangements will be made to take eastern papers in if they cannot stand the present tolls.

Mr. BERGERON. What are the tolls?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Ten cents per word for the cables, and each paper must pay a portion of the land tolls on this side. The market reports supplied by this service are of great interest and importance to those interested in different lines of commerce. There have been mistakes in the service, but that same remark would be true of all such services. The service is a good service; it is a Canadian service; it will be improved. The funds are very carefully administered, the collections are made every month and the newspapers pay dollar for dollar with the government. There is no politics in the association. We hope soon to have it on such a basis that it will be able to take care of itself. If we wish to improve our connection with the old country, if we wish to be more in touch with the mother land, nothing can so much conduce to that end as the establishment of cable lines owned by the governments of Great Britain and Canada, and I throw out this as a hint to the government. One of the postal reformers in England stated the other day that he sees a penny-a-word cable service in sight. I trust that may come, but it can only come by co-operation between the governments. The greatest monopoly in the world to-day is the cable monopoly, which has its headquarters in London, and they have been able to maintain exorbitant cable tolls.

Mr. BERGERON. What about the Marconi system?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I had hoped that by this time the Marconi system would have made good, and I believe that some of our news despatches have come by Marconi. It is true that some of the news bureaus in London, which are also great monopolies, have tried to break down the Canadian Press Association by offering to take charge of the collection and distribution of Canadian news. But no matter how well conducted a news bureau in London may be, our contention is that it is better

that the Canadian press should make its own selection of the news to be cabled here. I may point out that in connection with the recent elections in England and in connection with the great sporting events we have had a first-class service. The rifle contests at Bisley are also well reported, and if we pay money out of the national treasury to send our volunteers to Bisley we might certainly pay a little to obtain the news of their achievements. The Olympic games are now going on in London and we have made arrangements to get early news of the results. I trust that the cable will be able to announce the success of the Canadian competitors.

Mr. BERGERON. Who are the gentlemen who represent the Canadian press in London?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. There are two of them, but their names I do not remember, although I saw them the other day. I believe they are Canadian newspaper men who have gone to England for that purpose.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I agree with the Minister of Finance that it would be impossible for the government to attempt any censorship of the news which is sent by the association to this country. I suppose the only reasonable way to look at it would be to consider what the news was which came to the Canadian press before this service was instituted and what it would be at present without that service. I am not familiar enough with the subject to venture any opinion as to whether the changes in that respect are so marked as to make it worth while for parliament to continue the grant. I have no doubt the government has considered the subject, and if they believe it to be of sufficient importance I would not be disposed to oppose the grant. I agree entirely as to the very great importance of our having news from the motherland of a distinctive character and not coloured with anything that would be more appropriate for another nation than ours. There has been a good deal of complaint of that in the past, and I think it was that very complaint that led the government to propose to parliament a vote for this service in the first instance. Some complaints have been addressed to me with regard to the character of the news very much along the line mentioned by the Minister of Finance. It was urged that the news was sometimes of an exceedingly trivial character and of little interest to the country generally. I do not think the government can deal very well with that except by submitting the whole subject to the consideration of parliament. It would be very desirable if the area over which this news were spread by the press of the country could be broadened; at the present time it seems to be very much restricted. As my hon. friend from South York suggests, if more newspapers could be induced to take the news the average cost to the newspapers of the country would be very much reduced, and the project would commend itself more to parliament than it otherwise can. I realize, of course, that that is not within the control of the government; but the government might at least urge upon the members of the association that steps should be taken in that direction. In fact, if it were necessary to alter the conditions of the grant a little in order to widen the area, I think that would be a wise course.

Mr. LENNOX. I have nothing to say in the way of fault-finding in connection with this matter. It is a little difficult to control the character of the news. It is exceedingly important however, that we should have early advice of certain matters transpiring not only in Great Britain but in other parts of the world—financial, industrial and commercial news. One suggestion I would like to impress upon the minister as to which he can probably do something. He has said that the news sometimes appears to be trivial. It is undoubtedly so at times, and what I think should be impressed on those furnishing the news is this, that Canada can only afford to pay for news that is industrially, commercially or nationally important. For instance, we could not very well justify paying very much money for social news, but we can justify paying money for anything that will advance the interests of the great producing classes in Canada, such as the manufacturers and the agriculturists.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Mr. BERGERON. Has my hon. friend ever received any remarks from the French newspapers of Canada in reference to this service? I know that some of the large French newspapers have complained very much about this service because the news all comes in English, even the news from France, and not only have they the trouble of translating it, but the news is so much changed that it is inaccurate. The hon. minister says that since this service was inaugurated we have had no anti-British news. That may be true; I hope it is; but we have a great deal of news, from England, from Rome, and particularly from France, that is anti-Catholic and completely erroneous, as we afterwards learn from the European papers. For these reasons, I think this is a venture that we should not have entered into.

Mr. FIELDING. I have no recollection of having received any protest from the French press on the subject, and certainly I have never received any protest from any source on the ground that the news was

offensive to the religion of our Roman Catholic brethern. I once received a personal letter from a gentleman connected with the French press to the effect that such a service was not any good to them ; but for the reason that it was a private letter, I did not feel at liberty to send it to any person in charge of the service. This service is in the hands of the press irrespective of politics, and any criticisms of its character should be communicated to the gentlemen who have charge of it. If it commends itself to the press generally, and I think it does, we are only too happy to subsidise it. But we have nothing to do with the character of the despatches.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not mean to say that there was anything injurious in the news ; but we got news which was not true, and it was only by reading the newspapers that we received eight or ten days afterwards that we found that it was not true. This showed that the service was not properly controlled. How did the newspapers get the news before we subsidised this service ?

Mr. FIELDING. They got it through the American Associated Press. The rich American papers controlled the whole business, appointed the correspondents and fixed the tolls, and our papers were furnished at low rates, with so much of the news as they chose to take. The news was very often coloured with anti-British feeling, to put it mildly. There were only two papers in Canada, the Toronto 'Globe' and the Montreal 'Star, which had their own cable news from England.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would like to call the attention of my hon. friend to the statement he made a moment ago concerning the character of certain news which is to be found in our French newspapers. Does he say that that news comes from the associated press?

Mr. BERGERON. I have been told so.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sure it does not. It does not come from London at all but comes direct or through the American associated press.

Mr. BERGERON. I was told the contrary, and was told that by these gentlemen that they were not only paying their share for this press service but paying it for news which was contrary to the truth.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. If there is any religious news of interest to the Canadian people, such as news from Rome regarding the appointments of bishops and other ecclesiastical matters of interest, and if any one in Rome will give that news to the Canadian press, our newspapers would be only too glad to disseminate it.

Mr. LEMIEUX. As a reader of the press and as having been a member of the Press Association, I am somewhat interested in newspaper affairs and follow very closely the despatches sent by the correspondent in London, Mr. Robertson, the brother of Mr. John Ross Robertson, of Toronto. From my personal knowledge, I can assure my hon. friend that he never, to my recollection sent anything which could be found objectionable by any race or creed. As regards news which appears sometimes in our press and to which objection may be taken, my attention was called by one of the highest dignitaries of the church in the province of Quebec to some items which appeared in a newspaper with which I am somewhat connected.

Mr. BERGERON. The 'Nationaliste' ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, nor 'L'Action Sociale.' I refer to 'Le Canada' of which I am vice-president. This dignitary pointed out that the item in question had not been taken from the British press nor had it come through any service we have in England, but was taken from newspapers published on the continent, which are opposed to the Catholic church. My hon. friend has never been on the staff of a newspaper or he would know that the scissors play a large part in the editorial room.

Mr. BERGERON. But we do not pay for that news.

Mr. LEMIEUX. But the public do. I am sure my hon. friend has no intention of injuring Mr. Robertson or making any insinuations against him. Mr. Robertson we know to be a fair minded man who would not lower himself by publishing anything disparaging to any religion.

Mr. BERGERON. I did not know who was responsible and I do not know Mr. Robertson, and am not making any charge or implying anything against him. All I say is that a lot of trash is sent across and published in our papers, which our papers would not publish if they had to pay the full rates and were not aided by this government subsidy.

Mr. FOSTER. I am told that the Reuters Press Agency is the most complete in the world, and that they made a proposition to put the whole of their world news at the disposal of the Canadian Press Association and allow that association to select their own editor so as to insure the sending of news that would be of use to Canada. In that way we would get a broader and a better service than we get now. Has the Finance Minister had any such proposition made to him?

Mr. FIELDING. A gentleman connected with the Reuters discussed the subject with me, but I do not think any proposal was ever made in writing. My suggestion was that he should consult the representatives of the press here and see whether they were

prepared to make any arrangement with him to replace the present one. I did not feel that I was in a position to make any arrangement with Reuters.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not suggest that, but when the government is paying out $60,000 in five years, is it not interested in finding out whether we could not have an improved service ? The service is not satisfactory at present although it is better than the old United States associated service. But it is not as good as we ought to have now.

Mr. FIELDING. In these things, it seems to me, the interests of the newspapers are much greater than those of the government. Of course, as representing the public, we are interested, to the extent of the subsidy, in having a good service. But the newspapers have even a deeper interest ; and besides they know the best kind of news and they know the best way to get it. If Reuters was the best source of supply, we could trust the newspapers, in their desire to get the best service, to make whatever arrangement might be most advisable. I thought I was doing right in saying to the representative of Reuter's : See these newspaper gentlemen ; we are anxious only to subsidize the best service, and the newspapers are the best judges of what is the best service. That is why it seems to me I was right in referring the matter to them.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

At six oclock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PROHIBITION OF OPIUM.

Bill (No. 205) to prohibit the importation, manufacture and sale of opium for other than medical purposes, read the second time, considered in committee, read the third time and passed.

THE CANADA SHIPPING ACT.

Bill (No. 183) to amend the Canada Shipping Act read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Mr. BRODEUR. This section is to take the place of section 4 of the Canadian Shipping Act. By section 4 it was provided that nothing in that section concerning the registration of ships should apply to ships belonging to His Majesty. In 1906 the imperial parliament passed an Act by which ships belonging to His Majesty should be registered. It did not make provision with regard to ships belonging to His Majesty in the colonies, but it reserved that power for the colonies themselves to exercise.

On section 2,

Mr. BRODEUR. The object of this amendment is to prevent the multiplication of the same name for ships. There was no provision in the law to the effect that when a ship was registered the name should be submitted to the department to find out whether it should be used. The result has been that a good many ships are bearing the same name. We find now, especially in sailing vessels, that there are not less than fifteen or twenty ships in one case bearing the same name. The imperial parliament passed a law last year by which the duplication of names should be avoided, by compelling people seeking for registration to send the name of their ship to the government. We are adopting absolutely the same legislation as was adopted by the English parliament.

On section 3,

Mr. BRODEUR. Sections 74 and 75 of the Shipping Act provide that in order to be admitted to examination a man must be a British subject, or domiciled in Canada for three years. It amounts to about the same thing, because when a man has been previously domiciled in Canada it is supposed that he takes out his naturalization papers. But it has been found that no such provision exists in the United States, and they simply confine the application to pass an examination to persons who are American citizens. This Bill is for the purpose of giving to the Governor in Council or to parliament the right to prohibit any citizen of a country which does not give us the same privilege as we are giving to it, the right to refuse such citizen to be admitted to pass the examination. My hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) wanted to make some remarks on this clause and we might therefore let it stand.

Section allowed to stand.

On section 4—certified officers.

Mr. DANIEL. What does that mean ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The sections which are mentioned before section 98 have reference to British ships which, not being registered in Canada, were not obliged to take certificated officers when they left our ports. A Bill was introduced by my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Maclean) some time ago dealing with the same question. The matter was dealt with by a special committee and as a result of the work of that committee a report has been made at variance with the section which is now proposed. In view of that I do not want to press this section, but I am willing to accept the report of the committee which has given the matter full consideration. We will strike out this section, and propose later

on the amendments which have been accepted by the committee.

Section withdrawn.

On section 5—certified officers.

Mr. BRODEUR. The object of this section, I think, will commend itself to all the members of this House. It is to provide that gasolene launches and gasolene boats of a small tonnage will not be obliged to take on certificated officers. This is done to meet a situation which exists on the St. Lawrence. It will be well known by the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) and also by my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) that American launches are carrying passengers and doing work on the St. Lawrence without being obliged to employ certificated officers, while our laws provide that Canadian launches are obliged to employ certificated officers. It was found that this legislation was affecting our citizens and it was thought advisable to provide that small gasolene launches of less than five tons gross tonnage should not be obliged to employ certificated officers.

Mr. J. D. REID. How does our Canadian law now compare with the American law as far as gasolene launches are concerned? I was around the Thousand Islands a short time ago and I was told our Canadian laws are much stricter than the American laws.

Mr. BRODEUR. Precisely; this clause is proposed to meet the situation which my hon. friend has just mentioned.

Mr. J. D. REID. I would like to see the same laws in force in both American and Canadian waters. There is so much traffic between the different points on the St. Lawrence that if you have different laws you will have trouble arising all the time. On the other side, as far as lights and signals are concerned, the laws are very good. I do not know what the laws are here, but I believe they should be practically the same on both sides of the river.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is the nature of the proposition.

Mr. J. D. REID. That is all I want.

On section 6—going to sea without certificate.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to correct an error which has occurred in the revised statutes. It is to restore practically what was in existence before the revision of the statutes and which perhaps is the law today, but in order to avoid any misunderstanding we thought it better to have this special clause put in the Act.

On section 7—offences.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to be struck out also, because it deals with the offences which were mentioned in section 4, which section was struck out. When we come to incorporate in the Bill the Bill which has been submitted to this House by the special committee appointed for that purpose this section will be of no use.

Section withdrawn.

On section 8—fees on engagement or discharge of seamen.

Mr. J. D. REID. Do these shipping masters receive a salary from the government?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, they are paid by fees. Some years ago there was a great deal of agitation in British Columbia concerning this matter. A law was passed by which it was provided that a shipping master should have the right to make a formal agreement with vessel owners enabling him to charge $10 for the hiring of men. They framed the statute in such a way that when there is no agreement, if a seaman comes and hires himself before the shipping master, the shipping master is not entitled to anything. The law was so framed that the shipping master would be deprived of his fees if there were no formal agreement.

Mr. DANIEL. Are these fees taken out of the wages of the sailors?

Mr. BRODEUR. No; they are paid by the vessel owner.

Mr. SINCLAIR. The fee provided for in British Columbia is a very large one indeed and might be rather a serious thing for the vessel owner. There would be a crew of 25 men on an ordinary tramp steamer and the shipping master would get $250 for an hour's work. I would like an explanation of why you allow $10 in British Columbia and only 50 cents in the other provinces?

Mr. BRODEUR. Some years ago it was found absolutely impossible to find seamen in British Columbia, and with the consent of the vessel owners I believe, it was arranged that a fee might be agreed upon between the owners and the shipping masters. This law does not compel the vessel owner to pay $10; it simply says that he may make an agreement with the shipping master to pay that sum, but if he can get men for 50 cents so much the better for him.

Mr. J. D. REID. Could a man be inspector of hulls and shipping master at the same time?

Mr. BRODEUR. I know of no such case.

Mr. J. D. REID. It would be a very dangerous thing if that were allowed because there are some vessels which if they were better inspected it would be all the better for those who sail on them.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There was a good deal of discussion when this amendment in the law which you are now retaining was passed about two years ago. Does the minister knows how it has worked out in practice ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It has worked out satisfactorily. We had a complaint about one shipping master which was investigated and held not to be well founded.

Mr. CONMEE. Would the provisions in clause 5 exempt vessels propelled by electricity or gasoline from carrying a certified officer ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes. This provision was inserted to meet the representations from the St. Lawrence and the Lake of the Woods districts, that these vessels should not be obliged to carry a certified engineer or master. It is proposed that all vessels less than five tons shall not be obliged to have a certified officer.

Mr. CONMEE. It would seem to me that the language of subsection (c) of section 13 might conflict with section 5 in this respect, but if the minister is satisfied I suppose it will be all right.

On section 9—tonnage duty.

Mr. BRODEUR. The object of this provision is to reduce the dues which are levied upon vessels for the Sick Mariners' fund from 2 cents per ton to 1½ cents per ton. It has been found that we have been collecting more than has been expended, and we hope that this reduction will make the receipts and expenditures about equal.

Mr. DANIEL. I am glad that the minister is making that change. At present there is a large surplus in this fund, because the tax is bringing much more than is required for the benefit of sick seamen.

Mr. BRODEUR. There is a surplus, but not a large surplus, and it has been considered advisable not to impose on the vessels a larger tax than is required for the maintenance of the sick seamen. With this reduction there may not be sufficient to cover the expenditure ; but we hope to make it sufficient by a wise administration of the money entrusted to us.

Mr. DANIEL. I may say that the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Mr. Prefontaine, expressed himself in this House as being of the opinion that the whole tax ought to be abandoned, and expressed his intention of making that change.

Mr. BRODEUR. We must of course provide for the sick seamen. If the vessel owners were willing to undertake the matter themselves, that would perhaps be sufficient ; but it is feared that in some cases the vessel owners would not look properly after their sick seamen, and therefore it is perhaps better to maintain the situation as it is.

Mr. DANIEL. I quite agree that the government would have to look after the sick seamen, but I thought there might be some other method of doing it.

On section 10—pilotage dues.

Mr. BRODEUR. This section is proposed for the purpose of repealing the legislation passed some years ago providing that vessels plying between the Great Lakes and Montreal and Quebec should not be required to take on any pilots. Some accidents have occurred as a result of this, because I was surprised to hear some time ago, some pilots whom we had dismissed had been taken on by some of these vessel owners. The Shipping Federation is urging strongly this legislation, because, as everybody is aware, the channel between Montreal and Quebec is not a very wide one, and the vessels plying there have to be put into the hands of persons of experience ; but it is feared that they are sometimes put into the hands of persons who are not experienced, and that accidents have occurred in consequence. I may quote the cases of the 'Cassandra,' the 'Turret Bell,' and the 'John Lambert.' When we learned that the vessels were taking on apprentice pilots whom we had dismissed for misconduct, we thought the time had arrived when we should impose this restriction.

Mr. DANIEL. The section referred to in this clause refers to ships that are exempted from compulsory pilotage. I would like to call the minister's attention to the next succeeding section in the Act, namely, section 478, where he will see that the pilotage authorities of certain pilotage districts are, notwithstanding anything contained in this last section, authorized to make regulations as to what ships shall be exempted from compulsory pilotage. The ports mentioned are Halifax, Sydney, Miramichi, and Pictou. I wish to call the ministers attention to the fact that the pilotage authorities in the port of St. John are the pilot commissioners, who have as full control over pilotage matters in that port as any pilot commissioners have in any of the ports of Canada. I inquired at the department to ascertain why it was that the pilotage authorities of the port of St. John were not given the same power and authority as the pilot commissioners in those ports that I have named, and the department was unable to furnish any reason. I do not know whether the minister has since acquired the information, but when I spoke to him he could not give any reason why the pilot commissioners at St. John were not included in section 478.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend drew my attention some time ago privately to this matter and I asked the officers of my

department to find out the reason of the omission and they have not been able to do so. I surmise, however, that the reason was perhaps due to the fact that St. John is treated differently from the other harbours. There was special legislation passed in the 80's concerning it.

Mr. DANIEL. That has nothing to do with the pilotage authorities.

Mr. BRODEUR. I know. It was with regard to the administration of the harbour itself, but it is probably due to that fact that St. John has not been treated in the same way as the other ports mentioned in section 478. I intend looking into the matter, and if there be no reason found why St. John should not be on the same footing as the other ports, we shall have to amend the law. I am under the impression, however, but speak subject to correction, that there has been some protest on the part of the Board of Trade on the ground that if St. John were put on the same footing as the other harbours, the result would probably be an increase in the rates for tolls which the vessel owners would have to pay.

Mr. DANIEL. Not necessarily. It all depends upon the action of the pilotage commissioners. I do not know whether they are all appointed by the common council or a portion by the common council and a portion by the government, but the effect of placing the authority in the hands of the pilot commissioners would not necessarily result in any increase of the pilotage dues.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, it might, because the harbour of St. John would then be included in clause 477, under which all vessels plying between Nova Scotia or any part of the Bay of Fundy and St. John would not be obliged to pay any pilotage dues, whereas under section 478 the pilot authorities would have the right to impose such dues. I think that was the objection made by the board of trade.

Mr. DANIEL. This would give the commissioners probably the authority to impose pilotage dues on some vessels that are not now affected, but the point is whether it would not be fair and right to do so under the circumstances.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is considered that St. John is too big a port for that. Mr. Finlayson moved to add the following subsection to section 10:

Subsection 1 of section 477 is amended by adding the following paragraph:

Ships making or entering the harbour for refuge shall not pay pilotage dues.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have no objection to incorporate this amendment which has met the approval of the subcommittee to which the Bill to amend the Canada Shipping Act was referred.

On subsection 11,

11. Paragraphs (i) and (j) of section 565 of the said Act are repealed and the following are substituted therefor:

(i) 'passenger' means any person carried on a steamboat other than the master and crew, the owner, his family and the servants connected with his household, and other than the guests of the owner of any steamboat used exclusively for pleasure, if such guests are carried on such steamboat without remuneration or any object of profit; and

(j) 'passenger steamer' means any steamboat carrying passengers.

Mr. BRODEUR. The object is to make clear what constitutes a passenger. Application was made the department to allow freight vessel owners to bring guests in their boats. It was feared that if such permission were given, it would perhaps cause those freight vessels to have a passenger service and so we thought it advisable to make it very clear that this would not be allowed.

On section 14—to amend section 591.

Mr. BRODEUR. The old section 591 provided simply that the report should be made to the inspector. We want it made very clear that it shall be made to the inspector who issued the certificate.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The expression is a little unusual—'shall report such occurrence to the office of the inspector.' Why 'the office'?

Mr. BRODEUR. That is what we proposed. But the Senate thought that, as the inspector might be dead, or might have disappeared or been replaced, it would be better that the report be made to the office. I think this was suggested by the leader of the opposition in the Senate. It was accepted by us, as we wish to have the provision verey definite.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The form of words is unusual. I should have supposed that some such expression as 'to the inspector who issued the certificate or his successor in office' would be better.

Mr. J. D. REID. The inspector is often away from his office. Go to the office of the inspector in Kingston while he is off inspecting, and you will find his office locked up.

Mr. BRODEUR. There is always somebody to attend to this work. It is supposed that they will have somebody to attend to it.

Mr. J. D. REID. They have no clerks.

Mr. BRODEUR. They do some other work generally, and they have somebody to attend to these matters.

Mr. J. D. REID. I have gone many times to the inspector's office in Kingston

and found him away on duty and his office closed up.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think that this clause could be improved. What would the leader of the opposition think of using the expression 'make a report of such occurrence to the office of the inspector'?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister's suggestion would still leave the matter open to the objection on the ground I have mentioned. But it may work out; I am not very critical of the language.

Mr. DANIEL. Is the inspector of hulls also the inspector of machinery?

Mr. BRODEUR. There is the inspector of hulls and also the inspector of boilers and machinery. The report is to be made to this inspector who gave the certificate.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I might suggest what I think will meet the point, and that is to provide that the report shall be in writing. If the party making the report found the office locked he might fulfil the letter of the law as here proposed by standing there and making the report to the office.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have no objection in accepting the amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 15—changes in certificated officers to be reported.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I think subsection 2 of this section is objectionable. It imposes a new duty on the captain and owner of the ship of reporting to the inspector whenever he changes an officer. It is customary for steamboats crossing the Atlantic to change their officers every trip, and it would be a good deal of trouble to the captain to report every change of officers to the inspector, who I suppose, is some officer in Ottawa, who would simply file it away in a pigeon-hole, so that, while a good deal of trouble for the captain, it would be of no advantage to anybody. We now require the custom-house officer to see that the captain and mate have certificates as required under the law. If you choose to impose the same duty upon the customs officer with regard to engineers, I have no objection. I think subsection 2 should be cut out.

Mr. PARDEE. I endorse the remarks of my hon. friend from Nova Scotia (Mr. Sinclair). So far as the inland waters are concerned, if this duty is imposed upon masters I feel sure it is a law which will not to be adhered to to any great degree. For on inland waters officers are changed very often in the season. Besides, this seems rather impracticable. I cannot see what is to be safeguarded by having this section passed, as, under the law, these men must have certificates in order to be employed.

Mr. BRODEUR. In the spring, for example, on the inland waters, the inspector is obliged to see that all the requirements of the law has been complied with before he gives his certificate. It was supposed that this legislation would be a very wise move, because it would ensure that those in charge of the vessel are certificated officers. When a change takes place we have nothing before us to show whether this vessel is properly manned afterwards; no report has been made showing whether she has on board an officer possessing a proper certificate. If we find that it is necessary, when a vessel is inspected in the spring, to have the names of the certificated officers on that vessel, and that the certificate shown to the inspector bears those names, I think it is a wise suggestion that when a change takes place it should be at least communicated to the department. Then we will know whether the new appointment on the vessel is a certificated officer or not. We have not in the service a sufficient number of men to inspect every vessel plying on the ocean or inland waters; that is why I think we should require that when a change takes place in the officers of a vessel that change should be communicated to the department.

Mr. DANIEL. If the statement of the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) is correct that the vessel cannot clear unless she has the proper certificated officers, what is the necessity for this?

Mr. BRODEUR. There are places where we are not obliged to clear, places in the inland waters.

Mr. SINCLAIR. The inspector has the duty imposed upon him in the spring, or at the time of inspection, to see that the men have a proper certificate. It is the duty of the engineer to hang the certificate up in the cabin, and the engineer is fined $20 if that certificate is not found hanging there. I do not believe, however, that a case has ever occurred where a ship has been sailed in Canadian waters requiring a certificate by an engineer that did not have a certificate. The owner of the vessel is under a heavy penalty if he employs a man without a certificate. Then there is this other safeguard, that he can be called upon at any moment to produce his certificate. I think those provisions are sufficient, and we are imposing another duty upon the ship owner and the shipping master that, to my mind, is altogether unnecessary. If we keep on piling new duties on these people we will drive away ships from our waters altogether. I do not believe there has been a single Act passed in the Canadian parliament during the last ten years that has

really had the effect of encouraging the shipping industry of this country. Every one of those Acts imposes some new burden on the man who is endeavouring to prosper in his business. This Act is a sample of a good many others that have been passed. We have to have certificated engineers for every tug boat in Canada that has an engine over a certain size. Tug boats were allowed to run without any certificated officers in Canada and in England, and there are twenty tug boats in British waters for one in Canadian waters, and there are no certificated officers required. But for the purpose of pleasing some labour people somewhere, we are imposing a new duty on the ship owner to employ certificated men on tug boats. I understand there are about 700 of those tug boats in Canadian waters, many of them engaged in hauling logs in the Ottawa river, and isolated places in the northern parts of this province. The tug boat is owned by the engineer; or his son is perhaps the engineer, and the owner is the captain. These men are the only people on the tug boat. Mr. Adams who is in charge of this department, says that he scarcely ever knew of an accident happening through these men being uncertificated. If you read the evidence taken before a commission of this House two years ago, evidence given by the shipping men in Ottawa, you will see that they point out what a serious thing it is for them that they should be compelled to employ certificated men on their tug boats in the upper waters. But that discussion will come on better when this clause now suspended is taken up. I would like hon. members who take an interest in this matter to look into this question before it does come up.

Mr. BRODEUR. This clause will be considered to-morrow.

On section 17—temporary certificates to act as engineer.

Mr. CONMEE. I think the machinery of the old law was preferable. A large number of boats are now being operated on the inland waters that cannot be operated after this law comes into force. I understand that it makes a further restriction. What is the use of talking about a tug boat of only four nominal horse power, of what service is that kind of a boat?

Mr. BRODEUR. The object of this amendment is simply to provide for a situation which occurs in New Brunswick. The old section provided that the minister could issue temporary certificates on a steamboat authorizing the engineer to operate within certain specified limits in the waters of Canada. The result was that in New Brunswick, in the district of Passamoquoddy Bay, temporary certificates were given to persons plying between Grand Manan to the mainland, but if they wanted to go outside to Eastport, those temporary certificates could not be used. The change which is proposed is that the minister may specify the limit within which he shall act.

Mr. DANIEL. It merely cuts out 'within specified limits in the waters of Canada.'

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes and the limit shall be specified as designated in the certificate. This is to give to a person the advantage of acting not only in Canada but also on the other side of the line.

Mr. CONMEE. Unfortunately the minister, or the draughtsman who drew this clause, has in his mind a particular situation in one of the provinces, but the law applies to the whole Dominion of Canada. We have plying on the Lake of the Woods, Wabigoon lake and a dozen other lakes, boats of 30 or 40 horse-power. This Act would cut them out. They are already suffering great hardship. Section 26 of the Act, 45 Victoria, provides that:

> The minister, upon a report of a duly appointed and qualified examiner of masters and mates, may grant a temporary certificate as master to an applicant sufficiently qualified by his knowledge and experience to take charge of a steamboat of not more than ten tons gross tonnage.

A few years ago that tonnage was changed to 20 tons but the number of passengers were not increased. The Act now provides that he may take charge of a boat 20 tons gross tonnage carrying not more than ten passengers and plying within the minor inland waters of Canada.

An hon. MEMBER. That refers to masters and this deals with engineers.

Mr. CONMEE. The same thing applies to engineers. On the minor inland waters the law is not respected and it cannot be. The people have the right to carry on their business, they will carry it on and if the law is not made to suit conditions they will take the risk of violating it. That is what they are doing to-day. Along the line of construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific boats are plying on the inland waters of from 80 to 100 tons and of from 25 to 80 horse-power. This also cuts it out because it is of more than 20 tons gross tonnage. The law states that they must have a certificated officer handling a boat of more than that tonnage unless permitted under the rules of the department, which I understand, they are sometimes in the discretion of the inspector. Yet, the boat upon which that master is placed is confined to ten passengers. That is entirely unreasonable, there is no good purpose served by it and it is only imposing a hardship and impossible conditions upon the owners and those who operate these boats. It may be said that you can get a certificated engineer and

captain to run these boats. But, you cannot do it.

Mr. J. D. REID. Why ?

Mr. CONMEE. Take the best certificated officer you have on the Great lakes, put him on the lake of the Woods and he cannot run a boat of 20 tons because there are no charts of that lake. No man can run a boat on one of these small inland lakes except the man who has grown up in the district and knows the local waters.

Mr. J. D. REID. Why does he not get the certificate of a master or engineer ?

Mr. CONMEE. He ought to do it but the law will not give it to him. The way to remedy this is not to impose more onerous conditions but to give the inspector jurisdiction. The inspectors are either competent or they are not competent. Why not allow the inspector to say what boat an officer is capable of sailing ? If a boat is capable of carrying twenty passengers say so ; if it is competent to carry more than 20 passengers why should it not be allowed to do it? If a contractor wants to remove his staff of 50 or 100 men from one point to another is he going to make ten trips with a tug when he might do it all at once ? The boat is perfectly safe and large enough. What purpose is served by imposing such a condition as this ? It must be apparent to the minister that the risk will be taken, that the boat will carry a larger number of passengers and take the chance of the penalties being imposed. I submit that there should be a change, that instead of it being limited to 4 nominal horse-power it should be 30 or 40 horse-power when a law is being made which is going to apply to the whole of Canada. We had my hon. friend from Strathcona (Mr. McIntyre) making the same statement with regard to certain waters in his constituency. He said that no man could sail a vessel on these rivers unless he had knowledge of the river or unless he had been engaged there for a year or so before he became the master of a boat. You can employ no one to run these boats except the men who have had practical local knowledge and experience of the particular water in which the boat is operating. Therefore, these hampering conditions which serve no good purpose and which do not protect the public should be removed from the Act instead of further onerous conditions being imposed.

Mr. BRODEUR. I must take exception to the last remark of my hon. friend from Rainy River (Mr. Conmee). We are not increasing the difficulty which he is mentioning; it is quite the reverse. The statute which is now in force provides that a temporary certificate may be issued to engineers of vessels of 4 nominal horse-power of the single cylinder type and 9 horse-power if of the compound type. We are increasing it to 14. Instead of increasing the difficulty which my hon. friend has mentioned we are moving in the direction which he suggests. In regard to the suggestion of my hon. friend that we should leave entirely to the discretion of the inspector the question as to whether certificates should be given or not, I do not quite agree with him. I think that in this case it should not be left entirely in the discretion of the inspector. Of course, if there are special circumstances we do not want to take any action that would prove a hardship to any person, but is it not dangerous that passenger vessels should be operated by persons who are not absolutely qualified? Why should not these men pass their examinations and take certificates? We are willing to grant them certificates in the cases of small vessels. But, to go farther than that, as my hon. friend suggests, and issue temporary certificates to officers of vessels of 40 horse-power is a very serious step and a step in the wrong direction. We must ensure the safety of the people. Passengers are going on these boats and we must see that these boats are in charge of persons who are properly qualified. In exceptional circumstances we issue temporary certificates and if there were cases which would prove a very serious hardship we would consider the circumstances. I remember a case which came to my knowledge a few years ago where, on Lake Temiskaming, the engineer of a boat left and they could not get anybody to take charge of the vessel. Of course, we would not take procedings where it was impossible to get men. To provide that these vessels should be obliged to take officers who pass an examination would be a serious step.

Mr. CONMEE. The argument of the minister is against himself, because if this is an improvement and not a restriction then it shows how bad the former law was. I had the honour of accompanying a deputation, some of whom came 1,000 miles, to see the minister, and it was pointed out to him that if they were obliged to engage certificated officers, these men could only stand round and draw their pay while the local men who had knowledge of the waters operated the vessels. What good purpose can be accomplished by such legislation as this. I would ask him to let clause 17 stand until he considers it further.

Mr. BRODEUR. I will be very glad to consult Mr. Adams who has a great deal of experience in this matter.

Mr. CONMEE. I want to enter my protest here. Is there no regard to be paid to the thousands of people who have their money invested and who do busines with these vesels. I do not think it is a sufficient answer to the representations made to say

that some officers of the department will be consulted. I protest against that.

Mr. J. D. REID. I agree with the hon. member (Mr. Conmee). Here is one of the most important Bills of the session submitted to us within two or three days of prorogation, when it should have been introduced long ago and referred to a committee so as to allow the vessel owners and others interested to be heard. There is a good deal in this Bill that should be criticised but we are told that it must slide through now. We have had navigation laws for a great many years and they could easily be allowed to exist for the three or four months intervening between this and next session when a well considered Bill could be introduced and the people interested heard in regard to it. The government will have to take the responsibility of this Bill because the House is not treated fairly by submitting it to us at this late hour of the session.

Mr. BRODEUR. The Bill has been before the House since June 2 and previous to that it was fully discussed in the Senate and the interested parties had the advantage of being heard. I sent it to the Senate in order to give the interested parties an opportunity of being heard.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Were they heard before the Senate ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know if the Bill was referred to a special committee; I am informed now it was not.

Mr. J. D. REID. That is the very point I raised.

Mr. BRODEUR. It has been before the Senate for three months.

Mr. CONMEE. Who knew anything about that?

Mr. BRODEUR. For several sessions past there have been Bills brought before the House by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster), the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Leighton McCarthy) and the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. McLean) and they have been discussed in the House and referred to committees. The change proposed in this section is a mere verbal change and it removes some of the disabilities which have been mentioned.

Mr. J. D. REID. The minister tells us to-night that he does not know anything about the Bill and that he will have to consult his officer who is not present. The Bill is prepared by his officer who no doubt does his best, and while it may be all right in theory it may be all wrong in practice. I want the very best Bill that can be produced and one which will protect the public while at the same time it will not be a hardship on those interested in the business.

Mr. BRODEUR. Under the present law these temporary certificates are issued only to engineers in charge of 9 horse-power compound engines and now we are extending it to 14 horse-power so that it lessens the restrictions formerly placed on vessel owners.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have been informed that application has been made on behalf of certain ship owners in the maritime provinces to so widen the Act as to enable Canadian vessels up to 500 tons to sail as far as the River La Platte without certified masters and mates. Is that provided for in this Bill?

Mr. BRODEUR. I may say that such a question was brought up in connection with a Bill which has been introduced by my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. A. K. McLean). This Bill was referred to a committee, which heard evidence and unanimously reported in favour of some changes being made in that direction. I think the committee recommended the adoption, not of the River La Platte, but of British Guiana, as the limit. That provision will be incorporated as a section in this Bill.

Mr. EMMERSON. I would oppose the enlargement of the powers in that direction, and I speak on behalf of ship owners as well as of ship masters and mates. I have under my hand a long communication, which I do not propose to inflict on the House at this moment, but I would like to know when that amendment will be under discussion.

Mr. BRODEUR. As soon as we are through with the Bill as it is, I understand that a motion will be made to incorporate in this Bill the provision which has been reported by that committee.

Mr. PERLEY. This section 17 refers to the granting of temporary certificates to engineers on small passenger steamers. I think the minister might increase the horse-power, on which he would grant temporary certificates, to fifteen or twenty horse-power. I want to point out that there is nothing here providing for the granting of temporary certificates to engineers on tug boats. For instance, on the Ottawa river there are a great many tug boats engaged in towing logs, none of which have certificated engineers, although many of the engineers on them are able to take the machinery to pieces and put it together again, and have been at their work for many years. Provision ought to be made for granting temporary certificates to these men.

Mr. BRODEUR. There is nothing in any existing legislation requiring tug boats to have certificated engineers. This Bill will provide that engineers on tug boats of a certain size shall be obliged to have certificates. If the House agrees with that, we shall have to provide for issuing temporary certificates to engineers on tug boats.

Sections 17, 18, 19 and 21 allowed to stand.

On section 22—deck loads.

Mr. BRODEUR. This provision is for the purpose of making the phraseology the same as in the British Bill.

On section 25,

Section 732 of the Canada Shipping Act is amended by adding thereto the following paragraph:

'Certificate' includes license and branch license.

Mr. BRODEUR. In our law there are cases in which we issue not only licenses but certificates. This is for the purpose of declaring that certificates include licenses and branch licenses.

On section 28,

The said Act is amended by inserting the following section immediately after section 782:

782a. It shall not be necessary to hold a preliminary investigation before a formal investigation is held.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to meet some cases, in which the negligence is so apparent that it becomes necessary to hold immediately a formal investigation.

I intend to move the following amendment:

That after paragraph (d) the following be inserted:

Where the minister has reason to believe that a master, mate, pilot or engineer is unfit or unable to discharge the duties.

This is to meet the case of an officer who may be blind or have some defect which renders him absolutely incapable. There is no provision at present to give the minister the right to hold an investigation.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 29,

29. Section 784 of the said Act is repealed and the following is substituted therefor:

784. A court holding a formal investigation into a shipping casualty shall hold it with two or more assessors to be selected for that purpose by the minister. Such assessors shall have nautical, engineering, or special skill in the matter to be inquired into, and the court shall be the sole judge as to whether any assessor possesses the requisite skill.

Mr. BRODEUR. Section 784 provides that the assessors must be men having experience in the merchant service. We may not, however, have any such officer at our disposal, but we may have an officer who has a certificate of the Royal Navy, for example, and we therefore think it advisable that we should dispense with the words 'having experience in the merchant service.'

Mr. BERGERON. Can the hon. minister tell me how often this Canada Shipping Act has been amended since its first enactment?

Mr. BRODEUR. It has been changed very often like all laws that have been long on the statute-book. Generally speaking, the principles we follow in the Canada Shipping Act are those adopted in England. In England they pass laws affecting even Canada in relation to shipping in some cases, and it is found in these cases that it is wise to have similar laws here.

Mr. MONK. Do any of the provisions of this Bill apply to stationary engineers?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. MONK. Because representations have been made to me from Montreal that it is very desirable that legislation on these lines should be passed for stationary engineers.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is a matter for the provinces. Boilers are inspected by the provincial authorities—I know that as far as my own province is concerned that is the case. The Bill does not make provision in relation to any engines and boilers except those on vessels.

Mr. MONK. But this Bill applies not only to the inspection of boilers and engines but also requires the certification of engineers.

Mr. BRODEUR. So far as stationary engineers are concerned, the matter is dealt with by the provincial authorities.

Mr. MONK. It may be so.

Mr. BRODEUR. I move that the following clause be added to the Bill, and I would call the especial attention of my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) to this:

1. Paragraph (f) of section 72 of the Canada Shipping Act is repealed and the following paragraph is substituted therefor:—

(f) 'coasting voyage' means between any port or place on the eastern coast of Canada and other port or place on such coast, or in Newfoundland, Labrador or St. Pierre or Miquelon or a port or place on the eastern coast of the United States of America, or Mexico or Central America, or in the West Indies or on the eastern coast of South America, not further south than five degrees north latitude, and also means a voyage between any port or place on such coast or on the western coast of the United States of America, not further south than the harbour of Portland in the state of Oregon, and not further north than Cape Spencer in the territory of Alaska, or any inlet or bay having its entrance on the eastern side of the said cape.

My hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. A. K. Maclean) introduced this year a Bill defining the coasting voyage. It was referred to a Select Committee of this House to hear evidence. That committee made a unanimous report. They proposed to define the coasting voyage as meaning a voyage between a place in Canada and a place north of Cape Hatteras. But Cape Hatteras is in

North Carolina, and most of the coasting trade of the maritime provinces is not with that section but more especially with the West Indies. It was found advisable, that the limitation of the coasting voyage should be extended to the limits I have mentioned in this section.

Mr. EMMERSON. How far does that take them ?

Mr. BRODEUR. To British Guiana.

Mr. EMMERSON. I would like to bring to the notice of the committee, and particularly of the minister, the contents of a letter I have received from a retired sea captain, a gentleman of large experience who has sailed practically every water in the world. I can best do so by reading extracts from his letter :

I notice that there have been witnesses called from Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island who are anxious to allow Canadian vessels as large as 500 tons to start upon voyages as far as the River La Platte without having a mate on board with a certificate of competency.

This agitation no doubt arises with owners of coasting vessels who are anxious to man their ships with cheap men as officers. This, sir, is certainly a retrograde step, and is not in the real interest of the shipping of the country and no doubt has arisen with those owners who insure their vessels with the great insurance companies and carry very little or no insurance themselves.

The writer never knew a ship owner who carried his own risk that did not prefer competent men as masters and mates. I passed my examinations in England before there were any certificates issued in Canada. At that time we were not obliged to have certificates in England, they allowed us to enter and clear our ships if the ship was owned in the provinces, but we could not sail as master or mate in a ship owned in the United Kingdom except we held certificate of servitude, showing we had been master before the year 1851 when they first issued certificates of competency in England. The examinations in Britain are a little more difficult than in Canada, but they have excellent preparatory schools where the candidates attain a prescribed way of doing the work necessary for examination, and it is in my opinion a correct and necessary way and the man who has not sufficient intelligence nor energy to attain it, should not be placed in a position of such responsibility as attaches to the master or mate of a ship with cargo of great value and the lives of many other men depending upon him.

It is just as necessary for a mate to have a certificate of competency as it is for the master, for a master may die or be disabled as well as another, and why should the lives of the ship's company and a valuable ship and cargo be imperilled or placed in jeopardy because the owner of the vessel can save a few dollars a month in a mate's wages ?

I am sorry to trouble you with such a lengthy document as this letter, but I know whereof I write. I know by myself I was a good mate and a good ship master before I held any certificate of competency, but was a better and more competent one thereafter. I could give you many instances of the benefit of these examinations, but do not wish to inflict upon you unnecessary writing. But do not let us go backwards, for surely if it be necessary for those who practise law, medicine, engineering, dentistry or selling drugs, to pass examinations and obtain certificates of competency, it must be necessary for officers of ships to be competent, for a small ship unskillfully handled might easily sink one of the great steamships with a thousand people on board.

I cannot help resisting an argument in favour of retaining the examinations and issuance of certificaes of competency, which is very strongly supported by the fact that the holder of a certificate is to a very marked extent responsible for any dereliction of duty or neglect of duty, that he is held responsible and must be accountable by the Marine Department of the Board of Trade in the United Kingdom, or by the Marine Court of this country, or by a consular court of British subjects in a foreign country, who may upon sufficient evidence either cancel his certificate entirely or suspend it for almost any period, which means degradation and prevents him from attaining such position again in a British ship until the court that degraded him, or a court with equal authority, reinstated him by again granting his certificate. This I assure you, sir, is a strong incentive to more particular attention to his duty, and a constant study of the rules of the road, meaning the rules adopted by every nation that govern the conduct of ships when approaching each other, the avoiding of collisions at sea, as well as the rules specified by the authority under which he holds his certificate.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that, whatever be the merits of that letter, it has no relation whatever to the section now before the committee, but it might have some relation to the next section.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think the letter is germane to this section because there is the same principle. It is a retrograde movement, as I understand it.

Mr. BRODEUR. A proposition has been published to increase the tonnage of vessels. I propose to move two amendments.

Mr. EMMERSON. But they all incorporate the same idea. In the first place, you define what coasting voyage is, but you have extended the mileage so to speak of a coasting voyage.

Mr. BRODEUR. Masters of vessels and engineers will object to that.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. The object of this section is to define and fix the limits of the coasting trade on the Atlantic and the Pacific. Up to 1903 the southern limits of the coasting trade extended to Cape Horn, on the western side, and consequently the coasting voyage permitted vessels to sail around the entire coast of both north and South America. Now it is proposed to

fix the southern limit at British Guiana. It is not necessary to have a certificated master or mate when engaged in the home trade in Great Britain. It is as difficult to navigate a ship along the Irish, Scottish or English coasts as it would be from the maritime provinces to the British West Indies. There is no restriction whatever there. In the United States the coasting trade law permits American vessels to engage with trade in Cuba and the Philippines, which virtually means there is no restriction whatever. If it is proposed to fix the southern limit of our coasting trade at British Guiana——

Mr. EMMERSON. Until very recently the United States did not have certificates at all.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. We have a great deal of trade with the British West India Islands. A great number of our smaller vessels desire to engage in that trade and there is no objection to it.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that to make it easier ?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. Well, it does for ships of a certain size. It will remove some restrictions. Shipping men in the maritime provinces say that it is necessary in the interests of our trade, that our shipping is at present hampered by the law as now existing.

Mr. BERGERON. Have you a case in view ?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I think that what I have said applies to the maritime provinces generally. We had a great deal of evidence taken before the committee. Vessel owners and sailing masters were here and they seemed to be of the opinion that it would be desirable to extend the limits of the coasting trade. There is some objection to increasing the tonnage of vessels which uncertified masters and mates are permitted to navigate.

Mr. BERGERON. I think that these measures are brought down very late in the session. We have no time to go through the old Act and compare it with the amendments.

Mr. BRODEUR. This Bill was introduced in December last and was sent to a committee for the purpose of being examined and of hearing evidence.

Mr. BERGERON. Did this come from the Senate ?

Mr. BRODEUR. This is an amendment which has been brought down from that committee. This was not in the Bill at all. The Bill introduced in the Senate was a government Bill and it has come over to us after having been a couple of months in the Senate.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN.

Mr. BERGERON. What becomes of the other Bill ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The other Bill is on the Order Paper ; that is Bill (No. 12). It was presented at the opening of the session.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. According to the ruling of the Speaker earlier in the session this could not be touched at all.

Mr. FINLAYSON. This was reported by the committee over a month ago.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But, if there is a similar provision on a Bill on the Order Paper, according to a ruling of the Speaker, it cannot be dealt with now.

Mr. BRODEUR. It cannot be passed except by the unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. BERGERON. It was not asked; it should have been done before.

Mr. EMMERSON. A reference to the Act of 1903 will show that the term' coasting law ' was defined there and on the eastern coast of the United States coasting vessels could go as far south as Cape Hatteras in the state of North Carolina. They could go to Newfoundland, Labrador and St. Pierre Miquelon, but they could not go down below Cuba or the Florida coast. Under the amendment that is now proposed a coasting vessel——

Mr. BERGERON. Can go around the world.

Mr. EMMERSON. Can go practically anywhere in South America.

Mr. DANIEL. She cannot cross the equator.

Mr. EMMERSON. It might as well be so.

Mr. DANIEL. No, it might not, because crossing the equator is much more difficult navigation that getting down to the equator or within a few degrees of it. In the evidence that we had before this committee that matter was fully brought out. An effort was made by some members of the committee to extend coasting voyages as far as the River Platte, but in the professional evidence that we had, objection was made to giving a coasting voyage certificate that would allow a coasting voyage to extend beyond the equator on account of the difficult navigation that is encountered in that region. That is really the reason why the coasting voyage was not extended.

Mr. EMMERSON. Of course, my hon. friend (Mr. Daniel) having been a member of that committee, and having heard all that evidence, would be in a much better position than I am to speak of that, but I certainly would submit this fact that there must be much more difficult navigation south of Cape Hatteras than there is north of it.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. Why ?

Mr. EMMERSON. One of the most difficult sections of the east coast of the United States is south of Hatteras. Vessels coming from the West Indies or from South America find the very greatest difficulty in approaching Hatteras. I do not, of course, assume to have any technical knowledge, but I have always understood from sea captains that their greatest difficulties in coming from southern ports to Canadian ports, especially in the winter season, were in approaching Hatteras. At any rate the idea involved in this amendment is that you are loosening the ropes as it were and permitting vessels to be in charge of non-certificated officers——

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. No.

Mr. EMMERSON. They have what are called coastwise certificates but you are permitting them to go on voyages that are practically not coastwise, A coastwise vessel in going from any of the maritime ports in Canada will strike for Cape Cod and then go down. If going to New York it will go through the Sound. If it is going to Philadelphia it will strike out but sometimes even then it will follow down the Sound when going on that voyage. But, it seems to me that we are taking a retrograde step in doing away with the necessity of having certificated officers on these larger voyages. Vessels of a cetrain size are enabled to engage in this coastwise traffic without being manned by certificated officers. You are going to raise that limit and therefore you are lessening or doing away with the restrictions. My hon. friend has stated, very fairly that the owners of vessels have asked for this, that the owners of vessels in Nova Scotia have deemed it to be in their interests that this should be done. Most reforms in the law respecting the safety of ships were carried against the protest of the ship owners.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is the hon. gentleman opposing this Bill ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am.

Mr. J. D. REID. Then the Bill cannot be considered because it requires the unanimous consent of the House to proceed with it.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am not raising any technical objection. I am opposing it on principle.

Mr. J. D. REID. It does not make any difference whether it is principle or not so long as you are opposing it. I would like the ruling of the chair on that point.

Mr. EMMERSON. That technical objection should be taken before we went into committee.

Mr. BRODEUR. The House has given its unanimous consent to take this clause into consideration, and when the clause is being considered any hon. gentleman can express his views pro or con.

Mr. BERGERON. The point is that we are taking a clause from a certain Bill on the Order Paper introduced by a private member and adding it to this government measure. The private Bill being on the Order Paper this cannot be done without the unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. BRODEUR. The unanimous consent of the House has been given.

Mr. SINCLAIR. This government Bill is before the House and the hon. member for Lunenburg is perfectly in order in moving his amendment.

Mr. LENNOX. The amendment moved is taken from a Bill which is already on the Order Paper, and Mr. Speaker has decided quite recently that that cannot be done except by the unanimous consent of the House. The member for Westmorland does not give his consent and therefore the consideration of this Bill is not in order.

Mr. BERGERON. The other day the hon. member for York (Mr. Maclean) moved to add to a government Bill, a clause taken from a Bill which stood in his name, and Mr. Speaker ruled that he could not do so without the unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. BRODEUR. The unanimous consent of the House was given when I moved to consider this question, and the leader of the opposition mentioned the point but he did not press it.

Mr. LENNOX. A member of this House can take an objection under the rules at any time he sees fit, and when he does so his objection disturbs the unanimous consent of the committee.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. What is your authority for that ?

Mr. LENNOX. My authority is a well recognized rule of the House which was acted upon quite recently.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have submitted certain objections with respect to this legislation. In 1903 parliament decided that a coasting voyage should not extend south of Cape Hatteras and that it was not in the interest of safe navigation that Canadian vessels sailing from a Canadian port to an American port should be allowed to to go beyond Cape Hatteras unless they were in charge of officers certificated under the laws of Canada. By this amendment we propose to say that it is not necessary to restrict. Are there any reasons why we should not go back to the old law that existed previous to 1903, and indeed, previous to confederation ?

Mr. PICKUP. In 1896, the coasting voyage extended all around the coast of South

America. It was in 1903 that the change was made.

Mr. EMMERSON. If in 1896 we felt that the time had not come when we should compel every man who navigated a vessel as far south as Cape Hatteras to have a certificate, the reasoning is so much the stronger.

Mr. PICKUP. You did not insist on their having certificates until 1903. Previous to 1903 certificates which were granted for coasting voyages enabled a master to sail a vessel to South America. It seems unfair to the man who gets a certificate now that he does not have the same privilege as the man who got a certificate previous to 1903.

Mr. EMMERSON. For what reason did we limit it in 1903? I cannot conceive that this parliament would take such a step without some good and sufficient reason. I can only assume that the reason was that it was considered in the public interest that these vessels, when going on voyages south of Cape Hatteras, should be manned by officers who had certificates which were more than coastwise certificates.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I would like to know why my hon. friend wants to stop a coasting vessel at Cape Hatteras when its business is largely south of Cape Hatteras—in the West Indies. Why does he not want the vessel to go to some place where it can get some business, where our vessels have been going for generations? I venture to say that the hon. gentleman cannot find a single accident that has happened from the fact that coasting captains have been allowed to go south of Cape Hatteras. Everybody who has studied the question has felt that a mistake was made in 1903, when the limit was fixed at Cape Hatteras. I could understand a man saying that a vessel should not go around the Horn; but to say that we should stop at Cape Hatteras when a large amount of the business is done south of that point strikes me as absurd.

Mr. EMMERSON. We do not stop the business. We simply require that vessels engaging in that trade shall be manned by officers who have the necessary certificates.

Mr. SINCLAIR. You are defining the limits of a coasting voyage. Even whether a man has his certificate or not, he must stop when he reaches Cape Hatteras.

Mr. EMMERSON. But he can have a certificate otherwise than a coastwise certificate.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend knows that most of the mariners of the maritime provinces are coast-voyage mariners, and if you force them to take seaboard certificates, you will render matters more difficult for most of them.

Mr. J. D. REID. I would ask the chairman for a ruling on the point I raised.

Mr. PICKUP.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. My ruling is that the motion is out of order unless the House unanimously consents to take it up.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. Without speaking on the point of order, I would like to see the proposed legislation pass the House in one form or other, either as added sections to the government Bill or as it was introduced. It will take just as much time to get it through later in the week as it will to-night. The minister could put himself in order by changing a single word in the section which he asks to be added to the Bill. So I do not think my hon. friend should press his objection.

Mr. EMMERSON. I wish it to be understood that I do not object to this amendment on the ground that it forms part of another Bill that stands on the Order Paper.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I would ask my hon. friend to state his objection, so that we may know what it is, and then we can reply to it.

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not object to the consideration of this clause, but I do object to changing the definition of the expression 'coasting trade' so as to allow vessels manned by those having coastwise certificates going beyond the limitations set forth in the Act of 1903.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. BRODEUR. I would propose that section 3A be added to amend section 96 by striking out 100 and substituting 150. The Act provides that a sailing ship registered in Canada of 100 tons register may go to any port in Canada on a coasting voyage. I am now proposing to make the limit 150 tons.

Mr. EMMERSON. I shall oppose this for the reasons set forth in the letter which I read to the House.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. BRODEUR moved that section 97 be amended by striking out the words 'two hundred' and substituting 'four hundred.'

Mr. EMMERSON. I object to this increase.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is with regard to the mates.

Mr. EMMERSON. The mate very often has to take the place of the master. Frequently in voyages to the West Indies, the masters are lost at sea or die and the vessels have to be taken charge of by the mates. If there is any reason for requiring a certificated master, you should certainly require a certificated mate.

Mr. BRODEUR. As far as Great Britain is concerned, there is no restriction.

Every vessel engaged in such voyages may be without certificated officers. In the United States the restriction is 700 tons. Before the committee it was established by evidence that it was very difficult to find mates, and in some cases vessels had to be detained a long time because they could not get proper officers. We did not think it advisable to increase the limit to 700, but the committee thought we should increase it to four hundred. With some reluctance, the department agreed to embody this clause in the Bill.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. KEMP. Before the Bill leaves the committee, I would like to ask the minister a question. With respect to section 477 of the Bill—'compulsory payment of pilotage dues'—there are certain exemptions, as, for instance, certain vessels employed in voyages between ports on the great lakes and ports on the St. Lawrence. Were the representations made by the Dominion Marine Association considered, and what was done about them?

Mr. BRODEUR. Some representations were made by the Marine Association with regard to this. They asked that the Bill should be amended in the opposite direction from that we have taken. But I found on examining the records that it was impossible to comply with their request. I might quote several accidents that were due to the fact that the vessels had not proper pilots. There was one case that occurred this spring. My hon. friend understands the necessity there is of having vessels in charge of the right men on the St. Lawrence between Montreal and Quebec, the channel being somewhat narrow. Representations were made to me by the Shipping Federation that, in order to prevent accidents, we should always have pilots on these boats. The Shipping Federation represented to me the case of the 'John Lambert.' The master held a United States certificate and did not understand that the rules for the harbour of Montreal were different from those for the great lakes. The result of the captain not knowing this was a serious accident. Another instance was that of a young man who had been dismissed by the department as apprentice pilot because his habits were not regular, and who was taken to pilot some of these vessels. We have been taking all the precautions possible in order to ensure the safety of navigation of the St. Lawrence, and it would not do to allow a man who had been dismissed from the service because his habits were faulty to be taken on these boats and become the cause of accident.

Mr. KEMP. I do not object to that, nor do I wish to take up time in discussing the general question. I want to know whether these exemptions were done away with? For instance, ships 'employed in trading between any one or more of the provinces of Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia or Prince Edward Island and any other or others of them.' Are these cancelled?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. KEMP. Why discriminate? Why legislate against the captains and masters of vessels which originate in Lake Superior, Lake Huron, Lake Erie and Lake Ontario?

Mr. BRODEUR. This is a privilege not being taken advantage of by these people to whom it is allowed.

Mr. KEMP. But it is a very serious matter for the captains of vessels on the great lakes who are trying to build up trade between the upper lakes and the lower ports. I will not take up time discussing the matter; I simply enter my protest against it.

Bill reported.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Civil government—Department of Agriculture—to pay G. F. O'Halloran, Deputy Minister of Agriculture, a salary of $1,000 per annum as deputy commissioner of patents from April 1, 1908, $1,000.

Mr. J. D. REID. Perhaps the minister will explain why he is only spending $500,000 in the interests of the farmers and nearly six and a half millions on——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. TALBOT. This is the last week; it is time to be serious.

Mr. FOWLER. Would the minister please explain this vote?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). A short time ago, when this question was up in connection with the Civil Service Bill, I explained the situation. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) was here then.

Mr. FOWLER. I would like to ask if it is the intention of the government to give what we may call the rank and file of the civil service any additional pay?

Mr. FISHER. There are no special items in the supplementary estimates of a general character for the civil service. I do not know just what the hon. gentleman means by rank and file. But the estimates give, so far as I know, all that the government intend to bring down.

Mr. FOWLER. I mean the first, second and third class clerks. I understand the deputy ministers are to have an increase, and I wanted to know if the others were to have. There was some talk some time ago of a ten per cent advance by way of

bonus. I understand the minister to say that the government has abandoned its intention with regard to that, if it ever had one.

Census and statistics—further amount required, $5,000.

Mr. BERGERON. I thought the census was finished.

Mr. FISHER. The census of 1901 was finished long ago, but we have now a permanent census office. Last year we took an agricultural census of Quebec, Ontario and the maritime provinces.

Fumigation stations—further amount required, $500.

Mr. FISHER. These fumigating stations are a protection against the introduction of the San Jose scale into Canada. The nursery stock that comes in from the United States has to be fumigated.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I have been waiting for an opportunity to comment on the humiliating manner in which the Minister of Agriculture has treated the Agricultural Committee and the members of this House. It is not reasonable to make any prolonged discussion in regard to agricultural matters at this stage of the session. But I want to call the attention of the minister to the way he has treated the Agricultural Committee, and the way in which he has dealt with the resolution that committee passed on the 20th June, 1905. That resolution read as follows :

That this committee realize an injustice is being done to the people of Canada through their British embargo on our cattle being maintained, and believe that it would be in the best interests of the farming industry of the Dominion to have a deputation consisting of the Minister of Agriculture of each province of the Dominion to act in conjunction with the Dominion Minister of Agriculture to wait upon the chairman of the Board of Agriculture of England, giving as much publicity to their proceedings as possible, and laying before the said department the justice of our requests, to have the Act authorising the said embargo repealed.

That resolution went through committee into this House, and the House passed it unanimously. It was the wish of both sides of the House that the minister should conduct that matter in the manner expressed in the resolution. Now he has not raised a finger towards carrying out the wishes of this House. In his reply to this resolution he makes use of the following words :

The Minister of Agriculture has made no effort to bring together such a deputation for the purpose set forth in the above resolution, for the reason that, in view of the repeated representations made by the Canadian government and the persistent refusals of the British government (as shown by the documents attached hereto and those previously brought down) and the persistent action of the British parliament in refusing to amend the existing law so as to admit of the importation of live Canadian cattle into the United Kingdom, such action would, in his opinion, be futile and undignified.

Why does the minister take the position that it would be both futile and undignified to obey a resolution of this House ? He takes the position that the Agricultural Committee and the members of this House did not know what they were doing when they passed that resolution. I could go through the whole of this correspondence relating to the cattle embargo, and show that the minister has not raised a finger towards trying to remove that cattle embargo. I have letters under my hand addressed to Lord Strathcona wherein he states distinctly that so far as this government is concerned they do not want to get mixed up with the cattle embargo in Great Britain. When he received letters from the meat association of Great Britain, and when he knew that an agitation was going on in that country from year to year, and he was urged to give some encouragement to those who were endeavouring to remove the cattle embargo, the minister, instead of giving that encouragement, did the very opposite, and would not give a particle of encouragement to these men. The minister knows that when the vote was taken in the British House of Commons his attention was called to it ; he knows that when representations were made to him from different sections of the country urging him to lend some assistance to the men who were fighting for the removal of the cattle embargo in Great Britain, he refused to raise a finger, he practically told Lord Strathcona that this government did not wish any action to be taken.

Mr. FISHER. I do not wish to continue the controversy. The hon. gentleman says I know all about it. I think I do, and I am quite willing to say now that I have not taken the steps there suggested. My reason for not doing so was that almost immediately after that resolution was passed, the Minister of Agriculture of England declared emphatically and publicly that so long as he continued in office the embargo would not be removed. He was followed by another Minister of Agriculture, who declared the same thing, and he has been followed by a third minister of the oposite political party who has declared exactly the same thing. As this is a matter which has to be dealt with by statute in the British parliament, and as the government has declared over and over against the removal of the embargo by Act of parliament, I think it would be both futile and undignified on the part of Canada to bother any more about it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The minister knows full well, that, while it did not carry, a

measure providing for the abolition of the embargo was before the British House of Commons.

Mr. FISHER. With what result?—it was overwhelmingly defeated over and over again.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Yes, but if the minister had been able to show to the British House of Commons that the Ministers of Agriculture of the Dominion and of the various provinces were anxious to have this embargo removed does the minister not believe that would have had a great effect on that body? He knows full well that instead of him taking up the resolution of the committee and dealing with it in the proper method he has failed in his duty in this respect, and we cannot censure him too strongly for the manner in which he has acted.

Mr. FISHER. They have the official despatches from this government making representations and giving reasons why the cattle embargo should be removed, they were before the British government and the British parliament, and members of the British House of Commons, in all these debates, quoted them, but they have had no effect.

Mr. STAPLES. I do not think the Minister of Agriculture is justified in sitting quietly down and making no effort to remove the embargo on our cattle. Surely the minister should make an effort to have the resolution adopted by the Committee on Agriculture and endorsed on the floor of this House forwarded to the British government and to the British parliament. He should make every effort to secure the abrogation of that embargo. It is essential to the best interests of the agriculturists of this country that it should be removed, and under these circumstances is the minister going to sit down quietly and say that they have discussed it on the floor of the imperial parliament and that there is nothing more for him to do but to accept whatever finding they may have arrived at? That is a pretty weak argument, and I believe the farmers will not accept it in the way the minister expects them to.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. And he has instructed Lord Strathcona not do do anything in this matter.

Mr. STAPLES. Has the minister forwarded the resolution of this parliament asking that the embargo should be removed, or has he called the attention of the imperial parliament to the resolution adopted by the Committee on Agriculture and endorsed on the floor of this House? Has the minister even gone that far?

Mr. FIELDING. Would my hon. friend (Mr. Staples) help us by pointing out just what can be done with the British government that has not already been done to get them to remove the embargo? What would my hon. friend do?

Mr. STAPLES. I would not sit down and say there is nothing further to be done. I would make a further effort. That is the time I would get busy.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend would get busy, but my hon. friend has not answered the question. Would he be good enough to tell me what he should do? The British government has announced its policy on the question, it has a large majority and, having announced its policy, what is my hon. friend going to do to change it? Do not tell me that he will get busy. We are all busy.

Mr. STAPLES. If I were the Minister of Agriculture I would certainly consult my colleagues and try and formulate a policy for the removal of the embargo.

Mr. FIELDING. That will not do. What would my hon. friend do to make this wicked British government change its policy?

Mr. STAPLES. I would lay every argument that is possible to lay before them.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend has only waked up. That has been done. Tell us something else.

Mr. STAPLES. The Minister of Agriculture said not more than a moment ago that he had not even laid before the imperial authorities the resolution that was passed by this House. Has he done all he might do?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, and more.

Mr. BERGERON. Could not this government withdraw our preference if they will not do that?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, we could, but we think it would not be wise to do so.

Mr. BERGERON. Why should the farmers of Canada suffer for the sake of giving England a preference of about 33 per cent?

Mr. FISHER. Would my hon. friend do that?

Mr. BERGERON. Yes, I would. I do not think that the preference is worth anything at all.

Mr. FIELDING. To whom?

Mr. BERGERON. To Canada.

Mr. LENNOX. Are we right in saying that the Minister of Agriculture did not take any action upon the resolution of this House?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. The Minister of Finance asks what we would do. I think the farmers of Canada ought to be represented in this House in a peculiar and especial way. They are the backbone of the institutions of this country, and the Committee on Agriculture ought to be a peculiarly important committee. If there is any committee of this House which is entitled to great respect it is the Committee on Agriculture. I understand that that committee passed a unanimous resolution upon this point. They represented as thoroughly and completely as they can be represented the farmers of Canada. I have great respect for the Minister of Agriculture, but I think he is assuming a great deal when he——

Mr. D. ROSS. I rise to a point of order. Is this discussion pertinent to a vote of $500 for immigration?

Mr. LENNOX. I think the Minister of Agriculture is taking on himself a great deal when he assumes that he can veto——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. LENNOX—a resolution of the Committee on Agriculture and the action of this House. When the Minister of Finance asks what could have been done it is clear that the Minister of Agriculture could have laid those two resolutions before the House of Commons in England.

Mr. McKENZIE. I would like to say a word in regard to this matter as I was responsible for bringing the matter before the Committee on Agriculture. It is generally known that the farmers are anxious to have the embargo removed. We know the attitude of the British government, and we are very sorry that they have taken that attitude, but I may say that I have found the government always willing to take every step in their power to bring the matter before the British government. I would call the attention of the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong), who is criticising the Minister of Agriculture so severely, to the fact that one of the latest attempts on the part of the government to impress this matter upon the British government was when the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) called the attention of the imperial conference and of the British government especially to the fact that the embargo was maintained as against Canadian cattle, and intimated to the British government that it would be regarded by the people of Canada as a very gracious act on their part if that embargo were removed. Still I hope that the matter will work its own remedy and that we will soon have the British people in greater numbers demanding that the embargo be removed in order that they may get relief from the exorbitant prices that are being demanded for meat in that country at present.

Mr. BARR. It seems to me that the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture who brought that resolution before the House urging that the Minister of Agriculture should take action is very easily pleased. We find the chairman of the committee, after being snubbed by the Minister of Agriculture and after being treated not with the courtesy, that he should be treated with, coming here and defending the minister who has told us that he would not even forward that resolution to England. I submit that if England is going to treat us in the way she has done over this embargo it is time that we should look after our own interests. If we cannot get justice done then we can look after ourselves, and probably we will find that the preferential duty is not to the advantage of Canada. If England is not going to give full consideration to her colonies then the time may come when Canada may have to take action. The least the Minister of Agriculture could have done would have been to forward that resolution to England. We all know the time was when we were told that if there was a reform government in power in England they would have so much consideration for the reform government in Canada that they would remove the embargo. But now that the reformers are in power in England this government is afraid to embarrass them, and so the Minister of Agriculture would not forward the resolution which expressed the wishes of all the farmers of the Dominion of Canada. I am surprised that the chairman of the Agriculture Committee who was so bold when he was in the committee, should be found to-day defending the course of the minister. I can tell him and I can tell the minister that the farmers of this country will not stand being humbugged and treated discourteously.

Mr. CHRISTIE. It would appear to me from the standpoint of the farmer, that the Minister of Agriculture has treated this matter very lightly. There is nothing so detrimental to the interests of the farmers of Ontario, and of the Dominion generally, as this embargo on our cattle in the English market. There is an agitation in Great Britain among the live stock people demanding the removal of that embargo, and I think the Canadian government should extend some assistance to the men in England who are trying to benefit us in this respect. The day is past for growing wheat profitably in Ontario, and so we have to direct our attention to the raising of cattle and sheep. Our cattle are under embargo in England and recently there has been an embargo of 30 days put on Canadian sheep going into the United States. All this simply means that the Canadian farmers cannot any longer profitably raise sheep, with wool at 7 or 8 cents a pound and an

embargo of 30 days on these animals entering the United States which was our only market for sheep. Consequently, the Ontario farmers have only the dairy industry left to them. I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture what we may expect in the future with reference to those matters I have mentioned ?

Mr. FISHER. The hon. member (Mr. Christie) is not more anxious then I am to have the embargo on Canadian cattle entering the English market removed. There is no excuse whatever for that embargo. I have made the strongest possible representations to the British government, they have several times replied that they cannot entertain the proposal, that they would not entertain the proposal. That reply has not only been given to me as Minister of Agriculture for Canada, but it has been reiterated over and over again to the different bodies in Great Britain who have demanded the repeal of the embargo. I trust the agitation in England will succeed. Nobody would be more glad than I if it did, but I am sorry to say that all the indications are that for a number of years yet it will not succeed. We have placed our arguments forcibly and vigorously and completely before the British government and I do not believe that reiterating and reiterating them will accomplish any good purpose. If hon. gentlemen opposite can tell me anything that will accomplish our object I will be glad to consider it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. That being the case why did the minister ignore the resolution of the agriculture committee and of the House and refuse to send it to England.

Mr. FISHER. I said I was ready to do anything that I thought would accomplish any good result.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. It does not depend on what you think.

Mr. FISHER. I do not see any use in beating the air with idle threats. I know that the people in England who are agitating there have had great hopes but that time and again these hopes have been dashed to the ground.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. They had no help from Canada.

Mr. FISHER. They had every help from Canada. They have the papers and the documents which have been placed before the British government and these documents have been used in argument by their representatives in parliament. Is it likely that we will accomplish what they, in England, cannot accomplish ? Is there any use for us to beat the air with mere reiteration of the arguments we have advanced time and again. I am quite ready at any time to aid the agitation in England but I think action on our part in the present juncture would be futile. Suppose the English people were to represent to the parliament of Canada that we must do something which we think to be detrimental to Canada but which they would think would be advantageous to England, do you think they would be likely to succeed ? I think it would be looked upon by us as an impertinent interference in matters of domestic concern ; and I do not want to put myself or the Dominion of Canada in a position to be snubbed. We have come pretty near being snubbed in regard to it already. I do not want to get entirely to the point of being snubbed.

Mr. CHRISTIE. The majority of the farmers in the province of Ontario are breeders of live stock, and there is a splendid market in Great Britain for pure bred live stock. Could not the hon. minister make an effort to have our live stock tested and allowed to be sold over there without being killed at the port of entry ?

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend surely knows that the diseases against which the embargo exists are pleuro-pneumonia and foot and mouth disease, and there is no test against these diseases.

Mr. FOWLER. This seems to be an awful indictment against the Minister of Agriculture on the part of a number of distinguished agriculturists such as the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) and the hon. member for Dufferin (Mr. Barr), and an awful confession of impotence on the part of the minister. He says that it is impossible for him to do anything in this matter. I supposed, from the experience we have had of the hon. Minister of Agriculture, that nothing was impossible to him. He seems to be unfortunate in his own department ; but when he took charge of the Department of Militia in the absence of the minister of that department, he was able to do wonderful things—he dismissed summarily one of the best officers that ever came to this country from Great Britain. But he does not seem to have influence enough with the British government, though his friends are in power there, to get this little embargo removed. I do not think he does himself justice. When he became Minister of Agriculture, we thought we had at last an ideal minister for that department, a horny handed son of toil who knew what it was to plough and sow and reap, and we thought our agricultural interests would be well attended to ; the only thing he has done to advance agriculture has been to teach the farmers' wives how to fatten chickens and how to kill them. Of course, I admit that the Prime Minister has to some extent tied his hands, because he told the people of England that the trade preference was given to them without any expectation of re-

ward, and therefore it is that the suggestion of the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) can scarcely be acted on by the Minister of Agriculture. I am sorry that the minister is not able to do more for the farming class than he has done; I am sorry that he is only able to get a paltry half million for the farmer, while the Minister of Militia, with the strong influence which he has over this government, is able to get six and a half millions for the soldiers.

Mr. FISHER. I am trying to make up for it by getting more now.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to ask the Minister of Agriculture why he allowed the report of the Committee on Agriculture to be adopted. That committee met and formulated and passed this resolution, which was reported to this House and adopted by this House. The Minister of Agriculture says that the Committee on Agriculture know nothing about it, and that the members of this House who adopted that report know nothing about it. Why did the hon. minister place the committee and this House in that position ? Why did he not rise and say that the report could not be adopted? If the chairman of the committee had the interests of the agriculturists at heart, he would tender his resignation or else call the committee together and pass a vote of censure on the minister for turning down its report.

Mr. CHRISTIE. I want to ask the minister to give us the new regulations in reference to the importation of thoroughbred stock from the United States into Canada.

Mr. FISHER. I cannot give my hon. friend that information off-hand ; but I will get it and send it to him. Regarding the quarantine placed upon Canadian sheep going into the United States we received notice of that two or three weeks ago, and we immediately entered into communication with the department at Washington, the conclusion of which has not yet been reached, so that I cannot give any detailed information with regard to it. I can only say that our understanding is that that quarantine was put on in consequence of some scabby sheep having been found in the United States, which were believed to have been brought in from Canada. We have been investigating the matter to see just what the facts are in regard to it. I have not yet seen a report on that incident; but I hope shortly to be able to ferret out the whole thing and to give the information. We are also in communication with the authorities at Washington to see in what way we can get this quarantine removed.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. After the statement of the minister, I think I should put on

'Hansard' a couple of letters. This letter is from the High Commissioner, dated 11th October, 1905 :

I beg to send you copy of letter dated August 7 (with an enclosure) which I have received from the National Association of Meat Traders on the subject of the Canadian cattle embargo. The general secretary of the federation also came to see me recently on the same subject, when I explained to him the attitude of the Canadian government in relation to the question, as outlined in the correspondence which I have had the pleasure of having with you. I understand also that there will be a general conference of the various interests concerned in the removal of the embargo on November 24 next at the Westminster Palace Hotel, when the question will again be considered, and if you wish me to take any action in regard to it, I shall be much obliged if you will kindly favour me with your views.

Mr. Fisher wrote as follows:

My Dear Lord Strathcona,—Yours of October 11 has just come before me. I have been away for several weeks in the west and only private letters were forwarded to me. I note what you say in regard to the cattle embargo discussion. It seems to me in line with our opinion that we ought not to take any part in this, which has now reached the stage of a political discussion in England. I would not suggest your having anything to do with the conference. Of course, if matters there develop so as to make you decide it worth your while to do anything about it, I shall be quite satisfied to leave that to your judgment.

And so on. I have here a memorial from the National Federation of the Meat Trader's Association which I might read for the benefit of the Canadian people who take an interest in this question, but the time is too limited. I would like however to just call attention of the minister to another letter which he wrote Lord Strathcona on the 10th May, 1905. I shall only read a part of it because it is very lengthy.

I do not know Mr. M. Donald Munro, but it is well understood that the men who handle Canadian fat cattle, shipping them to England are not particular about the embargo being removed. The farmers of this country, however, are, and there is a general feeling in the country on the part of everybody that the embargo is unjust and reflects upon the health of our cattle. . . .

I feel that we Canadians ought not to enter at all into the controversy at present going on in England, and therefore I have made no reference to any of the articles which appeared in the press there or the statements which were made by public men, with the single exception of what appeared to be in the official utterances of the minister.

I might go on reading letter after letter to show that the minister, instead of coming out boldly on the question and taking an active interest in it, instead of putting forth his best efforts to have the cattle embargo removed, was devoting his attention to minor matters. I only wish I had time to go

on and show the futile part the minister has taken in this whole matter. If I had the time I could go on and show what little interest he has taken in a subject which is so vital to agricultural interests. Take his whole career during the past eleven years and you will find that instead of his paying attention to the development of that great cattle industry, he has been paying his attention to some of the other departments to the neglect of the greatest industry we have. When we look over the paltry bits of legislation he has brought in for the advantage as he deems it, of our agricultural industry, we cannot but be convinced that the time cannot come too soon when a different government will have control of the country and promote different legislation for the advancement of that great interest.

Mr. OWEN. I would like to ask if the cattle from any other country are allowed to enter England on more favourable terms than the cattle from Canada?

Mr. FISHER. The Canadian cattle have the greatest privileges except the cattle of the United States, which are treated on the same footing.

Exhibitions—further amount required, $175,000.

Mr. CROCKET. Does this include the grant for the Dominion exhibition?

Mr. FISHER. No, that is a special grant of $50,000 each year and that is in the main estimates.

Mr. CROCKET. When may we expect a decision regarding the Dominion exhibition grant for 1909 ?

Mr. FISHER. Soon after the close of the session.

Mr. CROCKET. I trust the minister will bear in mind the claims of Fredericton. The people of Fredericton will be much disappointed if that grant is not given the capital of New Brunswick which is now making preparations for the provincial exhibition of 1909. If the grant be given to any other place, that will kill the provincial exhibition to be held at Fredericton.

Mr. FISHER. There are several applications on which the government will have to decide.

Mr. CROCKET. But there is no doubt that grant goes to New Brunswick.

Mr. FISHER. New Brunswick and Saskatchewan are the only two provinces which have not received the grant. Saskatchewan is asking for it for 1910 and New Brunswick wants it for 1909.

Mr. BERGERON. How much money is expended altogether on exhibitions?

Mr. FISHER. There is an amount of $200,000 in the main estimates and there will be about $375,000 altogether for the two exhibitions this year. This is the first opportunity we have had during many years of exhibiting at the general exhibition at London, and I wish to make a special effort in view of the fact that this is an Anglo-French exhibition. We are very anxious to show what our French Canadians can do under the British flag as compared with the colonies of France under the French flag.

Mr. BERGERON. These exhibitions may be a good thing but there is something lacking somewhere. After the exhibition we had at Milan, there seemed to be no good result. I have seen some business men from Italy who were in Ottawa and they told me that when anybody in Italy wanted to know anything about Canada, they did not know where to apply, as there were no Canadian agencies there. Some company in Italy wanted a lot of railway ties and probably would have bought a very large quantity in Canada if they had known where to apply for them. As I said when this question first came before parliament, if, after each exhibition is over, a Canadian agent should remain with a small exhibit of some of the Canadian staples, it would do more good. We have been perambulating our goods all over the world at exhibitions, but the time has come when agencies should be established. The former government established agencies in Australia, and these have been continued by the present government. This shows that the system is an advantageous one.

Mr. FISHER. There is no doubt that there is great force in the suggestion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron). It is true that the impression made by these exhibitions is a strong one, but, naturally, if there is no continuance of work that impression fades. I do not know that I would be justified, in connection with my department, in asking for a vote of money for a continuance of the work. I think that should be in the Department of Trade and Commerce.

Mr. STAPLES. When will the minister have these regulations printed regarding the importation of thoroughbred stock from the United States? I believe these are the outcome of the Dominion Livestock Convention held last winter, and so there has been time to have these regulations printed and circulated. I know that the minister (Mr. Fisher) is a busy man. He has been for some time attending to the Civil Service Bill ; then he was down in Stanstead trying to convince the people there that there was no bar in the House of Commons. And so on. I think he should come back to his department and try to attend to affairs for the farmers.

Mr. FISHER. I do not seem to have appreciated my own capacity. The hon.

gentleman (Mr. Staples) pays me a compliment, which I accept for what it is worth, and thank him accordingly. He has reproached me unfairly on this matter, because these regulations were passed by the Customs Department three or four weeks ago and were immediately made public.

Further amount required to encourage the production and use of superior seeds of farm crops and for the enforcement of the Seed Control Act, $18,000.

Mr. STAPLES. How is this money to be expended? There is nothing more important in the interests of agriculture than the production and distribution of good seed.

Mr. FISHER. I am glad to have the hon. gentleman's opinion of the work we are doing. We are increasing considerably the amount of money to the Seed Growers' Association, which is working well in the province of Manitoba, from which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Staples) comes. Last year we got out a book generally known as 'Farm Weeds,' for which there has been a most unprecedented demand all over the country. I am proposing to get out a second edition, for which a considerable part of this vote is to be spent.

Mr. FOWLER. Do you issue them free?

Mr. FISHER. Yes. But I am seriously considering whether a limited number, at any rate, ought not to be sold. We have been trying to get them into the hands of those generally interested and in a position to justify their being given this book.

Mr. HENDERSON. Has the minister any of these books on hand?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. I will be glad to get one, for I have a requisition for it from a correspondent. May I call upon the minister to-morrow?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Does this vote cover the amount spent in sending out samples of seed?

Mr. FISHER. No, that is provided for out of the experimental farm vote.

Mr. FOWLER. I think the size of those samples ought to be increased.

Mr. FISHER. They are larger now than they used to be.

Mr. FOWLER. Better make them larger still. The farmers in my district are pleased with these seed samples; there is only one fault that they find with them, and that is that the samples are not large enough. It takes a farmer so long to grow from these small samples a sufficient quantity of seed to use on his farm that the seed becomes run out before he gets enough.

Mr. FISHER.

Mr. FISHER. He can do it in two years, if he does it right.

Mr. FOWLER. In oats you ought to have at least a bushel.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOWLER. Why not? These lawyers, doctors and others about me here express surprise. But gentlemen who know about farming, as the Minister of Agriculture and I do, know that what I say is sound. There is no better way in which you could spend money than this—it is far better than giving it to the Minister of Militia to buy Ross rifles with. If the Minister of Agriculture does not feel that he can go the whole bushel that I suggest, he should send eight pounds instead of four.

Mr. FISHER. We send ten now.

Mr. FOWLER. Make it twenty.

Mr. STAPLES. The hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Herron) has brought up this question before now. Every year we on this side have tried to impress the minister with the necessity of increasing the quantity of grain sent as a sample. We carry on farming differently in Manitoba from the way it is carried on in the eastern provinces. When only a small quantity of seed is sent to a farmer it is almost impossible for him to keep it separate.

If a farmer has a bushel, or sufficient to sow an acre, then he is in a position to harvest that and keep it by itself, and when he comes to thresh it, it will not be mixed up with other kinds of grain. It would be better if the minister would send out this seed to fewer persons and send it in larger quantities. A farmer in a particular district would get sufficient to seed an acre or two, and then after a year he is in a position to supply his neighbours with that kind of seed. I am glad to hear that the minister is going to be more liberal in sending out the synopsis that he has published. Some time ago I called his attention to the necessity of placing these books in the hands of the various municipal councils throughout the country. Since then I have had a great many letters from the clerks of municipal councils in the province of Manitoba, and from reeves, asking that this book might be placed in the municipal offices, the same as the minister has been distributing them among the various school districts. I would ask him now if it is his intention to carry out that idea?

Mr. FISHER. We are trying to do that, or something similar, and that is the reason I am asking for this money.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I want to endorse the sentiments of the hon. member who has just spoken (Mr. Staples). We are spending a good deal of money in sending out

small samples, and I venture to say that from ninety per cent of all the small parcels the farmers of this country get no result. I know from personal experience, and the experience of farmers in my district, that the sample is too small, it becomes mixed in with other seed. If you sent out at least half a bushel of seed to fewer individuals, you would get some benefit.

Mr. BARR. This is one of the items that I think is very much too small. We have an item of $18,000 for the production and use of superior seeds, and for the enforcement of the Seeds Control Act. We might cut that item in two, and I would like to know what could be accomplished by $9,000 in encouraging the production and use of superior seeds of farm crops. The government should send out fewer seeds in sufficient quantity to enable the farmers to bring forth good seed. We know that even when good seed is sown on a farm for a number of years it deteriorates. If the government were to spend $100,000 in sending out larger quantities of seed, they would be doing the greatest possible benefit to the farmers. In my experience I have had great trouble in supplying the farmers who wrote to me asking for samples of seed. I received a number of letters asking for this seed, and I got two or three samples and could not get any more. The farmers are the most important class in this country, and this item should not be less than $100,000.

Mr. CHRISTIE. I want to endorse what has been said by the previous speakers. Some of our farmers have put together the four or five pounds each one of them received and got one farmer to sow it, so that they could get some result from it. If you sow only four pounds of seed you lose track of it, and it is of very little use. If it was sent out in larger quantities and to fewer people, it would produce far better results.

Further amount required for the administration and enforcement of the Meat and Canned Foods Act, $20,000.

Mr. MARSHALL. How many inspectors has the minister appointed?

Mr. FISHER. I have not yet appointed any for the canned fruits and vegetables. I expect to appoint two or three more just as soon as the season opens.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I would like to know how many inspectors the minister has under salary in carrying out the Meat Act, also what amount of money it is costing the country, and if that Act is being enforced in every constituency of this Dominion as it is in my own riding.

Mr. FISHER. I could not say the exact number of inspectors. There are somewhere between forty and fifty veterinary inspectors, and a number of them have assistants who are not deputies, who are men chosen as much as possible from the butcher class, to aid them in inspecting the actual slaughter. It is being enforced all over the country.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Would not local veterinarians look after this Act better than some of the inspectors the minister has appointed? We have some very efficient veterinarians in my district.

Mr. FISHER. We laid down the rule last year that men required to pass a special examination, and good veterinarians do not wish to leave their practice. We require a man to go into the work the year round. We give him a salary of $1,200 a year. Most of them are put into the factories and do not travel.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Are the inspectors required to be single men ?

Mr. FISHER. No. We do not like to keep an inspector too long in one factory. He is apt to get slack and become too friendly with the people who own the factory. He must be ready to pick up and go whenever required. The chief veterinary inspector says that when a man is married it is not easy for him to remove at a moment's notice.

Mr. CLEMENTS. There is an efficient veterinary surgeon in my city who would like to have been appointed an inspector but he was practically told there was no use of trying the examination because he was a married man.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. A large canner informed me the other day that he wished to dispose of five cars of waste and chop apples. The bulk of this product goes to Germany where there is 7-10 of a cent surtax. The price he can get on these refuse apples is 1 1-5 cents and if you take 7-10 off 1 1-5 you will see what the surtax is doing for the apple man.

Mr. MARSHALL. Is it the intention of the minister to appoint sufficient inspectors to inspect the canned goods factories this season ?

Mr. FISHER. We did not undertake to inspect the fruit and vegetable factories in the same way we do the meat factories. I do not think we will be able to undertake the inspection of all the factories this year.

Mr. MARSHALL. It would be worth while to do it this season because the pack will soon be half over.

Further amount required for the development of the live stock industry, $20,000.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I was at the Experimental Farm recently and I want to compliment the department as far as the new building is concerned. But, the swine pens at the Experimental Farm are a disgrace to this country. If the minister would take some of this vote and build a proper pig-

gery out there he would be doing justice to his department and to the country.

Mr. CHRISTIE. I had the pleasure of visiting the farm and I must compliment the minister upon the fact that they had there some litters of pigs that are as fine as any I ever saw. But, I think that the Experimental Farm ought to have an ideal animal of all breeds. I think they should have an ideal pair of horses out there.

Mr. FISHER. There are some pretty good ones.

Mr. CHRISTIE. They should have ideal cows, both short horn and dairy cows. One of the largest farmers in North Ontario, a very prominent Liberal, was here and asked me to take him over to the farm. When I took him there he was very much disappointed with the stock that he saw. He said that he expected to see ideal animals He said: I have better animals in my own stables.

Mr. FISHER. What kind ?

Mr. CHRISTIE. Short horns.

Mr. FISHER. Beef short horns.

Mr. CHRISTIE. Yes. I think that at the Experimental Farm where there is so much money spent there should be ideal animals of all classes so that when farmers went there they could see what they should try to breed up to. I hope the minister will carry out that idea because I am satisfied that it is for that purpose that we keep the farm there. We are not keeping that farm for the purpose of raising common stock that every farmer can raise.

Mr. FISHER. I just take exception to this extent: My hon. friend is quite right in saying that we have no typical or ideal beef short horns there. The short horns we have are dairy short horns and I think my hon. friend will acknowledge that they are very fine specimens of the breed. The other breeds of dairy cows I think are ideal, each one of its kind. I have been about among the dairy herds of Canada and I venture to say there is not in existence such a herd of French Canadian dairy cows as there is at the farm. There is no better herd of Ayrshire and the Guernseys are a very fine lot. The dairy short horns would not come up to my hon. friend's ideal of beef short horns although they are very creditable as dairy animals. As far as horses are concerned I am surprised at my hon. friend's strictures. We have five or six teams of first-class horses, not, show Clydesdales, not the Clydesdales that go into the ring and take prizes, but first class working Clydesdales that will go through a large amount of work in a day. I do not think my hon. friend will find in his own county a barn full of working horses, not show horses, not stallions and mares kept for showing, but a barn full of working horses that will compare with our farm horses. I have been down through his county and I have seen finer show horses but not many teams of finer working horses. I would like to say to my hon. friend from West Kent (Mr. Clements) in regard to the piggeries that I have not been on the farm lately, but when I was there last I saw, without exception, the best lot of litters of young pigs that I ever saw in my life. At one time there were five sows with 72 or 73 pigs and they raised them all. My hon. friend is right in saying that the first part of the piggery that you see as you go in is not an ideal one, but I never saw a better place for wintering sows and keeping them in good order than that shed at the back of the piggery, and if I were going to build a piggery on my own farm I would build just such a place as that. I want to try to put up an inexpensive building there which will be a model for any ordinary farmer to build by. We find that pigs do better in comparatively cool and inexpensive buildings.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I mentioned in the House last year that I purchased some thoroughbreds at the experimental farm and they were a failure from the start to the finish. I would not like any other farmer to be led into the same trap as I was, because I lost one thousand dollars by the transaction if I lost a dollar.

Mr. BERGERON. This is an appropriate time to direct the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to a matter of considerable importance to breeders of horses in the province of Quebec. There is a provincial association which grants pedigrees for horses and there is also a federal association of the same kind. As the Minister of Agriculture knows the breed of French Canadian horses has pretty well disappeared, and the object of the provincial association is to improve and perpetuate it. A number of the farmers in the province complain that horses which have been granted a pedigree by the provincial association have been refused a pedigree by the Dominion association, and on this account great disappointment has been caused. The people who have made complaints to me were under the impression that some of our English friends wished to discriminate against the French Canadian breed of horses.

Mr. FISHER. I think I can explain the whole thing to my hon. friend. For a number of years in different parts of Canada there were local stud books and herd books kept for registering the pedigree of animals, but this system was found to be detrimental to the breeders of live stock, because a pedigree issued in Quebec would not be recognized in Ontario or the other provinces, and a pedigree issued in Ontario

would, in the same way, not be recognized outside of that province. Representatives of the breeders and live stock throughout the Dominion held a convention in Ottawa and they asked the Department of Agriculture to establish national stud books and herd books. After a great deal of discussion and consideration, I agreed to allow the National Live Stock Association to establish records and books at Ottawa, and I gave them office room in the department. It was agreed that the department should affix the Dominion stamp to the certificates they issued declaring that these records were accepted by the Department of Agriculture. At first all the breeders did not fall in with the arrangement, but one after another they have asked to be included in these national records, and among others the French Canadian Horse Breeders' Association. I discussed the matter with the breeders of French Canadian horses and we found that a great many animals had been recorded which were not French Canadian at all, and had no affinity with the French Canadian breed. In the province of Quebec the French Canadian breed of horses used to be well known, but unfortunately it has almost disappeared and there are very few pure bred animals left. In their anxiety to get a pedigree for their horses a number of French Canadian farmers had them registered in the Quebec book. Some of them were no more French Canadian horses than would be an English thoroughbred. Some of them were actually registered in other stud books as being standard bred trotters, some of them even as Clydesdales or English thoroughbreds. When the breeders of French Canadian horses asked to have the seal of the department attached to the pedigrees in this book, of course, we could not do it under these circumstances.

An hon. MEMBER. Carried.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend must have a little patience. This is a matter in which the farmers of Quebec are greatly interested, and which is of the utmost importance to them.

Mr. BERGERON. The minister is answering a question which I put to him, and I am anxious to get the information.

Mr. FISHER. I am answering the question in all courtesy, and I hope hon. gentlemen will have patience.

Mr. BERGERON. It is a very important matter.

Mr. FISHER. It is very important to the breeders in the province of Quebec. I met the representatives of the French Canadian Horse Breeders' Association and I told them that if they would appoint two officers of their association I would appoint two officers to represent the department, and these gentlemen would examine the French Canadian registered horses and decide whether the animals were typical of the breed and deserving of being registered.

Mr. BERGERON. What if they did not agree?

Mr. FISHER. Then they had to call in a fifth man who is generally the chief veterinary officer of the department, and who is well up in the work. As a matter of fact there has been no disagreement at all. In every case the representatives of the French Canadian horse breeders have endorsed the decision of the committee. The result is that to-day we are establishing at Ottawa a really representative national record of the French Canadian breed of horses. The animals which are registered in the national herd book will be very much more valuable and creditable to the French Canadian breed of horses than the animals registered in the old way could possibly be. The French Canadian Horse Breeders' Association at their annual meeting asked us to do that, we agreed to do it, they appointed their own representatives, and their representatives are doing the work.

Mr. BERGERON. Then some of these farmers must have been fooled by the provincial association, and have been paying for information which is not correct. There is certainly something wrong about it.

Mr. FISHER. There is nothing wrong, but as a matter of fact they are not keeping up the book at Quebec, and it cannot be accepted as a national book.

Mr. CHRISTIE. I am glad to hear that they are not keeping up the local book in the province of Quebec, because it was against the interest of the breeders. Any horse registered in the national herd book at Ottawa can be shipped to any point in Canada for half fare. That regulation has been obtained by the live-stock people. All these local associations have died out, and I am surprised to hear that an attempt is being made to keep up one in the province of Quebec, because the whole object of the breeders is to raise the standard of all breeds of animals, and that cannot be done unless they are recorded in the national herd book.

Mr. R. N. WALSH. How long does the minister intend to continue this system of registration, because you cannot improve the breed unless you record the ancestor. You will have to draw the line at some point, or a horse will not be regarded as of the French Canadian breed.

Mr. FISHER. We shall have to close the book at some point. That is a matter that will have to be arranged with the

breeders. I could not undertake to do it myself.

Mr. FOWLER. Does the same remark apply to the French Canadian cow as to pedigree ?

Mr. FISHER. That breed has been long well established and the herd book is accepted as a national record.

Mr. FOWLER. Have you a national herd book ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes. I may say that the expenses in connection with this herd book are increasing all the time. This year I am going to publish the first volume of records of French Canadian cattle that has been published.

Mr. W. JACKSON. There has been some discussion to-night in reference to the embargo. That is a question we cannot settle in the way we would, as we have to deal with a country outside of our own. I am not in favour, and I do not think the average farmer in Canada is in favour, of having our beef manufactured in England. We should finish the beef in Canada, and it seems to me that if we had regulations so that when our finished cattle went to England they could be retained there for a time before being slaughtered, it would be a great advantage; because cattle after crossing the ocean, and perhaps having a bad voyage, are not in fit shape to be slaughtered on arrival. Our live-stock goes to Great Britain under the same regulations as live-stock from the United States. Three or four years ago the British government prohibited cattle from going from a certain part of the United States. It was during the winter, when our cattle were practically barred from going to England, because they were shipped via the short line, which passes through the State of Maine, and we were prohibited from using that road, which practically meant that we had not that outlet for our stock. But bad as this embargo is, the agriculturist of this country must be vigilant to retain the privilege we have in the old country to-day. Our cattle are going through the United States to the British market and American cattle are going through Canada to the British market; and if there is any ground, however frail it may be, for the British agriculturist to say, the cattle from Canada and the United States are diseased, we shall find our cattle placed on the same footing as the Argentine cattle. Therefore we must be watchful of the privilege we have in getting our cattle into Great Britain in the way we do. But there is one thing which we have under our own control, and that is the right and privilege of improving our beef producing cattle. It is a regrettable thing to find in the weekly reports of the British market that our Canadian cattle are quoted at from a half cent to a cent a pound lower than American cattle. The result is that the British agriculturist who desires to seek a home outside of England will conclude that there is something wrong with the agricultural area of Canada, and will prefer to go to the United States; whereas as a matter of fact the conditions in Canada are such that we can produce better beef than they do in the United States. We can go to the United States fat stock shows and take all the first prizes.

The trouble with our cattle is they are not uniform. Our agriculturists look with pride to the stand our cheese has taken in the old country. Is it not in their interest that our cheese should be rated there as high as it is? If that be the case with cheese, it is more so in the case of cattle. It is highly desirable that our cattle should enjoy the same high standard. While our Agricultural Department has not possibly given too much attention to the cheese producing breeds of cattle, they have not given the attention they should have to the beef producers. We are losing millions of dollars every year through not producing higher grades of beef cattle. I have watched some of the experiments on the farm, perhaps more particularly since I have been in this House, and I must say that the last report of that department has been more to my taste and fancy than any of the previous ones. Our farmers are not as well convinced as they should be that they are losing money by feeding second-class grades instead of first-class stock, and I would like to ask the minister what he is doing in his department to improve the beef producing of cattle in Canada.

Mr. FISHER. One of the first things we undertook to do was to work in connection with the administration of the different fairs throughout the country and endeavoured to get a definite line of prizes and a definite and uniform system of judging. For that purpose we have sent out judges—not all of the officers of the department—to different fairs and we pay the travelling expenses of these men. The result has been a great improvement in the quality of judging. We have gone further in making these judges give their reasons verbally in the ring for their decisions so that the competitors will understand why one animal is so much better than another. That has a very good educative effect, and we have been very much gratified to find that an increasing number of exhibitions all over the country are asking for these expert judges. The extent to which they have done that, shows the value of the work. We have also had a system by which we have aided in the sales of thoroughbred bulls. Where the associations undertake to have a sale of thoroughbred bulls, we sometimes send an expert to aid in selecting the bulls and in other cases give small amounts to these

associations to assist them in carrying on the sales, by means of which a superior class of male animals has been distributed. Not always the highest class because we cannot as a rule have these sold at auction as the breeders of the choicest animals prefer to sell by private sale; but still we have been able by these means to assist in the introduction of a better breed of animals to be utilized for the improvement of the common cattle and in that way raise the quality of the stock. For instance in this particular neighbourhood of Ottawa, some five or six years ago it was almost impossible for a farm manager to buy fifty or sixty steers in the fall for the purpose of fattening, but to-day he has no difficulty getting them in this neighbourhood, thus showing an improvement in the live stock, and that is true of almost every part of Canada.

Mr. WILLIAM JACKSON. It seems to me that if we would distribute more stock from the farm, that would have a good effect. If you would distribute half a dozen of stock animals of the kind I speak of, our farmers would soon become awake to the fact that it is high time for them to stop breeding from scrub. I am in earnest in this matter. I cannot help but think that our farmers should be roused up in some positive way to appreciate the amount they are losing by not producing better beef. I have no fault to find with the department for what it has done in the promotion of the butter and cheese business, but the very fact that this has been boomed so much has been detrimental to our beef producing herds. I spoke of this matter last year and I know, as a man who has been dabbling in that business all my life, that it is high time we changed our methods. Go to Montreal or Toronto or the old county and you will find some good Canadian bullocks there, but they are not at all uniform. You find just the reverse in the case of American cattle which are exported, and that is the reason why our cattle are not sought after so much as the American.

Mr. R. N. WALSH. Does the department propose continuing the present system of testing for tuberculosis? Our cattle intended for export are tested while that test is not necessary in the case of those which remain at home. This interferes considerably with trade, and I do not see why we should insist on our cattle being tested before being sold. I have read the opinion of some officials of the department to the effect that there is no danger in using the milk of a tubercular cow. Why then should we, by applying this test, interfere with our export trade ? I have in mind a case in which the export of Holsteins to South Africa was prevented because we insisted on this test.

Mr. FISHER. We have to test them in order to get them into the other country. That is why they are tested. This whole question of testing for tuberculosis is one of the most complicated I have ever had to deal with, and I must confess I do not think we have any of us yet reached a conclusion with regard to it.

Mr. R. N. WALSH. In this case men who are buying did not wish the test. In South Africa they have more disease in a square mile than we have the country over. The test of the cattle was insisted on here.

Mr. FISHER. I will inquire into that.

Mr. FIELDING. I would call the attention of the committee to the civil government items, beginning on the first page, and I propose to take these up in their order so far as the ministers are present.

Civil government—Privy Council office—to increase the salary of F. K. Bennetts, assistant clerk of the Privy Council, from April 1, 1908, $400.

Mr. FIELDING. I am informed by the Prime Minister that that may be struck out. Arrangements will be made under the law which will meet the case of this gentleman. I move that that be struck out.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. WARD. As it is understood that on any of these items any matter could be discussed, I desire to bring up a matter—

Mr. TAYLOR. There is another item of the Justice Department further on, is there not?

Mr. WARD. I do not want delay. I regret very much at this early hour of the morning, and this late stage of the session, that I should feel obliged to discuss any matter of importance, but as the question I wish to discuss relates to the imprisonment of a man who, in the opinion of a great many of his friends, has been unjustly deprived of his liberty, I think it is of sufficient importance to devote a few moments to the consideration of it. Frederick Blunden, who lived in the neighbourhood of Fort Macleod, was tried there on November 22nd, 1904, and convicted of stealing two steers, and has been imprisoned at Macleod and Edmonton for three years and a half. Ever since his incarceration he has been appealing to the Department of Justice for a new trial. He objected to appeal for executive clemency, because he insisted that he was entirely innocent of the charge upon which he was convicted, and it would not answer his ends to be pardoned or allowed out on ticket-of-leave. These appeals have come, as the papers have shown, at intervals ever since his incarceration. The one answer has been sent to him—that nothing could be done. Now, it would be necessary to enter shortly into the evidence given at that trial in order to show why I differ, in some sense, from the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) and his predecessor. I do so with a great deal

of diffidence, because, with my limited experience, it hardly becomes me to differ with gentlemen who have had so much experience in these matters. The trial took place before Mr. Justice Harvey at Fort Macleod. The only evidence that was given against Blunden was that of Richard Train, who was caught by the Northwest Mounted Police killing these two cattle. Train's explanation of the matter at the time the mounted police came down upon him was that he had purchased the cattle two months before from a man he did not know. He repeated that on two occasions to the two sergeants of police, and he also said that if he had made a mistake he was quite willing to pay for the steers. Train was put in jail at Fort Macleod and lay there twenty-eight days before he made any charge against Blunden. Then, according to the evidence which is under my hand, he stated that he made this charge to save himself and by the advice of his 'agent'—I suppose he means his solicitor. This evidence of Train was contradicted in one very important particular by one of his own hired men. I might go back for a moment to explain that the story told by Train at the trial was that on Sunday evening, four days before he killed the cattle, Blunden took tea with him in the presence of his two hired men. During the course of the meal Blunden said he had one steer to sell. After eating tea, Train says, they went out together behind the barn, and Blunden pointed out in the bunch of cattle, from 100 to 200—Train said he would not swear there were not 200—these two steers. Train admits that he was not within fifty yards of the cattle, and says that Blunden rode down on his horse and pointed out two cattle in the bunch as cattle which he was willing to sell. Train admitted that it was dusk and almost dark. It seemed absurd to think that a man could distinguish a couple of cattle in a bunch of 200 when he was fifty yards away. The contradictioin to this statement is in the evidence of Lewis Albert Carr. His evidence showed clearly that he was trying to screen Train. His evidence, as given at page 75, showed that he was at Train's on the 11th September, the day this is said to have taken place. Then, at page 76:

Q. After supper what did he (Blunden) do?—A. He got up and went out.

Q. Did you see him after that?—A. I saw him leave the house; then I went out and went into the tent and did not see any more of him.

Q. You mean Blunden went out before you did or after?—A. Before I did.

Cross-examined by Mr. Nolan:

A. He turned his horse in the direction of his own house and I went into the tent and saw no more of him.

Q. As a matter of fact Blunden got on his horse and rode home, come now, tell the truth, didn't he get on his horse and ride home?—A. Yes.

Q. He went away leaving your man Train behind?—A. I do not know what became of him. I do not know what became of him after that.

So, although Train swears that Blunden went down and showed him these cattle, after tea, Train's own man swears that Blunden got on his horse and went directly towards his home. Blunden also swears in his evidence that during tea time he told Train that he had one small steer calf to sell. This same man Carr confirms the statement of Train made at tea. Now, Blunden, in his evidence, absolutely denies that he ever sold a hoof of any kind to this man Train. So he was convicted on the unsupported and really contradicted testimony of this man Train, who, as he states in his evidence, made a charge 28 days after he was in jail in order to save himself. Now, with regard to Train, I have here the proof of his conviction in Scotland of perjury a short time before he came to this country. In order to show the character of the man whose evidence convicted Blunden, I wish to read the charges upon which he was convicted in Scotland:

Richard Train, prisoner in the prison of Greenock, the charges against you are (1) that a petition for sequestration of your estates having been presented on October 26, 1898, you did, at a meeting of your creditors within four months next before such presentation, namely, on October 24, 1898, within the White Hart Hotel, Campbelltown, attempt to account for part of your property being £1,447 of money, by stating falsely that you had lost it between St. Enoch station, Glasgow, on the evening of Otober 12, 1898, and a house in Ayr, which you did not describe more particularly, on the morning of October 13, 1898, in contravention of the Debtors' (Scotland) Act, 1880, section 13b, 2.

This is also a part of the charge;

And a petition for the sequestration of your estates having been presented on October 26, 1898, you did, time and place last above libelled, attempt to account for part of your property, being £1,447 of money, by stating falsely that you had lost it between St. Enoch station, Glasgow, on the evening of October 12, 1898, and a house in Ayr, which you did not describe more particularly.

This is the letter from the sheriff's officer at Campbelltown, addressed to Charles Blunden:

Sheriff Wallace has asked me to reply to your letter of 22nd ultimo, and to send you the inclosed copy of the indictment against this person, who was tried at the Glasgow circuit court of judiciary before Lord Kincairney, in February, 1899, and was sentenced to six months imprisonment. He was found guilty on the first and third charges only.

I read that indictment to show the character of the man upon whose unsupported

and contradicted evidence Blunden was convicted. He did not ask for pardon or for clemency of any kind, but simply that he should be allowed a new trial under section 1022 of the Criminal Code. The Minister of Justice objects to that section for the reason, as he has stated to me personally, that that section should not be in the Act. That is not the position the Minister of Justice should take because it is in the Act, and I believe there is full power for the minister to take cognizance of the doubt which must exist in his mind with regard to this case, and to give a new trial to this man. I will read that section in order that the committee may know exactly upon what I base my opinion.

If upon any application for the mercy of the Crown on behalf of any person convicted of an indictable offence, the Minister of Justice entertains a doubt whether such person ought to have been convicted, he may, instead of advising His Majesty to remit or commute the sentence, after such inquiry as he thinks proper, by an order in writing direct a new trial at such time and before such court as he may think proper.

Of course, I submit that there must be a doubt in the mind of the minister, but the correspondence so far shows that he would not admit that there was any doubt, and of course having no doubt, I am inclined to believe he was right in the course he has taken hitherto. But I would ask him to reconsider that matter in the light of this conviction of Train, which I should be glad to send over to him, although he has expressed to me personally that it is not his custom to grant a new trial except in cases of capital punishment. I think there is sufficient doubt in this case to justify the minister in the exercise of the power he has under that section. Now, I submitted the matter to the Deputy Minister of Justice some little time ago, and his reply referred me to section 989 of the Criminal Code, and in connection with that section I desire to make this statement: That at the trial there was not the slightest attempt made to show that the cattle in question, although they bore the mark of George Lane, of Calgary, were stolen. The Deputy Minister of Justice contends that under section 989, where the cattle bearing the brand of another person are found in some other person's possession, the onus of proof rests upon the party having possession of those cattle. This section says:

When a person is charged with theft of cattle, or with an offence under paragraph (a) or paragraph (b) of section 392 respecting cattle, possession by such person or by others in his employ or on his behalf of such cattle bearing such a brand or mark of which the person charged is not the registered owner, shall throw upon the accused the burden of proving that such cattle came lawfully into his possession or into the possession of such others in his employ or on his behalf, unless it appears that such possession by others in his employ or on his behalf was without his knowledge and without his authority, sanction or approval.

Now, that being the statute law it must be construed strictly, and I say there is not a bit of evidence to show that these cattle were ever in the possession of Blunden, or in the possession of any one in his employ or on his behalf. There was no effort made at the trial to show that these cattle were ever in his possession, and it rests upon the bare unsupported and contradicted statement of Train to show that they ever could possibly be in his possession.

Now, in addition to all these points I have raised, I want to draw attention to a largely signed petition which was sent into the Department of Justice a short time after this man was convicted. As this petition sets out a good many facts, and the opinion of the people in that part of the country that something should be done in this matter, I will read portions of it. It was signed by 240 residents about Macleod, and I want to call attention to the fact that the ranchers about Macleod and that portion of the country are the very people whom the judges were endeavouring to protect, no less than thirty ranchers signed this petition asking that this conviction of Blunden should be set aside. The petition is as follows:

His Excellency the Governor General in Council, Ottawa.

The petition of the undersigned settlers and residents of Macleod district humbly showeth:

1. That whereas A. F. Blunden of near the town of Macleod, farmer, was on or about November 23, A.D. 1904, convicted by the Hon. Horace Harvey, a judge of the Supreme Court, of having stolen two certain beef steers branded Y T, the property of George Lane, and was sentenced to a term of ten years with hard labour.

2. And whereas on the evening of September 15, 1904, one R. N. Train was caught in the act of killing the aforesaid two steers and was then and there arrested and held in custody for 28 days before he informed on Blunden for having stolen that said two steers by selling them to him; that at the time of the arrest of the said Train he informed the police that he had bought the said steers a month and a half previous from a man he did not know and that he, Train, had made a mistake and was willing to settle; and when on the preliminary hearing Train repeated that he had made a mistake.

3. That Train was tried for the act of killing the aforesaid steers but was acquitted and was called as a witness against Blunden, which said evidence had been given in his own behalf and was the evidence upon which the said Blunden was convicted.

4. That the said Train was tried again before the Hon. D. L. Scott on February 8, 1905, for stealing two other certain cattle and was convicted of the said crime. That on the said

trial Train again accused Blunden of having sold him the said two cattle and at the trial of Blunden it was made sufficiently clear that Train had falsely accused the said Blunden to the court, that the said Train was there convicted.

5. And whereas the said A. F. Blunden is a young man who has always held the respect and confidence of all who knew him, and your petitioners could not believe him guilty until so found on the evidence as given.

6. That your petitioners know the said R. N. Train and believe that he accused the said Blunden in order to save himself, and we are of the opinion that a great wrong and injury is being done to the said Blunden, and furthermore we believe that the said Train was about and in a measure did accuse one James Smith of near the said town of Macleod, farmer, of having sold the said two beef steers, but on account of action being taken by an advocate on behalf of Smith in reference to business relations between Train and Smith, Train withdrew the accusation and laid an information against Blunden which led to his arrest and conviction as aforesaid.

7. It is submitted that Blunden should not have been convicted as Train's evidence was all the proof against Blunden and that Train was no doubt actuated by the motive of self-protection.

Now, therefore, your petitioners humbly pray that the royal mercy be extended to the said A. F. Blunden, and that the sentence upon him be remitted.

I did not mention that Train was convicted before Judge Scott of stealing two other cattle and sentenced to five years imprisonment, whereas Judge Harvey sensentenced this man against whom, as I contend, there was no proof, to double that term. Although I have failed so far with my hon. friend the Minister of Justice to get any reconsideration of the case, I trust that he will be able to take a different view of the matter and to grant the prayer of the petition and of the man who has written to him so often upon this subject.

In regard to the conduct of Blunden in prison, I might mention that the reports of his conduct have been from the first satisfactory and that in the last two reports he is recommended strongly as a proper subject for the consideration of the department. I would ask the minister to consider whether this is not a proper case for intervention. This man, although he has been invited, as the correspondence will show, to apply for executive clemency, states that he wants a new trial in order to establish his innocence and to go out a free man instead of a man with a stigma upon him. Surely it is some evidence of the innocence of this man that he refuses to apply for executive clemency, states that he wants a new trial in order to establish his innocence and to go out a free man instead of a man with a stigma upon him. Surely it is some evidence of the innocence of this man that he refuses to apply for executive clemency. It is some evidence of his innocence that he desires, in view of the new evidence which has come to light, that he shall be given an opportunity of showing that he was not guilty in the first place. In that connection I have an affidavit here from a man named Samuel Nelson, of Granum, dated February 13 last, which states that on or before September 14, he met Richard N, Train, with his boy driving a bunch of cattle between Round lake and Rocky coulée. My hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Herron) can give you information as to where that is. They were going in the direction of Train's home, Rocky coulee. This was on the day before Train was discovered killing these cattle and the evidence shows clearly, in fact, Train says, that these cattle were driven in by his boy and his girl. It is stated in one of the letters to the minister that this boy and girl of Train's would swear, if they had an opportunity, that these cattle that they drove in were cattle that Blunden never had anything to do with. In the face of all the evidence that has been presented, I would simply ask the minister to reconsider his decision not to grant a new trial and if that cannot be done, why, I suppose the only thing for Blunden to do is to apply for executive clemency. The man, is far gone in consumption and it will be a blot upon the administration of the department if he should die during his term of imprisonment.

Mr. HERRON. I wish to say a word in reference to the matter. As the case has been so fully dealt with by my hon. friend from Durham (Mr. Ward) I shall not at this late hour attempt to cover the ground again. The hon. gentleman has dealt with certain circumstances which led up to the conviction of Blunden so fully that the committee will thoroughly understand the situation. I would like to say a word further in connection with what led up to the severity of the judge in this case. I am not going to complain of the action of the judge in any way. For about ten or twenty years cattle stealing had been going on practically all the time all over the country and it seemed impossible to convict any one of this offence. It assumed such proportions that the whole country was up in arms against it, all the respectable people of that country, the officers of the law and even the judges, but they did not like to undertake to prosecute men on the ordinary evidence as compared with evidence that might be used in similar cases in other parts of the country. For the last ten years this cattle stealing has been going on to such an extent that the judges have almost reversed the transaction and now they are in many cases over severe. They are ready to convict men who have been accused of cattle and horse stealing on very slight evidence, and sometimes for the sake of getting a conviction they will accept evidence that they would not ac-

cept under ordinary circumstances. That is what has led up to this. I have no doubt that while judges have leaned towards leniency they have on occasions gone to extremes the other way. There is no fault of course to be found with the judge in this case. I hope the Minister of Justice will give this matter his serious consideration and if he gives this man a new trial he will be acting in accordance with the opinion of 95 per cent of the respectable people in that country. A great many people believe that Blunden is an innocent man. From the evidence it will be seen that it is quite possible that the man Train endeavoured to save himself by giving false evidence against Blunden. I believe Blunden is an innocent man and I hope the minister will give him a new trial and an opportunity to establish his innocence.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. When the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Ward) moved some months ago for the papers in this matter I urged that in the interests of the prisoner himself the motion should not be pressed. I am still very strongly of opinion that cases of prisoners who are universally making application for clemency or reconsideration of their trials should not be made the subject of discussion in parliament. The file in this case consists of some 300 or 400 pages and my hon. friend (Mr. Ward) has examined it and is familiar with it. I have read it some time ago and I am somewhat familiar with the circumstances, but other members of the committee are necessarily not acquainted with the facts. I do not propose to discuss them because they certainly cannot be intelligently discussed within a few minutes. Each of these two men had his trial, before a different judge, and each judge came to a like conclusion with regard to the guilt of each man. Neither was tried with a jury but two different judges upon different occasions and upon facts that to some extent differed, was distinctly of opinion that each man was guilty of the offence charged. My hon. friend has seen the confidential report of the judge before whom Blunden was tried and the judge says that he was convinced the man was guilty upon his own cross-examination. I can only say that after considering and reading the testimony so far from being convinced of the prisoner's innocence I have arrived at an opposite conclusion. Of course it is impossible for one who simply reads the evidence, to come to any conclusion at all as satisfactory upon a pure question of fact as the judge can who sees and hears the witnesses. I can see no reason why the conclusion of an experienced judge upon such a question of fact ought not to be deemed as valuable as the conclusion of a jury, or ought to be interferred with any more lightly. With one breath it is said that this prisoner insists upon his innocence and does not ask clemency while with another it is urged that it is a case in which clemency ought to be exercised. The prisoner himself is not by any means as unbending as my hon. friend from Durham puts it, because he has distinctly asked for clemency.

Mr. WARD. Because he is dying of consumption.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. It is true he maintains his innocence, but he urges his release upon the ground that he has served a long imprisonment already and ought to be the subject of a pardon or of conditional release upon ticket of leave. That is something in regard to which discretion has to be exercised, and I express no other opinion than to say that in view of the circumstances of the case it has seemed to me up to this time at any rate that it would be premature to interfere, and I have been unable to see my way to recommend it. On the question of a new trial I want to say merely a word. I do not understand the law to be that there is resting upon the Minister of Justice any duty or any right to order a new trial because the man convicted asks for it. I think the statute does not mean anything of the sort. We are here with the British system of administering criminal justice under which we have absolutely no provision whatever for the giving of a new trial by the courts in criminal cases, on a question of fact. If there is a mistake in law it is a different thing; if there is a mistake on the part of the learned judge in laying down the law to the jury or if there is legal miscarriage there is provision for a new trial. Can it be that the same parliament which so deliberately declined to intrust to any court in the country the power to order a new trial in criminal cases on a question of fact, would vest that very power in the uncontrolled discretion of a Minister of Justice.

I think it would be extraordinary if that were the law. Now, if we look at the section in the Criminal Code which is relied on, I think it plainly does not mean anything of the sort. It says: If (not upon the application of the prisoner) but if, upon an application for the clemency of the Crown in favour of some person convicted of a crime the Minister of Justice feels doubt whether this person ought to have been found guilty, he may, instead of recommending His Majesty to pardon or commute the sentence, after such inquiry as he thinks fit, order in writing that a new trial be had, at such time and before such court as he thinks right. It is not upon an application which the prisoner makes as a matter of right or as a matter of indulgence that a new trial may be given to him, but it is upon an application for clemency. It never could have been intended that any man, by the device of asking for clemency, could in an indirect way ask for a new trial. It is something of the minister's own

motion which is contemplated by the statute. If the minister, in considering an application for clemency, feels so much doubt about the matter that he does not know what to do, then of his own accord he may take this course as a solution of the difficulty. What would you have if it were otherwise ? This is a provision not limited to capital cases or to important cases of any kind, or to cases involving long imprisonment, but extending to every criminal prosecution, every petty squabble before a magistrate ; and if the Minister of Justice has power to grant a new trial in all criminal cases upon being asked to do so, it means that one man is appointed in Ottawa to sit in review over the hundreds and thousands of criminal cases which are tried every day of the week and in all parts of this country from the Atlantic to the Pacific. I think the simple stating of the thing demonstrates that it never was intended by parliament. No court may do it in any province, but one man is to sit in Ottawa and do that work for the whole Dominion. It is an impossible thing on the face of it, because when you once started doing it, you would have an application after every conviction. But apart from that there is no machinery for it. Suppose the prosecutor refused to attend ; there is no means of bringing him before this august tribunal which is to sit on his cause. And how is the minister to proceed ? No indication is given in the statute. I can only say that having given, not this particular case, but various capital cases, the most anxious consideration, my mind is unalterably convinced that parliament never intended to vest such jurisdiction in the Minister of Justice. In capital cases it has come to be almost universal that the prisoner's counsel applies for a new trial under this section, insisting that there has been something wrong done by the jury, that there was some evidence which was not correct, that there is something new discovered ; and the counsel thinks it is a dreadful thing for the Minister of Justice to tell him, what I am saying to-night, that he does not believe that parliament ever intended to vest any such power in the Minister of Justice. I think it would be disastrous to the administration of criminal justice in this country if it were so. I may say that ever since this section has been on the statute-book, in only one instance has it been acted upon, and that was one in which there was a lamentable miscarriage of justice. How could it be otherwise ? Suppose that a prisoner was convicted and condemned after a long trial by a jury, and then on an application the Minister of Justice sets aside the verdict and orders a new trial. Every juryman at the new trial would know it. There would be the argument almost irresistible that this great potentate had felt that the verdict against the prisoner was so unjust that he would not allow it to stand, and ordered a new trial. It is tantamount to an instruction to the new jury to acquit. In the case mentioned it was so taken ; there was an acquittal in spite of clear evidence. With regard to the case of this prisoner, I can only say that it is plain that although the other man may afterwards have been convicted of a like offence, it does not establish the innocence of the man against whom he testified. On the contrary, as the judge in Train's case pointed out, it might well be on all the testimony that both men were guilty, and indeed that was his opinion. The Minister of Justice must treat these cases when they come before him as applications for clemency, as cases in which the prisoner was properly convicted. He looks about for extenuating circumstances, inquires into all the facts of the case, the man's previous character, and taking into account all these considerations he advises whether or not it is a case in which the sentence, though it is a proper one, can properly be interfered with ; and it is upon that view and upon that only that his recommendations to His Excellency must proceed.

Mr. HERRON. I wish to draw the attention of the minister to one statement he made which I think is not correct, that is with reference to the judge being one of experience or of long standing. The judge was just newly appointed to the bench, and this was one of his first trials. I do not reflect on the judge or on the sentence at all for that reason. I have never heard any complaint against the judge in regard to the way he conducted the court or in regard to the sentence he administered at the time ; but I have heard since allegations of innocence on behalf of the prisoner.

Mr. WARD. I want to refer to one statements made by the Minister of Justice, that is, with reference to Justice Harvey's report. I did not feel at liberty to mention that report at all, because my hon. friend showed it to me in confidence ; but as he has referred to it and has spoken of Justice Harvey having stated that he believed Blunden to be guilty, I desire to say that what Justice Harvey did state in regard to that was that Blunden's attempt to prove an alibi convinced him of his guilt. Now, he made no attempt whatever to prove an alibi at the trial. He did bring three witnesses to the preliminary examination before the magistrate, but not before Justice Harvey at all. It is quite true that he made the attempt there ; but he states in his evidence that he got his brother to write to the clergyman who had performed the christening upon which they based the alibi that he was at home on the day the christening was held. And he got his brother to write to this clergyman to find out if that christening did actually take place on the 4th. When he found from the clergyman's letter that it took place on the 11th, the day he

was said to be at Blunden's house, he withdrew the alibi at the trial and there was nothing before the justice at all. How the attempt to prove an alibi, under the circumstances, was evidence of his guilt is beyond me to understand.

Mr. BERGERON. All those names mentioned have increases of salary, and I imagine these are all the increases that the employees at Ottawa will get. Does that mean there are to be no increases for the permanent employees at Ottawa?

Mr. FIELDING. There is no provision for a general increase except under the operation of the Act. Quite a number will get increases though not immediately. The suggestion was first made in the report of the Civil Service Commission, and afterwards in the House, that an increase of 10 per cent would be given, but if we did that for the service at Ottawa and not outside, there would be widespread discontent. It would cost a good deal to do it, and we thought we could not adopt that suggestion at present.

Mr. BERGERON. Then, as a matter of fact, there will be no increase?

Mr. FIELDING. No such general increase.

Mr. FOWLER. I notice there has been a general increase along the line so far as the deputy ministers are concerned, and that certain officials are regarded now as deputy ministers and receive the increase, such as the clerk of the House and the librarians of parliament. With this I have no fault to find, but there is one officer who has not received an increase, and that is the gentleman who occupies the distinguished position of Speaker. He receives the same salary to-day as did the Speaker thirty or forty years ago. Whoever may be the incumbent of that position receives the salary of $4,000 in addition to his sessional indemnity. He not only performs the duties of Speaker, but is supposed to entertain members of parliament and to be in a position to entertain distinguished strangers who visit this Washington of the North, and I think it simply disgraceful that he should not have a considerable addition made to his salary. Take the Clerk of the House, a very interesting gentleman, as we all know, and one whom we are proud to reward by giving him a respectable salary, but the Speaker occupies a more prominent position. He is called on to perform duties in the way of entertaining which are expensive, and there is no special allowance made to him in that connection. I think that his salary should be at least equal to that of a minister of the crown. I would commend these remarks to the careful consideration of the ministry, and hope they will make up their minds to do him justice. The office is the highest in the gift of parliament and one to which consequently should be attached a respectable indemnity, more particularly when we know that the gentlemen who have occupied that position have been, almost without exception, men worthy of it.

Mr. BERGERON. I would like to emphasize what the hon. member from Kings (Mr. Fowler) has said. Many years ago when we were discussing the salaries of the officers of the House, somebody held that the Speaker only filled the position some three or four months in the year, and the rest of the time he could devote to his profession or other business. But when we have sessions such as this one, lasting eight months, it is hard to know what he can do outside of parliament, and, as my hon. friend has said, the salary of $4,000 to the occupant of that high position is ridiculous. There are other officials who should not be lost sight of. There was a report made by the Debates Committee presented to this House, but the adoption of which was not moved for reasons the Minister of Finance knows well. These men have worked for the last twenty-five years at the same salary as they are getting to-day. I mentioned the case to the right hon. the First Minister, and he led me to understand something would be done, if not in the way of adopting the report of the Debates Committee, by a report of the Committee on Internal Economy or in some other manner. I see nothing in the estimates for these gentlemen, and I understand there are to be no more. Either the Prime Minister has forgotten or my hon. friend will let us understand how that report can be acted on. We have the best staff of reporters which can be found in the country and perhaps on the continent. They are the least paid of any parliamentary staff of the kind in the world, and I think it would be only an act of justice to them and show a proper regard for the report of the Debates Committee, that that report should be acted upon.

Mr. FIELDING. It is expected before the session closes that some action will be taken with regard to the 'Hansard' staff. More than that I cannot say at present.

Department of Finance and Treasury Board —to pay H. T. Ross, Assistant Deputy Minister of Finance, a salary of $900 per annum as law clerk, from the date at which the Civil Service Act of the present session comes into force, $600.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the explanation of this item?

Mr. FIELDING. In the case of gentlemen belonging to the learned professions, we have considered that we should pay

them a somewhat higher salary. We are doing it in one or two instances. This gentleman is acting as assistant deputy at $3,600. If he were not a professional man, we would have to employ a law clerk, and this item is so worded that if at any time the Assistant Deputy Minister of Finance should not be a professional man, he will not get the benefit of the increase.

Department of Marine and Fisheries—to provide for the appointment of an assistant deputy minister at a salary of $3,600 per annum.

Mr. TAYLOR. Why do you want an Assistant Deputy of the Marine Department?

Mr. BRODEUR. There are two branches in the department and the work is very extensive. It was increased last year by the addition of some branches which belonged formerly to the Public Works Department, and it is necessary that we should have somebody to replace the deputy minister when he is absent. We have no secretary of the department.

Mr. FOWLER. Have you made the appointment yet?

Mr. BRODEUR. The appointment is practically made, but the order in council has not been passed.

Mr. FOWLER. Who is to be the incumbent?

Mr. BRODEUR. I could not say off-hand.

Mr. BERGERON. Mr. Desbarats is acting now?

Mr. BRODEUR. As deputy minister—yes.

Mr. J. D. REID. In what position are the two men who are under suspension? Are they receiving their salaries?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. TAYLOR. I see you intend to appoint a purchasing agent. Surely, one man could purchase, not for one department alone, but for the whole government.

Mr. BRODEUR. As our purchases are extensive, it has been considered that, instead of having this work in the hands of agents and others in different parts of the country, it should be concentrated in one hand so that goods may be bought for the whole department at one uniform price and the lowest attainable.

Mr. TAYLOR. One man could purchase for the whole government.

Mr. BRODEUR. It would be a big job.

Mr. J. D. REID. I suppose the purchasing agent will be given the patronage and told to confine himself to that?

Mr. BRODEUR. There are merchants whom we know to be good merchants, furnishing reliable goods at fair prices; and in the case of small purchases, he goes to these and they are bound to furnish the best goods at prices that are fair and reasonable.

Mr. BERGERON. Why should there be a patronage list?

Mr. BRODEUR. In some cases, we cannot ask for public tenders. In all cases where the purchases are over $5,000 we do call for tenders.

Mr. BERGERON. But if the department is to have a purchasing agent, why should not that purchasing agent buy according to his own judgment?

Mr. BRODEUR. Certainly. That is what he is going to do.

Mr. FOWLER. Have you a man in your eye for this position?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Merwin?

Mr. J. D. REID. The purchasing agent should be allowed to purchase wherever he wishes to. But I know what will happen—there will be no difference from the condition of affairs we have known. The minister speaks of calling for tenders for over $5,000, but there are many purchases that aggregate same $5,000 to $40,000, the purchases made in small quantities.

Mr. BRODEUR. From the same person?

Mr. J. D. REID. Yes. The minister shakes his head. He has many times questioned the accuracy of my statements, and yet I think I have established them all. I can take the Auditor General's Report and show where he has purchased for the use of the department $10,000 from one person in the course of a year and has paid retail prices. Now, what the department ought to do is to follow the course taken by the Department of Railways and Canals some years ago. Seeing that the same goods were purchased from time to time, tenders were asked for the supply of these goods for a year, and the different centres of departmental work were supplied as required. But I can foresee what will happen—the minister will give the purchasing agent a list of names of merchants, and the purchasing agent will buy from these at retail prices; he will purchase $5,000 worth at the same rates, that I would purchase $5 worth. The hon. gentleman knows that his deputy minister declared before Judge Cassels that had the purchases been made at wholesale rates, as he had urged should be done, $200,000 would have been saved under the present minister. I have no doubt that in the next three years another $200,000 will be lost.

Department of Public Works—to provide for the increase in salary of the chief clerk appointed to the position of Assistant Deputy

Minister of Public Works at $3,600 per annum, from April 1, 1908, $1,650.

Mr. BERGERON. Has the successor to Mr. Gelinas, the late secretary been appointed ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No appointment has yet been made.

Mr. BERGERON. Will it be made soon?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, very soon.

Board of Civil Service Examiners—to increase the salary of Dr. Thorburn, chairman of the Board of Civil Service Examiners, $400.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not think this amount should be increased. Dr. Thorburn is getting $500 for holding examinations, and that should pay him pretty well.

Mr. FIELDING. He held two examinations at special points in the west during this year.

Mr. FOWLER. There are cases far more deserving of an increase than this.

Mr. J. D. REID. You are increasing the salary of this man from $500 to $900, and yet there are a lot of poor men in the service who expected a little increase this session, and they are not going to get one cent.

Mr. FOWLER. In consequence of an explanation which the Clerk of the House has made to me, I withdraw any objection I had to this item.

Supreme Court of Canada—contingencies—additional amount required, $500.

Mr. BERGERON. I understand that there is a gentleman over in Paris buying books for the Supreme Court. I think he has bought about $35,000 worth of books in Paris. Who ordered those books?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. There is nobody in Paris, that I am aware of, buying books for us. There was a proposition made last year when a vote of $5,000 was taken, that the money should be handed to a dealer in books living in Montreal, and that he should get all the books he could for that amount. I declined to sanction such an arrangement, and the money was left to be expended under the supervision of the judges, by the registrar of the court. The books wanted were particularly in the line of French civil law, and the work of purchasing them was to be supervised by the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Girouard. But no one has been commissioned to make purchases in the old country, so far as I know.

Mr. BERGERON. The information I had was that orders had been given to buy books in Paris, and that instead of buying them in Paris one gentleman was buying old books around Montreal and having them bound again, and another one was in Paris to do the same work. It looked like a scheme.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I think probably if second-hand books were being purchased and rebound, it would be a proper expenditure. But that is being done as a matter of private enterprise.

Penitentiaries—St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary—to pay Keeper J. P. Forster for services as brickmaking instructor during the season of 1906, $100.

Mr. BERGERON. Why are you singling out Keeper Forster for extra pay?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. He was performing special services altogether outside of his ordinary work as keeper, and in regard to which, as the inspector has reported to me, very much more than that amount was saved to the government.

British Columbia penitentiary—to purchase additional land and buildings, $15,000.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. That is to purchase a small corner of property which we have coveted for a long time, but we have only now been able to obtain it. It is in the corner of the penitentiary reserve. The reserve is bounded by two streets, Cumberland street and Columbia street, and at the intersection of these two streets was the residence of a judge, and an adjoining lot which approached almost up to the penitentiary wall. It was very desirable that that property should be added to the reserve, and we are now able to secure it.

Mr. FOWLER. I would like to have an expression of opinion from the hon. Finance Minister as to the argument that I was putting forward regarding an increase of salary to the Speaker of the House.

Mr. FIELDING. I can only say that the suggestion of my hon. friend is deserving of serious consideration, but I do not feel at liberty to say anything more about it.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. TAYLOR. What business will be taken up to-day?

Mr. FIELDING. It is understood that the Election Bill will be taken up for part of the day, and that at an early hour the motion for Supply will be made to enable an hon. gentleman opposite to bring up a matter of which he has given notice.

Mr. BERGERON. At 11 o'clock ?

Mr. FIELDING. At 11 o'clock the Election Bill will be taken up, but if it

takes too much time we will adjourn the consideration of it and the House will be moved into Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 2.15 a.m., Tuesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, July 14, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

CRIMINAL CODE—AMENDMENT.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 212) to amend the Criminal Code, and to repeal section 415 of the Railway Act.

Mr. FOSTER. What is this Bill ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The object of this Bill is to make some clerical amendments in the Criminal Code in a number of instances in which mistakes, either of printing or of manuscript, have been discovered in the revision of the statutes. In addition, there are two new provisions, and the repeal of a section which has become effete. The new provisions will make slight changes in one of the clauses as it now stands relating to the use of trading stamps ; the other is making it an offence to obtain credit by false pretenses or by fraud. There is also a clause, as the title of the Bill indicates, repealing the section of the Railway Act which imposes what has been spoken of as the double liability upon railway men, the liability to prosecution other than under the provisions of the Criminal Code itself.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE PARDONING POWER.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to ask whether we are to receive the return ordered by the House early in the session with reference to acts of clemency and pardon exercised by the Justice Department or by the Governor General ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will take a note of it.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT—AMENDMENT.

House in committee on Bill (No. 115) to amend the Dominion Elections Act.—Mr. Aylesworth.

On section 1—voters' lists in unorganized territory, Manitoba polling divisions, &c.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. There are three variations which I would like to move in the wording of the clauses as printed. In the first subsection, line 9, I would move to substitute for the words :

During the months of August, September and October,

The following :

Between the first day of August and the fifteenth day of October.

In subsection 9 at line 27, I would move to strike out the words 'of such judges' and substitute the words 'county court judge resident in Winnipeg. I understand there are two county court judges of equal seniority, who were appointed on the same day, and to make it clear I propose this amendment :

At the end of subsection 9, I move to add the following words :

And such distribution shall be completed before the first day of October in each year.

Mr. BRISTOL. I wish to enter my protest against sections 1 to 8 inclusive of the proposed subsection 9a. These sections relate to the establishment under certain circumstances in unorganized territory in the province of Ontario and the province of Ontario alone, of voters' lists framed under the Act of the Dominion parliament. I think that such legislation is unwise, impolitic and unnecessary and is apt to cause friction and bad feeling between the great province of Ontario and the government of the Dominion of Canada. The present Dominion Elections Act, sections 1 to 9, deals with voters' lists for Dominion elections and by it, without any exception, the voters' lists for Dominion elections are framed by the various provinces concerned. But this legislation, so far as these sections are concerned, for the first time takes it out of the hands of the province of Ontario to frame voters' lists for unorganized territory in Ontario and under all circumstances and for all time that power is placed in the hands of the Dominion government.

The reasons advanced for this discrimination against Ontario, this slander on the administration and legislation of that province, are astonishing. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) at great length set out that there had been great irregularities in the making of the last voters' lists which would be effective at the present election and said there had been dissatisfaction, but he failed to bring before the House, and up to the present there has not been brought before the House, one tittle of evidence by any man that he was in any way disfranchised. The Prime Minister was not content to stand on that ground, and I think wisely, for the obvious reason that all the complaints advanced by the Minister of Justice occurred after this legislation had been introduced. What is the obvious inference from that ? Unquestionably every thinking man must feel that there was an inten-

tion, long before there were any facts to justify it, to discriminate against Ontario by unfair and unjust legislation in this respect. The Prime Minister has not sought to justify it on that ground but intimates that he wanted to help the hon. member for West Algoma (Mr. Boyce) who had some complaint in reference to the last election ; but if you examine that position you find that what the hon. member for West Algoma complained of was first, partisan enumerators, and, secondly, that only six days were given for appeal and no time for enumeration. Under the present legislation as brought in, there is practically the same power to give just as short a time, or less than was given four years ago, because in both cases the Act reads that the laws of the province are to be followed as far as possible. We heard the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) dilating at great length on the injustice of the Ontario government's present law and he said there should be at least sixty days for appeal. This Act does not provide anything of the kind ; it says the laws of the province are to be followed as far as possible, and so the same position is retained in this Act as existed four years ago. Thus if it was intended to give any fairer treatment to the candidates in these constituencies, the Act as proposed does not carry out that intention.

Let us examine the existing Act for a moment to see the present scheme. Clause 6 provides that the voters' lists generally in the organized territory must be sixty days old. That governs the whole of Canada. Then to govern the case of unorganized territory, wherever it may exist, section 7, which was acted on at the last election, provides :

Where, under the laws of a province, the voters' lists for any provincial electoral district or division or any of them are prepared not at regular intervals, but at such times as are fixed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council or some other provincial or local authority, or only from time to time for the purpose of a general or other election in immediate contemplation, the last preceding voters' lists so prepared shall be used for the purpose of any Dominion election in the territory comprised in such provincial electoral district or division, or the parts thereof for use in which they were prepared, if such lists have been prepared not more than one year before the date of the writ for such Dominion election.

So that up to the present time if the law were unchanged, in every province where there is unorganized territory, where the lists are not prepared at regular intervals, the list remains in force one year, and without this present legislation the lists used at the last provincial election in Ontario as well as in Quebec would be the Dominion voters' lists under this statute. Quebec is permitted to retain those voters' lists, the voters there are not put to the trouble of getting on another voters' list as they are in the unorganized territory in Ontario, which is a discrimination against Ontario. There are to-day new lists in Ontario, only two months old. Every other province, and particularly Quebec, which has had elections, can go on its way rejoicing ; the lists are satisfactory because they are prepared by Liberal governments, but we will not have the same lists in Ontario for no reason that has been disclosed unless it be that they are prepared by a Conservative administration. There is no escape from that position.

Section 8 of the existing Act goes on to say :

In case the lists mentioned in the last preceding section have been prepared for more than one year, new voters' lists shall be prepared, and the Governor in Council may, for the purpose of preparing and giving effect to such new voters' lists, appoint all necessary officers and confer upon them all necessary powers.

2. In the preparation of such lists, the provisions of the laws of the province regulating the preparation and revision and bringing into force of the provincial voters' lists in such cases shall, as far as possible, be observed and followed.

Section 9, which 9a now proposed will follow, reads :

If any voters' lists have been prepared under the section last preceding not more than one year before the date of the writ for election, such lists shall be used, unless there are lists of a later date prepared under the provincial law, and new lists shall not be prepared.

So that under the existing law, unless the lists are more than a year old, they can and must and should be used.

The reasons for such legislation are obvious. How ridiculous it would be, suppose there happens to be a Dominion election this year, that Ontario alone in its unorganized territory, should be put to the expense and the electors in those northern districts be given the trouble of the preparation of another list this year. Unless there is some overpowering necessity, I am unable to see any ground upon which it can be supported. I have read the statement of the Prime Minister that section 9a, in his opinion, repeals section 7. It does as far as Ontario is concerned, in this respect, that it makes it necessary to prepare a list in Ontario where the list is one, two or three months old, but not in Quebec, although the list there is three months old.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Are there any lists pepared in the unorganized districts in Quebec ?

Mr. BRISTOL. There are.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No. There is provision in the municipal code for the preparation of lists in the organized districts, but so far as my information goes

there are none for the unorganized territory.

Mr. GAUVREAU. They do not vote at all.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. They do not vote.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Those people will be disfranchised.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It has not been worth while having lists prepared. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) in his speech on this question——

Mr. BRISTOL. Does not the Grand Trunk Pacific pass through there?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, but it was not intended to bring in the Grand Trunk Pacific vote, that is a very gratuitous insinuation. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier said that although the power exists to have lists prepared by the municipal code, the——

Mr. BOYCE. Is the fact that no lists had been prepared in the unorganized districts of Quebec the reason this government is not interfering?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Oh, I understand there is no list.

Mr. BRISTOL. The hon. gentleman is better informed than I could be as to the conditions in Quebec. We can only take the information that is given in the House, and the Minister of Justice brought into this House a Bill which provided for the making of voters' lists in the unorganized territories of Quebec. Perhaps he is equally ignorant with myself as to that province; but surely some of his colleagues from the province of Quebec could have put him right. We have this fact, that the Minister of Justice brought in a Bill which provided for making lists in the unorganized districts of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, but that, without any excuse, or for some reason best known to himself, he has decided to leave out the province of Quebec but to leave in the province of Ontario, although lists have been prepared in those districts in the province of Ontario within two months, and not one tittle of evidence has been produced before this House that those lists are unfair or unreasonable. Where lists are prepared by any provincial government, whether Liberal or Conservative, and complaints are made to the Minister of Justice that they are unfair, his first duty would be to communicate with the attorney general of that province and put the complaints before him and ask him if there is anything in them. That is the course he would take if he wanted this Dominion to go on without friction. But the ridiculous part of it is that these complaints did not exist at the time the Bill was brought in, which shows the animus of the Minister of Justice and his colleagues in introducing it at all. If we are going to conduct this confederation on harmonious principles, we must not encroach on provincial rights. If I were to read the many speeches the right hon. leader of the government has made in favour of accepting the voters' lists prepared by the various provinces I would keep the House longer than it would care to stay. Everybody is familiar with his utterances in that regard. I am astonished that he has departed from those principles so far as the great province of Ontario is concerned. If there is one man more than another in this country who should have been careful in this matter to have left the province of Ontario alone, in the interest of harmony, it is the right hon. gentleman. The feeling will exist all through that province that there has been unjust discrimination against it, that the right hon. gentleman has not acted with the sunny ways with which he usually conducts the public affairs of this country. This kind of legislation should be enacted only as a last resort, called for only by some imperative necessity. But, in view of the facts, it will be a blot on the statute-book of this country. To say that the government of Ontario will not have fair lists made in the unorganized districts is an insult to that government. There is no public interest to be served by putting through this legislation. Instead of it being styled an Election Act, it should be styled an Act to insure the election of the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee). I challenge the right hon. gentleman to find the slightest complaint in regard to the fairness of the voters' lists in any of these northern ridings, except that of our loud-speaking friend from Rainy River. Hon. gentlemen may get declarations which they will not show, but that is not the proper way to deal with legislation. There should be proper evidence produced that there is anything unjust or unfair. If there was any real ground of complaint in this matter, it was possible for this government away back in May, or in June, since the election took place, or at any time up to the 1st of July, to represent to the government of Ontario that they wanted new lists made in the Rainy River district or in any other district; because, under the laws of the province of Ontario, up to the 1st of July, and afterwards if it is desired, the province can have new voters' lists prepared in the unorganized districts. If there was the slightest complaint of those lists, why, in the name of common sense, was not the attorney general of the province communicated with, and asked to have enumerators appointed and to have the judicial revision which the law provides for? It was perfectly feasible; but the hon. member for Rainy River and the

government did not want that. They seemed to be blind to their own interests in this matter, even if their course should put people by ears and cause ill-feeling throughout the country. Such a state of affairs is a surprise to me, because it is contrary to the whole career and to all the public utterances of the right hon. leader of the government. Without any communication with the government of Ontario, but on ex-parte statements, hon. gentlemen opposite ask this parliament to legislate on this matter, and to treat Ontario differently from any other province. This legislation is unjust and ill-advised and is going to cause ill-feeling and disturb the harmony of confederation.

Mr. WATSON. How will it disturb the harmony of the unorganized districts?

Mr. BRISTOL. I was not dealing with them specially; but if I were a voter in any of those districts, and had an opportunity to get on the voters' list in June, I would object very much, in a part of the country where distances are so great and travelling is so difficult, to have to get on another one in July, August or September. The clauses I was referring to in the Ontario Voters' List Act are sections 57, 58 and 59, which are as follows:

57. The Lieutenant Governor in Council may appoint enumerators whose duty it shall be, unless such preparation is suspended by proclamation as hereinafter set forth, to prepare annually the voters' lists for those parts of the province without municipal organization.

58. Every enumerator before entering upon his duties shall take the oath of office before a district or county judge, police magistrate or stipendiary magistrate according to form 20 of this Act, which oath the enumerator shall forthwith transmit to the clerk of the Crown in Chancery.

59. So soon as may be convenient after the first day of June, in each year, but not later than the first day of July, unless the preparation of the lists is suspended by proclamation as hereinafter set out, the enumerator shall cause to be posted in a conspicuous manner throughout those parts of the territory for which he is appointed at every public and separate school-house, and at every statutory polling place, and at every other place which may be directed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, a copy of this part, and one or more printed notices in accordance with form 21, and the enumerator shall attend at the time and place mentioned in the notice.

It goes on to provide for appeals, for at least ten days' notice of the hearing of such appeal, and fifteen days' notice within which to put in the appeals. Now, it is urged as one of the reasons for bringing in this legislation that in one or two of the polling subdivisions in the district of Rainy River the time for appeal had not elapsed before the election took place. Well, I do not know what information the right hon. gentleman has on that point, but I have the information from the Attorney General's Department that not three votes in that district were affected in that way. There was ample time for appealing. The hon. member for Rainy River had the same right to appeal as anybody else, and if he did not take any action it was because he thought he could hold up the right hon. the First Minister to pass this legislation, for he knew that the list then being prepared and subject to appeal to the county judge was the list on which every Dominion candidate would have to go to the polls if the election took place within a year.

Mr. WATSON. How could there be any possible chance for an appeal when the voters' list was dated 5th June, and the elections held on the 8th?

Mr. BRISTOL. What I say is this. So far as a Dominion candidate or a prospective Dominion candidate, who might have an election this year, was concerned—not a provincial candidate—he could have put in appeals undoubtedly. The right to prosecute an appeal was not affected by the fact of an election taking place. The Dominion candidate had a perfect right to have that list revised by the District Judge, and it was his duty to see that it was put into shape because he knew it must be his list unless he got legislation from this parliament changing the law. That law was not introduced by us but by the Liberal party and has been acted on for years. If the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) did not have that list put in shape, it was because he thought he would hold up the First Minister and get a list which would elect him at all costs and under any circumstances.

I fancy there are many others of my colleagues on this side absolutely opposed to this proposed legislation. Therefore I shall not at this stage take time to criticise it as it deserves, but I would say that notwithstanding the howl from the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) and his desire for sixty days appeal, this Bill does not give one day more for appeal than does the Act of 1904. It says that the laws of the province shall be observed, and you have this ludicrous result that while that is admitted, the Dominion government propose to take the administration into their own hands. For these and many other reasons which could be readily given, I am against this legislation as unconstitutional, as opposed to provincial rights, as unjust, unfair and unreasonable, and therefore I submit the clauses I refer to should be struck out

A. C. BOYCE (West Algoma). My hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Bristol) has forestalled me in the protest I intend to make on behalf of northern Ontario with reference to the introduction into any Election

Bill of this Dominion of a clause at once so unnecessary and so mysterious as the one now proposed in substitution for the one, which was even more so than the present amendment. When one comes to consider the reason submitted by the Minister of Justice for this legislation, it strikes one at once how ridiculous and absurd is the position which the hon. minister occupies in the eyes of the country. Just let us see what position he took when introducing this legislation on March 9, 1908. He then said very little about the necessity for these lists in New Ontario and very little indeed with regard to any irregularity. Not one word did he say with regard to the fastening upon northern Ontario of voters' lists to be prepared by this Dominion. It is clear from the complaints which have come and have been referred to since, that there were no irregularities in the preparation of the lists because there were no lists then prepared. There was nothing to complain of except that the appointment of enumerators was in the hands of the Conservative government of Ontario, and that was considered sufficient ground by the Minister of Justice for interfering with the right of that province to administer her own laws and prepare her own voters' lists.

The second reading of this Bill was moved on May 5; and speaking of the irregularities which justified the necessity for portions of clause 1, the minister said at page 8101 of 'Hansard':

I do not know and I do not suppose anybody can know, without the taking of evidence whether or not that state of things does exist.

Contrast that with the very fair statement of this minister on July 2, page 12112 of 'Hansard.' He said:

With regard first to Manitoba, I have not tried to check over those statements, but certainly they were categorically made and were backed up apparently by evidence of a documentary character, but many of them were with equal definiteness denied from the other side of the House, and I have no doubt, as I said when speaking six weeks ago on this very point, that it would take a judicial inquiry to establish in any individual case what the facts and truth may be. Enough at least at all events has appeared to demonstrate that there is great dissatisfaction and that that dissatisfaction extends to the minority of that province, a minority provincial which is represented in this House by a majority of nearly two to one seats.

Then with regard to Ontario, the minister listened with great intentness to what the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) had to say, and I may take this opportunity of declaring that that hon. gentleman is unable to substantiate the many statements he made of irregularities in the election or the preparation of the voters' lists, which affected that election or the regularity or validity of those lists. What did the Minister of Justice say after the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) sat down? What he said will be found on page 12117 of 'Hansard,' speaking of the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee), he then said:

He pointed out the facts which were not controverted.

—which have never been so far as I am aware contradicted, and which I presume are incontrovertible as establishing the manner in which in his own constituency and under the present Ontario Registration Act these voters' lists were being prepared.

Mark you, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Justice said that the hon. member had stated facts which had not been controverted which had never, so far as he was aware, been contradicted, and which he presumed were uncontrovertible. And, Sir, he sat there, mute, absolutely senseless to the protest which I made during an hour or an hour and a half in which every point that the hon. member for Thunder Bay and Rainy River had made in the shape of complaint or allegation of irregularities was not only contradicted, not only controverted but either completely explained away or absolutely disproven. Sir, there is a Minister of Justice who is a spectacle before this country. It is upon statements and pesumptions such as that that this Minister of Justice seeks to force through, with the concurrence of the Prime Minister a measure which is a direct invasion of the provincial rights of the great province of Ontario, rights which the Prime Minister was so careful, in days gone by, to safeguard and of which he was so loud a champion. Then, at page 12118, speaking of these irregularities complained of by the hon. member for Thunder Bay and Rainy River, the Minister of Justice said:

And if we find in such an important centre as the chief place of the riding the hon. gentleman represents, lists prepared in that sort of way under the Ontario statute passed only at the recent session of the legislature, and if we find coupled with these various lists so prepared that whether by accident or by design all right of appeal is cut off to those who would wish to appeal, and that these lists stand to-day as lists which have not had in any respect whatever the work of the judge in the way of revising or hearing objections to them, a clearer case it would be difficult to find for legislative interference.

And, Sir, instances which make this a clear case for legislative interference upon which the Minister of Justice depends—whether true or untrue—arose not merely after the Bill had been introduced but after it had received its second reading; and even the facts upon which he relied were denied and controverted upon the floor of this House. Moreover the hon. minister proceeds on hearsay, as you will find at page 12119:

I am told that in one of the ridings the enumerator refused to go to a settlement where there was an overwhelming preponderance of voters of the adverse political party.

The minister stated that he had these facts from letters and declarations in his possession. And yet, when he is asked to lay his evidence upon the table he says that it consists of private correspondence and cannot be produced in the House. I ask the committe again to say whether the Minister of Justice is endeavouring to act even with reasonable fairness towards the House and the country, but more particularly towards the province of Ontario. But the Minister of Justice does not take that position always, as has been said, and said so well, by my hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Bristol). Speaking of the position in the province of Quebec, at page 12122, he refers to the complaints which have been made by members from his own side of the House as to the disfranchisement of voters in the province of Quebec both for provincial and federal elections. And this is what he said :

The province of Quebec is possessed, according to hon. gentlemen on this side, of a considerable extent of unorganized territory, in which at present there are no voters' lists——

I commend this to the attention of the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in view of what he has said to-day.

—and the people who live in those districts do not vote either for the provincial legislature or this House. That seems to be an anomalous condition. My hon. friend from Wright county (Mr. Devlin) said something about the number of such persons who were residing within the limits of his constituency. The number was considerable. On attention being called to the fact that, not merely in Wright and Montcalm and the other counties alongside Montcalm, which extend into the northern or unsettled portions of the province, but in the ridings of Gaspé and no doubt of Chicoutimi and Saguenay and other portions of the province, there are possibly many colonists who, under the present system, have no means of getting a franchise—on attention being called to that fact, no doubt the provincial legislature will at once provide a remedy.

What does the right hon. gentleman say this morning ? He says that the remedy is left with the legislature of the province of Quebec, because, forsooth, these are unorganized portions of Quebec in which voters have not voted either in provincial or in Dominion elections. I think I understood him correctly in that. He does not deny it, therefore I assume that it is correct. If that be the case why does the hon. gentleman not apply the same remedy to Ontario ? Why does he propose, by Bill passed in this parliament, to create polls and to make up voters' lists in the unorganized districts of Ontario where there have never been polls before, or a vote cast either in provincial or Dominion elections ? He cannot deny that this is what he provides for by this Bill so far as Ontario is concerned, nor can he deny that, in the case of Quebec, he leaves this remedy in the hands of the legislature of that province. The right hon. Prime Minister says : I will not leave this in the hands of the provincial legislature of Ontario, but I will force it with an iron hand upon that province, not merely as a temporary method of meeting a temporary exigency, but for all time; but so far as a similar condition in Quebec is concerned. I declare, through my Minister of Justice, that the legislature of Quebec shall be free to remedy the difficulty in its own way.

Again I ask the right hon. gentleman, if he applied that condition of things to the province of Quebec in 1904 when he permitted the lists to be made up in nine polls, aggregating 543 names of voters who never voted before in that district, at places where there was no settlement, in many cases no patented land, in other cases not a single dwelling house, and in most of them absolutely no roads—there were 543 names appearing on those voters' lists. The right hon. gentleman made up voters' lists where there were never any voters' lists before, either provincial or Dominion. The right hon. gentleman assumes legislative authority with regard to Ontario which he scorns to establish with regard to Quebec and leaves to the Quebec legislature. Has the right hon. gentleman laid before this House one tittle of evidence to support the statement he has made that there was dissatisfaction about the lists in Northern Ontario ? Not one tittle of evidence. The Minister of Justice is asked for the evidence on oath that he speaks about, for the letters that have been written to him containing these complaints. He won't produce them, but at the same time he says that the evidence is not contradicted. Can one imagine a gentleman occupying the position of Minister of Justice so wanting in the first principles of fairness that he would inflict this measure upon the province of Ontario and at the same time refuse to make public the sworn declarations with regard to irregularities which he says he possesses ? Will the right hon. gentleman subscribe to that sort of justice? Will he say that the Minister of Justice is justified in passing this measure upon evidence which he will not or dare not produce before this House? Would the right hon. gentleman ask this House to accept evidence that a court would not accept under similar circumstances? If I were at the bar of a court and were to tell the judge that I could abundantly prove my case by affidavits, by sworn evidence that I have in my bag, but I won't produce it, it is satisfactory to me, and therefore the court must be satisfied with it also—there you have an illustration of the position of the Minister of Justice and of the Prime Mnister of this country in forcing this legislation upon the province of Ontario. In the province of Quebec the Minister of Justice says that numbers of persons are disfranchised, but although hundreds are disfranchised in the province of Quebec, the Minister of Justice does not think that is a case

for interference by this House, and he is content to leave that to the jurisdiction of the provincial legislature of Quebec. But where there is a list not closed, and where only one appeal was put in against that list in the district of Rainy River, the Minister of Justice takes that one case as sufficient to justify him in going on with this legislation. I protest on behalf of the unorganized districts, and on behalf of the province of Ontario, against this iniquitous legislation, and I shall continue to so protest until the right hon. gentleman sees fit to change it.

Then with regard to the irregularities referred to by the hon. member for Thunder Bay and Rainy River (Mr. Conmee), all I can say is that the irregularities were in no sense sufficient to vitiate the voters' lists that were already made up. I hold in my hand a memorandum of the dates of the courts of appeal from all the voters' lists in that district, made up under the unorganized provisions of the Act of 1893, and I find that although the list for Kaministiquia, which is complained of by the hon. member, and the list for Simpson island and Heron bay in that constituency, were not closed at the time the provincial election was held, yet I find that courts were appointed for every place in the district where these unorganized lists were made up, and that the lists were duly revised and duly closed, and they remain now certified as good lists, the statutory time for which has completely expired, There is no reason why they should not be used for the Dominion elections except the reasons which have been referred to by my hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Bristol), namely, that the hon. member for Rainy River knows perfectly well that he has absolutely no chance, in view of the result of the provincial elections, of retaining a seat in this House, with a popular majority of between 1,000 and 2,000 against him, unless he is able to make up the lists as they were made up in 1904, to suit the constituency of Port Arthur and Rainy River and to secure the election for himself. There was a protest, I believe, filed with the returning officer by one M. J. Kenny on the 13th day of June. That was a protest against the fact that the voters' lists had not been certified by the judge ten days before the polling day, and, therefore, that the list did not come under the provision of subsection 3 of section 78 of the Ontario Elections Act, and respectfully submitting that in view of these irregularities the returning officer could not make a legal declaration with reference to the election of the member for that riding. And when Mr. Kenny delivered that letter of protest he stated to the returning officer that the objection was taken by Mr. James Conmee, M.P. It is easy for the hon. member for Rainy River to manufacture complaints himself or to get them manufactured over the hand of his solicitor, Mr. M. J. Kenny. It is easy for the hon. member (Mr. Conmee) to keep the sore open; it is easy for him to hug a grievance, and the result of my investigation is that the hon. member for Rainy River would rather have the grievance than, in the public interest, find a remedy. His hope is to be able to make the lists under this Bill according to his own ideas and to go into territory where voters' lists were never before made so that he may accomplish the very thing the Prime Minister has so warmly deprecated. The making up of these lists under this Bill is open to the further grave objection that it affects 11 provincial ridings in Northern Ontario, in all of which there are regularly made up voters' lists only a month or two old and which could be used at the next Dominion election. And, Sir, in only one of these 11 ridings could the member for Rainy River or the Minister of Justice find the shadow of a complaint. Let these gentlemen give any particulars of irregularities, and I have the information here ready to answer them. But the member for Rainy River seems to dominate both the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice; he seems to hold them in the hollow of his hands and to 'boss the job,' and so in violation of all the principles of the Liberal party and in violation of all the principles laid down by the Prime Minister himself the lists in these 11 constituencies are to be taken out of the control of the province of Ontario, not only for the next Dominion election, but for all time. Against that insult to my province I protest most strongly.

Mr. A. E. KEMP (East Toronto). Mr. Speaker, I still hope that the Prime Minister will see his way to prevent this insult to Ontario and to treat that great province in the same manner as the other provinces of the Dominion are treated by this Bill. A few days ago the right hon. gentleman told us that he made certain concessions in the case of Manitoba and British Columbia so as to meet the views of the opposition, but it occurred to me that in his heart searching the right hon. gentleman found that the public opinion of this Dominion was against that interference by the Dominion parliament with the provincial lists, and so he stayed his hand. If we are going to have all over Canada electoral lists prepared by Dominion authority well and good, but if this parliament declares, as it has declared that the federal lists shall be made by the provincial authorities then let us not discriminate. The Minister of Justice told us that every word of this Bill was written by his own hand and I have wondered where he got his inspiration. Surely it was not from the Prime Minister because the right hon. gentleman could have told him about the position of the Liberal party on the Franchise Act of 1885, a measure,

which the Prime Minister told us, had engendered much bitterness. Again, the Prime Minister could have reminded his Minister of Justice of what happened in 1893 when the Liberal party in convention decided to do away with the Dominion Franchise Act and to confide the preparation of the lists to the several provinces. Again, the right hon. gentleman could have pointed his minister to the declaration which he himself made in 1898 when the present franchise Act was brought into force, and when the Prime Minister said (Hansard 1898, page 4015):

But I would not have hesitated to accept the franchise provided by the Conservative legislature in Quebec because though there were many things in that franchise on the whole to which I would have objected, still as it satisfied the province, it would have satisfied me. It is the same way as regards other provinces. It is possible the control of the several provinces may pass into the hands of the Conservative party, but still on a question of this kind I am disposed on my part to accept the franchise prepared by the legislature, whether Liberal or Conservative.

I have been endeavouring to discover what motive actuated the Minister of Justice in preparing the original Bill submitted to this House and I can arrive at no other conclusion than that when he found a province in which the legislature was controlled by the Conservative party he aimed to have the lists in that province prepared by federal authority. He started at the Pacific coast and finding the province of British Columbia with a Conservative government he attacked that province, and when the Bill was submitted to the House it was found that nobody of any political party had any serious objection to raise to the lists in British Columbia. In Alberta and Saskatchewan there were Liberal governments; these young provinces are still to some extent under the paternal care of the Dominion government and so they were not interfered with. Then he came to the pioneer province of Manitoba and he laid violent hands on that province and he attempted to destroy every principle laid down by the Liberal party with regard to the franchise. He essayed to wrest from the province of Manitoba the possibility of her having anything to do with the electoral lists in federal elections. Then, he came to the province of Quebec, and it is very difficult to find out just what the conditions are in that province but I presume so far as the unorganized districts are concerned they are much the same as in northern Ontario. The Minister of Justice pretended to interfere with the control of the lists in the unorganized districts of Quebec, but as the Prime Minister announced in this House he communicated with the authorities of that province and he accepted their explanations as satisfactory and would withdraw that portion of the Bill which referred to Quebec. What a contrast between his manner of dealing with the Quebec government and with the Ontario government. In no way whatever has the right hon. gentleman communicated with the attorney general or with the government of Ontario to find out what were the conditions in the northern part of that province with respect to the lists or to ascertain whether if any irregularities existed the provincial government was willing to correct them. Let me tell the right hon. gentleman, in view of the concessions he has made to Manitoba, that the government of the province of Ontario are fully as competent as the government of Manitoba or of Quebec or of any other province of the Dominion to make out a proper electoral list. This is a serious matter. It is nothing short of a slur upon the province of Ontario. Surely we are as highly civilized in the province of Ontario as are the people of any other province, surely we have reached as high a state of development in that province as have the people of any other province, and yet under this Act the Prime Minister casts a slur on the people of Ontario and discriminates against that province in respect to six constituencies. I would draw the attention of the House to the fact that what we call New Ontario is being very rapidly developed by the present government who know every foot of that territory and who so understand its wants that there is no authority in the Dominion so competent to deal with the voters' lists there as is the provincial government. I warn the Prime Minister that the people of Ontario will not forget this insult. We in Ontario point with pride to our sister province of Quebec and surely the Prime Minister must see that this discrimination against Ontario will create a great deal of ill feeling. I would also call attention to the fact that it is only by the weapon of the great majority which the Prime Minister has in this House that he could perpetrate such an outrage. The right hon. gentleman has not a majority in this House from the province of Ontario, but by his majority from the province of Quebec and other provinces of the Dominion he is able to say to the people of Ontario: You are not competent to make fair electoral lists; we will not trust you. The present government of Ontario singularly enjoys the confidence of the people and I believe that this slur will be resented in a way which will surprise the Prime Minister.

Now, as I have said, wherever the Minister of Justice found a Conservative government in power he laid hands on that province. He did not interfere with Nova Scotia, although as was shown by the letters and documents read by the leader of the opposition very grave irregularities ex-

ist in the electoral lists of that province. But a Liberal government is in power there and the irregularities are not noticed by the Minister of Justice. Then, New Brunswick had a close call. You will notice that the provincial elections in New Brunswick were held on the 8th of March and this Bill was introduced on the 9th of March, and so you can imagine what would have taken place had the New Brunswick elections been held a month earlier and the Conservatives returned to power. Again, in Prince Edward Island there is a Liberal government and there is no interference with the lists there. Therefore, in looking for the reason which prompted the Minister of Justice in drafting the original Bill I can only come to the conclusion that he sought to present a thoroughly partisan measure and that the discrimination against the Conservative provinces was partisan to the last degree. One word with respect to the hon. member for Rainy River. The fallacy of the arguments which he attempted to present to this House in favour of the Bill was completely exposed when it was shown that the alleged irregularities which he pointed to as a reason for the Bill occurred long after the Bill was introduced. I believe, and I think all reasonable men will believe that the electoral lists for the unorganized portions of Ontario are just as good lists on the average as are to be found in any province of the Dominion. If there be irregularities I do not believe they occurred by intent, and at their very worst they are certainly not greater than those which are shown to exist in Nova Scotia or elsewhere. I trust that even at the last hour the Prime Minister will withdraw this clause of the Bill and refrain from doing this injustice to the province of Ontario.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT (Muskoka). Representing as I do one of the constituencies in northern Ontario which will to some extent be affected by this Bill, I feel I am justified in uttering as strong a protest against it as I am capable of uttering. It has been truly stated in this discussion that we have as correct voters' lists in northern Ontario as we ever had, and as correct lists as are to be found in any part of the Dominion. Then, why should there be interference by this government: why should this government lay violent hands upon that portion of Ontario and say: We cannot trust you; we will take this matter entirely into our own hands and we will put a stigma upon the government of Ontario and upon the people of that portion of the province, because after all these lists have been made up by the people who reside in these unorganized territories. Now, Sir, the strong ground of the objection of the member for Rainy River is that there was not sufficient time under the Ontario statute to properly compile these lists, but let me point out that the time given for the preparation of these lists under the provincial law is just as great as the time provided for in this Bill so that this chief ground of complaint by the hon. member (Mr. Conmee) falls to the ground. But, the hon. member (Mr. Conmee) cares nothing for that so long as he gets the preparation of the lists into the hands of men whom he thinks he can manipulate. I might point out also that under the system of registration if it is at all well done we have better voters' lists than we have under the ordinary system of compiling voters' list in the organized portion of Ontario, and I think the same thing would apply to any portion of Canada.

Owing to the constant movement of population, some system of registration is necessary if we are not going to disfranchise a large number of people. I hold in my hand the voters' list for 1907 as finally completed by the judge, of one of the municipalities in my riding. I hold another as it comes from the hands of the assessor for 1908. That covers a period of between seven and eight months. In that municipality alone I find new voters being qualified to the number of over 100. That municipality is of course somewhat larger than some of the others in the riding, but it represents only about one-ninth of the riding; so that that indicates a change in the voters of that riding of 900 voters in the space of less than eight months. If that proportion is kept up for the whole year, it will mean between 1,300 and 1,400 voters that would be qualified to vote at an election next fall if put on list who will be disfranchised should the election be then brought on. In the unorganized section, in which there are only a few municipalities, the same thing will not apply. In the last election the government took the machinery into their own hands, and in the course of a couple of weeks they had to do what it takes two months to do under the Act, so that the list was necessarily very incomplete. It is almost impossible to make up a proper list in that length of time. But bad as it was, there were more votes polled in the unorganized portion in proportion than in the organized portion of the riding I represent, being 72 per cent in the unorganized portion and ony 65 per cent in the organized portion, on account of the length of time required to make up the voters' lists. So I think it is absolutely necessary, if we do not intend to disfranchise large numbers of people in the organized districts, that we should bring the machinery more up to date than it is at the present time. While it may not pertain particularly to this Bill, I want to emphasize that point. This Bill, as I understand it, is to enable a few people to be put on the voters' list in the district of Rainy River and Thunder Bay. There is no complaint, I understand, in any other part of the unorganized districts.

Mr. CONMEE. I may say to my hon. friend that there are similar complaints from other ridings.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT. If there are, they have never been laid before this House. It may suit some hon. gentlemen very well to keep in their pockets the complaints and bring them down at the last moment, when there is no opportunity to defeat them. That may show a high degree of cleverness, but I do not think much of it. Suppose you do put on a dozen or half a dozen voters for the Rainy River and Thunder Bay district, I have no hesitation in saying that in some of these northern ridings there will be at least a thousand people disfranchised. Perhaps there will not be that many in the district which the hon. gentleman represents, but there is a great difference in the number of voters when the election is held at the proper time of the year, say in the month of June, as compared with late in the fall. In the recent election held in the province of Ontario by the Whitney government there were over 50,000 more votes polled than there were in the last Dominion election, which was held late in the fall. In the riding which I represent hundreds of people had gone to the woods at the time of the election, and found it impossible to get back to vote. The right hon. gentleman brought on the election in what is called the deer season. All over this country we have men enduring the burden and heat of the day with the hope that in the beginning of November they will have a couple of weeks of hunting in the northern woods of Ontario. These men come from all parts of the province. If the right hon. gentleman again brings on the election late in the fall, it will have the effect of disfranchising thousands of people in this way. What are the votes of a few people in one riding compared with the disfranchising of thousands of people throughout the province? Under the terms of this Bill the revising of the lists is put at such a date as to make it impossible to avoid that sort of thing, because in spite of anything he can do, it will take from now till the 1st of November to prepare the list. Then hundreds of men go into the lumber woods late in the fall, and these people will be disfranchised as well. With regard to the actual working out of this measure, we shall have this condition of affairs. Under the local Act notices are put up in the month of July in the various ridings throughout that northern country, and the enumerators who will be brought in under this Bill will go to work a few weeks later, so that you will have two sets of officials at work, and the public will be put to the inconvenience and trouble of looking after two sets of courts to see that they are on both lists. That may look very easy to the people assembled in this parliament, but it is far from easy in those scattered settlements of northern Ontario, where the distances are so great and where the conditions are such that sometimes travel is almost impossible. I want to point out another defect in this Bill. I find no provision in it making it necessary to take as a basis the present voters' lists as compiled by the province. Every man in these unorganized districts will have to see personally that he is put on the list. As it is to-day, a man who has been on the list knows that he has the qualification, and the chances are a thousand to one that he will remain on the list unless there is some reason why he should be put off. Under this Bill that cannot be, but every man will have to see for himself that he is put on the list. This is a very distinct hardship to the people, and I appeal to the right hon. gentleman to take the voters' lists as compiled by the province of Ontario as a basis, if he must put the Bill through, so that every man will feel that he is already on the list unless for some reason his name should be removed. That would do away to a large extent with the difficulty of making every man go and see that he is put on the voters' lists of an unorganized portion of the province. As regards the courts necessary to be held, I have made a calculation and find there will be an average of fifty enumerators' courts for each one of the Dominion ridings represented in this House. Only a small portion of the district I represent comes under the scope of this Bill—some eight polling places. In my experience that means an enumerator's court for every polling place, and our plan has been in the past for a judge to have a court of appeal in every place where the enumerator sat. A hundred courts will have to be held by the judges over that northern district in a short space of time and the same number of courts in connection with the provincial lists. The judges will have in addition to their ordinary division courts and quarter sessions and will have to crowd into that two and a half months perhaps 125 courts in some ridings. It would be physically impossible for any judge to hold all these, and I do not know whether you can make a provision for the work to be divided between two or more judges even if they do happen to live in the districts they preside over.

All these things considered carefully should lead the right hon. gentleman to decide to remove clause 1. While that might be found objectionable by two or three of his friends, I believe that in the province and particularly in the unorganized districts, he will make more friends and stand better in the public estimation. There has been no hardship in any quarter of that section of country with regard to the lists compiled by the late government. They are as correct as one can reasonably expect and certainly as correct as they are anywhere in the or-

ganized portions of Ontario or the Dominion. Under all the circumstances it would be well for the right hon. gentleman to remove this clause, to take away this stigma from the province of Ontario, especially northern Ontario, and let us make the Bill as perfect as possible. I am not asking too much when I ask the right hon. gentleman to appeal to his Minister of Justice to remove this clause and treat the province of Ontario the same as Quebec or any other province. If the province of Quebec can be trusted to make her own lists, why cannot Ontario? Surely the minister will not say that he cannot allow a Conservative province to control its own voters' lists.

Mr. ALCORN. As a representative from the province of Ontario, I desire to register my personal protest, in the strongest possible terms, against the insult placed by this government on that province. Surely the government are not going to cast this stigma on the province of Ontario of declaring that its provincial government and officials are not to be trusted and that they are incompetent to compile fair and reasonable lists which may be used both in Dominion and provincial elections. I am not aware of any ground for this particular clause in this Bill except that in the opinion of hon. gentlemen opposite, a province, presided over by a Conservative cabinet, cannot be trusted to make up its own voters' lists. The justification for this Bill must be some wrong which requires a remedy. Well, what is the wrong? We have no information on that score. We have had no specific allegations made to the House by the government or any member of it, not even by the Minister of Justice. Then why should Ontario be treated in a different manner from the other provinces? It has been stated in a general way that dissatisfaction exists with regard to the lists in northern Ontario, which were prepared for the purpose of the provincial elections on June 8 last. Well, I suppose that a certain degree of dissatisfaction will always exist against the party which has the making up of the election lists. The Minister of Justice told us that certain information had come to him by letters and other written communications, and that certain irregularities were said to have existed in certain polling divisions in the northern territory. But he gave no detailed information to prove these charges. Speaking on that subject, at page 8101 of 'Hansard,' on May 5 last, he said :

> I do not know and do not suppose any one can know without the taking of evidence whether or not that state of things, as so described, does exist or not.

But no evidence was taken, and the taking of evidence was the very proper means, as pointed out by the minister himself, by which the House might have been informed whether the legislation now proposed is necessary. It has been said that certain appeals were, in some nebulous manner, not particularly described, impeded in respect of the lists made up in northern Ontario last June. That objection however can have no force. If the judges did, in one instance, or possibly two, certify lists as to which appeals had not been heard, that did not impede going on with the appeals in the ordinary and proper way and holding courts of revision and disposing of any appeals that any person chose to make. Whether the list had been placed in use for provincial purposes or not did not prevent the courts of revision from going on and appeals being had in the regular way for the purposes of a Dominion election. Now, as this Bill must be based upon some wrong requiring a remedy, one would have supposed that the remedy applied would be commensurate with the wrong complained of. I have heard no specific complaint other than that the lists in one or two instances were certified by the judge before the time for appeal expired. It seems to me that, if the government, in their unwisdom, conceive it necessary to bring in such a measure as this covering the whole ground of the preparation of lists, their revision and bringing them into force, they entirely overstepped the wrong of which they are complaining. Their proper course would be to take such measures with the Ontario government as would induce that government to right any such wrong as that to which I have alluded; and if that course was not effective, if the Ontario government refused upon proper representation being made, to right the wrong, then a Bill might be brought in covering the irregularities which the government might be able to prove to exist. But it seems to me that the revolutionizing of the whole electoral courts in northern Ontario and imposing upon that portion of the province entirely new lists, with all the attendant labour and expense—and, it seems to me in trying to work out the particulars, hardly workable at all—cannot be justified as commensurate with the wrong of which the government complains.

At one o'clock, committee took recess.

Committee resumed at three o'clock.

On section 1,

Mr. BOYCE. I beg to move that for the reasons stated, subsections 1 to 8 both inclusive of section 1 of this Bill be struck out. In making this motion I desire to point out the difference between this law as it stood prior to the advent of the Whitney government in 1905, and the present law. In the elections of November, 1904, the law stood as it is now, with this amendment, accepting the provincial voters' lists in their entirety, provided they were not more than a year old at the time of the issue of the writ for a general election. So whenever there were provincial lists in the unorgan-

ized territories under the old law which were not one year old at the date of the issue of the writ, those lists were used for the Dominion election. Now I fail to see that any argument has been adduced in support of this legislation, any sound reason put forward upon which that basis should be changed, any logical ground for the change of basis and the non-acceptance of the provincial lists for federal elections, any ground upon which to reverse the principles which the Liberal party enunciated in their platform of 1893, and which they emphasized in 1898 when they repealed the Franchise Act and provided for the acceptance of the provincial lists. If this law were to pass, although you approve of the provincial lists and accept them, in almost all cases, if you held an election, although the provincial lists were only three months old and properly prepared, under this amendment you would provide that those provincial lists shall not be used, lists that had been prepared three months, or perhaps only 60 days, before the issue of the writ. But the right hon. gentleman proposes to ask the province of Ontario to put aside those lists for all time, and to accept lists which may be eleven months old, thereby disfranchising all those who became entitled to vote since the last lists were made up. The right hon. gentleman will see what I mean, by referring to subsection 7 :

Where, within one year prior to the date of the writ for an election in any electoral district composed wholly or partly of such territory not municipally organized, voters' lists for any such territory have been prepared under the provisions of this section, such lists shall be used for such election and new lists shall not be prepared therefor.

That emphasizes the right hon. gentleman's intention absolutely to discriminate against lists prepared under the jurisdiction of the province of Ontario, although in the case that I have mentioned, nine months more recent, regular provincial lists have been prepared under the laws of the province. My right hon. friend would absolutely discriminate against those, ignore them, cast his professions to the winds, and use lists which were eleven or eleven and a half months old, and thereby disfranchise all those who became entitled to vote in the meantime.

Mr. J. D. REID. Before this Bill is passed I want to enter my protest against the reflection that is being cast upon the province of Ontario. The only reason I can see why Ontario is being treated in this way is that the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) has insisted that he be looked after in the next election. I am surprised that the Prime Minister has listened to the hon. member for Rainy River in this matter. Here is an election Bill prepared, and the only province in the Dominion of Canada that is reflected upon, I might say insulted, is the province of Ontario, by these words :

Notwithstanding anything to the contrary herein contained, voters' lists for the portions of the province of Ontario which consist of territory not municipally organized shall be prepared during the months of August, September and October in each year.

Now I assert as a citizen of Ontario that it is most unfair to our great province that the Prime Minister has seen fit to yield to the solicitations of the member for Rainy River and insert that clause in this Bill. I have not heard one word throughout the whole province of Ontario complaining of any unfair treatment under the last lists. I do not believe there is a man in the province of Ontario who believes that Mr. Whitney, the Prime Minister of Ontario, would allow a single improper act to be committed in the preparation of the voters' lists. Even if there had been a little trouble in a couple of polls in the Rainy River constituency, I think myself that the Prime Minister, being a resident of the province of Quebec, would have been the first man to let the province of Ontario alone. The hon. the Prime Minister has tried to lead the people of the province of Ontario to think that he wants to be fair and just, but in this matter it is the only province at which he is hurling this insult. I think the hon. member for Rainy River has been well treated, he has had public works given him up there, enough to carry his constituency without having to be assisted in this way. So far as I am concerned, I think the Prime Minister should name this the Conmee Bill, because it is simply a Bill passed by this House to elect the hon. member for Rainy River.

Mr. BENNETT. A Bill for the relief of the hon. member for Rainy River.

Mr. J. D. REID. Yes. In getting this Bill through the Prime Minister hopes to win four or five more constituencies, in some way. I think the Prime Minister is most unfair towards Ontario. As regards the province of Quebec, he sees that a Liberal government is in power, and the voters' lists will be prepared within the next month or so just as he wishes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. J. D. REID. The Prime Minister thinks he is safe there, so he is willing to withdraw Quebec, but in Ontario, where lists have been prepared and the Prime Minister cannot say that anything has been wrongly done, he wants to have five or six members elected simply by this Bill. I am surprised that the Minister of Customs, who represents Ontario in the cabinet, and who, I am sure, is proud of his province, has not prevented this slur being cast upon it. The Minister of Railways and Canals

and other ministers from Ontario seem to be afraid to protest against it. It may be that there is truth in the story that an effort is being made to get the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Trade and Commerce out of the cabinet and that therefore these gentlemen are afraid to stand up for Ontario. The Prime Minister has evidently decided that we will have an election this fall, a year before we should have it, and he hopes by thus taking an unfair advantage through these lists to carry six counties.

Mr. BLAIN. Mr. Chairman, as seconder of the amendment of the hon. member for West Algoma (Mr. Boyce) I wish to express my disproval of the course pursued by the leader of the House in introducing legislation to deal especially with Ontario in respect to voters' list. In the last session of the legislature, prior to the election just held, not a word of protest or condemnation of the Whitney administration for their preparation of the voters' lists was presented nor has any complaint been heard since the election. I have not heard a valid argument advanced why Ontario should be legislated against in this respect. The right hon. gentleman knows that the people of Ontario are anxious for a fair and honest voters' list. His own party had charge of the preparation of these lists for over thirty-six years, and since this party came into power in 1896 elections have been held on the voters' lists prepared by the legislature of that province.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. BLAIN. The Prime Minister says 'hear, hear.' Why is he not now willing to trust himself and his government to a voters' list prepared by a provincial government in Ontario now? There can be but one reason. I do not wish to single out my hon. friend from Rainy River (Mr. Commee) but my hon. friend has a history in Ontario, he was a prominent follower and supporter of Sir Oliver Mowat in days gone by and continued a support of the Liberal party in the legislature. He has a record that is all his own, peculiarly his own, I do not wish to refer to it, but if the right hon. gentleman had turned a deaf ear to my hon. friend and had asked the honest people of northern Ontario whether they thought federal lists should be prepared for the coming election, I am sure the answer would have been that they were quite satisfied with the lists they had and did not ask the government to go to the expense or to single out that part of Ontario which will soon become an organized district. This course will not bring support to the right hon. gentleman when he appeals for support to the people of that district. I think he could afford to trust the people of Ontario. They applauded him in days gone by, he announced himself prior to 1896 as a champion of provincial rights. That was his great cry in Ontario and other provinces and many people in that province, I think too many, trusted him and voted for him—the right hon. gentleman may smile, he has heard predictions before, but I venture this prediction that when the election comes my right hon. friend will receive from these northern districts a rejoiner such as he never received before, because of this Bill. Neither in the discussions in this House nor in the newspapers of Ontario, even the 'Globe,' have any valid reasons been given why the government should not adhere to the policy of provincial voters' lists for federal elections as they did in 1897. Why do they depart from it? Because a Conservative administration controls affairs in Ontario now; therefore my hon. friend asks for special legislation providing for special lists in northern Ontario in order to give the Liberals a better chance. I am surprised that gentlemen from Ontario on the other side of the House have not protested against this invasion of the rights of that province, they sit quietly and allow this Bill to go through without a protest. The Minister of Customs who is well and favourably known in Ontario, whom the people have honoured, who has called loudly for provincial rights and has told the people of the fairness of the right hon. gentleman and of the government he is supporting, sits quietly by and says: It is all right, we shall have a special voters' list for my own province in the unorganized district. I want to say a word or two to the Minister of Justice. I am sure when at the close of the session the Minister of Justice reflects upon his position he will have cause to regret that he was the father of this Bill which strikes at the province of Ontario. Evidently one reason for the action of the Minister of Justice was that he might save the hon. member for Rainy River, but I venture to think that although that hon. gentleman may put on the voters' lists all the employees of the Grand Trunk Pacific in his constituency, it will not save him at the next election.

Mr. MILLER. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) think that the judges to whom this matter will be entrusted would put on the voters' lists employees of the Grand Trunk Pacific who have no right to be there?

Mr. BLAIN. I do not know, and I am not going to speak for the judges. My argument is that the preparation of these voters' lists should be left to the province of Ontario, and the hon. member (Mr. Miller) has supported that principle in the days gone by.

An hon. MEMBER. He will support anything.

Mr. BLAIN. Of course, he will be compelled to support anything that comes from the government.

An hon. MEMBER. He was independent once.

Mr. BLAIN. We have not seen any evidence of that since he came to the House. I tell the First Minister that he is making a serious mistake when he presses through parliament legislation which is an invasion of the rights of the people of Ontario.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the motion is brought to a vote, I desire to add a word to the protest which has been made by my colleagues from Ontario. It is rather a singular thing that nobody finds a word to say in support of this clause. The Prime Minister has no word in support of it; the Minister of Justice is dumb on the question and he cannot hear anything we say; and the Solicitor General, who ought to be in his place earning his money, is out of the House successively and continuously. I protest, in the first place, against the unfairness of making us discuss a question with a man who cannot hear us and with a sub-officer who ought to take this legislation, being well paid for his job, out of this House and shirking his proper duty. What use is there in addressing an argument to a man who has got to wait until he reads 'Hansard,' and then maybe to-morrow he will vouchsafe an answer. We could avoid that by having the Solicitor General put in charge of this Bill. But the Prime Minister does not give us either a chance to discuss the matter or to put a man before us who can discuss the matter with us. In that he is unfair to this side of the House, which at least does wish to discuss and put its reasons with reference to these various measures before the government and parliament. Of course, it makes no difference to men on the other side of the House. They have no criticism to offer; they are not supposed to offer any; they are not invited to offer any; their's is simply to vote whatever the Prime Minister wants, and it makes no difference to them whether the Minister of Justice can hear their arguments or not, or whether or not there is a Solicitor General in his place who can hear. But with us it is a little different, and I protest against this abuse of his position by the Prime Minister. We must not forget the legislation with which the right hon. gentleman came down to this House, on March 9th, and we must not forget the legislation with which he came down some two months after. And we cannot help expressing the opinion that if he had climbed down just a little bit further it would have been better for his own reputation and better for the public life of Canada. He and his Minister of Justice came down with a proposition to invade their old code rights, the provincial control of franchises, in the case of four provinces, three of which are now administered by their opponents and the other of which is still in their grasp. The Prime Minister, more than any other man, at one period of his career, took this simple and logical position: I prefer to trust the provinces in the matter of these franchises and in the matter of preparing the voters' lists. The right hon. gentleman went further and said: I will trust these provincial governments, even though they are opposed to me, for although in some cases wrongs may be done, yet upon the whole I believe the virtue of the principle will overweigh occasional wrongs, and even with that in view I argue for provincial franchises and provincial control of the lists. But a change came over my right hon. friend's vision, and this legislation was introduced on the 9th of March; introduced in all its boldness—so bold that my right hon. friend was himself a little terrified when he came to look at it. I am charitable enough to think that he did not give that legislation thorough personal revision until it had been discussed many days in this House. If I am wrong in that it makes it no better for my right hon. friend. But the bold proposition he came down with was: To seize the making of the lists in the province of British Columbia, from which no single note of dissatisfaction or protest had ever come to him or to any member of his government. Why did he single out that province? For no other reason than that he did not want to single out the province of Manitoba alone, and so, for the sake of company, he added in British Columbia. And when some few of the members from British Columbia gave a tardy and lukewarm submission to the measure, not one of them made a note of strong complaint, and in fact the consensus of their opinion was that both sides of politics believed there were fair and just voters' lists in British Columbia. But he proposed to take hold of the province of Manitoba. He grasped the province of Manitoba in 1904 through a subclause in the present election law, and by means of a forced revision, a partial revision, a scandalous revision, in which the thin red line outrage was perpetrated to his knowledge and to the knowledge of his colleagues March 9th, 1908, he proposed if possible to get a legal way of doing what he did before in an illegal manner, and so avoid the judgment of the Supreme Court of Manitoba, which pronounced that the thin red line action was illegal. And so he proposed to put his own partisans in charge of British Columbia, in charge of Manitoba; men appointed by himself, started in after the writ had issued to do the whole work of enumeration, of notification, of revision and of notification again, in the short period which elapses between the issuing of the writ and the holding of the election. No amount of argument of the Minister of Justice, specious as it is, that they were allowed to do it either before or after the issue of the writ affects the question at all. You must

take the maximum of the power that the government takes in any legislation and criticise it upon that, and the maximum of the power they took was to place their own creatures in charge of this matter after the writs for the election were issued and to do the whole work of notification, and enumeration, and revision, in that short and impossible period of time.

Then, Sir, they took hold of the province of Quebec as to its unorganized districts and of the province of Ontario as to its unorganized districts. That was the intention of the right hon. gentleman and his Minister of Justice; that is what they proposed to push through; that is what their following in the west, outside of the British Columbia province, assisted them in attempting to push through, and for which they fought week after week with the strongest of language and the stoutest of backbones, determined to push it through and to teach the Conservatives what they ought to be taught in the province of Manitoba. Well, Sir, something happened. My right hon. friend, began to sense what he was trying to push through, and the fair-minded men in the country began to say that he had gone further than he should have gone, that he had bitten off more than he could chew without injuring his political digestion; and after a month and a half or two months he came down. He left the province of British Columbia alone; he left the province of Manitoba alone; he deserted the stalwarts of the province of Manitoba who had made their plaints—one, two, three, four, half a dozen of them, set out in long affidavits and in long statements that they read in the House; what was, according to the Minister of Justice, incontrovertible proof of the terrible wrong that was being done to them. He deserted them all, he climbed down, and he is hanging now by the eye-lids to the little unorganized territories of the province of Ontario. Why did he not drop that, and complete his reputation for being honest and fairminded. Having let all the rest go, why does he hang on to this? There is the same obloquy, the same unfairness of spirit, the same lack of argument to back it up that there was in the other case. Why did he desert the stalwarts from Manitoba and cling to the one lone man from Rainy River? How do these gentlemen feel about it? After all their partisan support, after eating the leek and being dragged through the mire at the heels of my right hon. friend's devious policy in the west, to be sacrificed on the altar of seeming fair play, and yet to have this spotless dove from Rainy River made their particular favourite and put up on high. How do they feel about it? My right hon. friend has not only to square his accounts with the 'Free Press' of Winnipeg and with those ardent followers of his from the west, but he has to square the account which yet remains with reference to his treatment of the province of Ontario. They will not discuss it here. His followers from Ontario will not open their mouths here. Let me tell him that this discussion has only begun, and that before this year is over there is not a hamlet or town in the province of Ontario that will not hear of this insult to the government of Ontario, and fully heed it. My right hon. friend snaps his fingers in the face of public opinion. Once when I was talking to him across the floor of the House, when I put his pledges of 1896 before him, and his performance of none of them, the right hon. gentleman pulled himself up and said: 'Well, Sir, what are you going to do about it?—we are here and you are there.' Yes, my right hon. friend is there; he has his majority behind him, but it is a majority which he got in 1904. Another question is, how the country feels in 1908? My right hon. friend is bucking up, without the best backing, against a government which has the very best backing. He, the leader of a moribund and disintegrated government, is bucking up against the Hon. Mr. Whitney and a fresh, vigourous government. He, with a majority in a moribund parliament, elected four years ago, is bucking up against a government in the province of Ontario which has the verdict of the people of a little more than a month ago, and an overwhelming majority in favour of that government—95,000 of a majority in the province of Ontario, formerly his right arm; and is it because that has been lopped off from his support that he visits with this petty revenge, if I may call it such, with his puny punishment, the province which had refused to recognize his lordship and refuses to bow to his sovereignty? Well, if he does, he will only find after the next election record is placed on file, that his majority from the province of Ontario will be still less. There are fairminded people amongst the Grits in the province of Ontario. Mr. Whitney's majority of 1904 and his majority of 1908 show that there are more than Tories in the province of Ontario that will vote against a party which has been false to all its pledges in provincial matters, and much more against a party which has been false to all its pledges in federal matters. My right hon. friend has not given a reason. The Minister of Justice has not given a reason. He visits with that superior smile of his any objection which is taken from this side of the House, and deigns no answer. But my right hon. friend and his Minister of Justice have to get out before the people of this country, before the universal trial judges of this country, and have got to answer there for this legislation against the province of Ontario. I ask my right hon. friend whether this was not his position in 1896; did he not say: We will take the provincial

franchise and the provincial arrangement of the list? He did. Did he not say: We hold power in our hands, and if we find that these are violated and gross instances of injustice are shown, we will have a chance to remonstrate with the provincial authorities, and if they do not conform with what we believe to be right, we have then the further right to take the matter into our own hands. That was his position; how has he carried it out? I ask him to say whether or not he has had the courtesy to communicate with the Hon. J. P. Whitney or the attorney general of Ontario, giving them the grounds on which he thinks wrongs have been done in those constituencies, and asking them to examine into them, and if they find that these wrongs have been perpetrated, then to provide the means for redress.

Such I venture to say he has not. I venture to say that neither he nor his Minister of Justice ever had the courtesy to approach the government of Ontario and put the case before it. Why? Because they had no case. When a case is to be put, it must be a reasoned one, based upon substantial evidence. But the Minister of Justice takes this absurd and petty position that because the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) has said something in this House and read something in this House, both of which he may believe to be true, but which have been absolutely and categorically denied by my hon. friend from West Algoma (Mr. Boyce)—and one member's word is just as good as another's in this House—because that hearsay statement has been made, my right hon. friend and his Minister of Justice take it as evidence upon which they can base this extraordinary piece of legislation. Why, the Minister of Justice gave away the position himself. He said he had heard nothing that could be called evidence and that evidence was the only thing that should guide one. I have no evidence, he said, and without evidence we cannot properly ascertain the true facts of the case and the basis of the difficulty. Yet he has not seen fit to take evidence. Neither has the first minister. The government has not proceeded in that way at all; but on a mere expression of dissatisfaction, on the mere assertion of one member met by the equally positive denial of another, just as intelligent and just as well posted, he has brought in this Bill. That is all there is, and yet on that evidence, which in a court of law would not hang a cat, which would not be permitted to have the least weight before any judge, our Minister of Justice—save the mark—in this Dominion parliament has thought fit to interfere with the sacred right of the franchise and attack the honesty and administration and good intentions of a local government. What answer has my hon. friend? There can be none. He has not been courteous nor honest nor fair. What he should have done, when the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) made the statements he did—what he should have done, if he thought there was a possible case, was to collect the data, put the case before the Hon. J. P. Whitney, and then if nothing were done, he would have some reason for grasping power which otherwise he has no business to lay a hand upon, and in laying hands upon which he is going against his own principles and his own record.

Then I asked my right hon. friend a question regarding the unorganized districts in the province of Quebec and what reply did I get? The Minister of Justice replied, and his reply shows the bareness and the baldness of the whole case. He said there were hundreds of people in the unorganized districts in the province of Quebec who could not vote. What does the right hon. gentleman propose to do in their case? Or is he only looking after those whom he expects to vote for the Grit candidate. Is it not as much the business of the Minister of Justice to see that the hundreds of voters in certain unorganized districts in the province of Quebec are given votes as to see that some voters who, it is alleged, have been left off the lists in the unorganized districts of Ontario, should be put in a position to vote. Is my right hon. friend solicitous that these voters in the unorganized districts in the province of Quebec should be in a position to exercise their franchise? If so, there is just as much imperative necessity that they should be looked after and organized and put in a position to exercise their rights as it is that these voters in the unorganized districts of Ontario should enjoy the franchise. But what has been done? My right hon. friend has dropped Quebec but hangs on to Ontario. Why has he dropped Quebec? He gives a very ingenuous reason. He says that the party friends who lead the government in that province may be trusted to make matters right, but in the case of Ontario the hon. Mr. Whitney, just returned by an immense majority, and his government cannot be trusted to do what is right. Why, the right hon. gentleman never asked him, never gave him the opportunity, and up to the 30th of June of this year, Mr. Whitney, both by his declarations and the power he possessed, could have remedied this matter of appeal, if my right hon. friend had deigned to enter into communication with him. Mr. Whitney had the power, the will and the desire, but my right hon. friend seems as anxious to keep a grievance as my hon. friend from Rainy River (Mr. Conmee). Both of them cherish grievances. They can give over the unorganized districts in the province of Quebec to the provincial legislature but they refuse to trust them to the province of Ontario.

The right hon. gentleman has gone too far in this matter, the defect alleged is that there are voters in the unorganized dis-

tricts of Ontario who have been left off the list. But why were they left off? Because the local elections were held on the 8th of June, and consequently there was not sufficient time to take appeals and have lists revised. But that is a difficulty only for this year, if it be one, and what is the hon. gentleman's proposed legislation? Does it confine itself to remedying that grievance this year? No, but the right hon. gentleman makes that pretense to grasp the unorganized districts, eleven of them, for all time to come. His measure goes immeasurably beyond the grievance and proves that it is not a desire to remove a real grievance which animates the right hon. gentleman but a desire to grasp the voters' lists. Take all your newspaper statements and the statements made in the House, and you have only one or two or three places where any grievance is alleged, but you see that as a pretext to grasp the whole eleven unorganized districts. Why do you do that? Not because you want to remedy a grievance localized in two or three places but because you wish to have the organization of those districts permanently in your hands. That will not appeal to the people of Ontario. It will not appeal to fair minded men throughout this Dominion. And after all, take out your partisans on the one side and the other, and you have the salt of the political earth in the shape of that large number of thinking people, growing every day larger, who hold the balance of power and who exercise an independent spirit of criticism and judgment with reference to both political parties. That you are outraging. The public sentiment in this country will not go with you. It will go against you and you feel it has gone against you when you give the people a chance to speak by their ballots.

I protest as strongly as I can. I make my protest here, throughout Ontario and this Dominion: and if these hon. gentlemen will not give a reason for the belief that is in them, they will be obliged to give it when we meet them at the poll.

Mr. PATERSON. It is well understood that it is highly desirable no lengthy speeches should be made at this stage of the session, and therefore I suppose many members may keep quiet who otherwise would feel it incumbent on them to take part in the debate.

But it seems to me that hon. members opposite want some one from the province of Ontario to speak on this subject. My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has gone into one of his paroxysms, one of these streaks that at times take possession of him, and has tried to wax indignant about a thing that, it seems to me, can be treated reasonably. What is this fuss about? What is it that he is going to discuss with the electorate?—and that, I suppose, he will give us the privilege of discussing with him. He tells us that some outrage is being committed, that war is being entered upon against the Whitney government. He says that we will find that we are up against the Whitney government. We are evidently up against some individuals in this House who hope some time to form a government, my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) being one. It is with them we will have to fight; we are not fighting with Mr. Whitney at all. We are seeking to have our own rights in this matter. We are not departing from our principles——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. PATERSON. I think hon. gentlemen opposite have admitted that we have kept that one plank in our platform.

Mr. BERGERON. You are spoiling it now.

Mr. PATERSON. Then do not hon. gentlemen opposite see how wrong they were for years in stating that we had not kept even this one? If they were wrong then they may be wrong now. We are seeking to have the new lists in places where there are no municipally-prepared lists. We have said in the past, and say now: Adopt the lists which are municipally prepared and upon which the local elections are held. But there are no municipally-prepared lists in the unorganized districts. There was special legislation by the provincial legislature to deal with these unorganized districts and provide for making up the lists. Hon. gentlemen say this Bill is special legislation. We are proposing to do the same thing with reference to Dominion lists. Is there anything wrong in that? The special legislation providing for making the lists for the Ontario House was carried out by partisans. I am not going to say they were unfair men, but they were men of the provincial government's own choosing, men who did not occupy judicial positions. These men prepared the lists, and on those lists the elections were run. If this Bill passes, it will declare the sense of this House that while in the organized counties the lists of the provincial elections should be used, yet in the unorganized districts where there are no municipally-prepared lists this Dominion legislature shall direct how those lists shall be prepared.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) allow a question? Does he propose to move an amendment to apply this to the province of Prince Edward Island?

Mr. PATERSON. I am not proposing any amendments to the Bill. We are discussing this question of Ontario and this alleged outrage of which hon. gentlemen talk.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) probably did not catch the drift of my question. He said the government proposed to take charge of the making of the lists where lists were not municipally prepared. I supposed, of course, he would move to apply it to the province of Prince Edward Island where the lists are not municipally prepared.

Mr. PATERSON. I will do the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) the justice to say that he is not so dense as not to understand what I said. We are discussing Ontario——

Mr. BOYCE. Why not apply the same to Quebec?

Mr. PATERSON. The subject under discussion now is Ontario. According to hon. gentlemen opposite, if we were trying to do this thing in Quebec we would be doing the monstrous thing that they declare we are doing here. Now, whether a monstrous thing or not, we are doing it only in Ontario, and, therefore, the discussion can be confined to Ontario. There was necessarily special legislation by the provincial legislature to provide for the making of these lists for the provincial elections. I maintain the right of this parliament, in perfect consistency with the principles we announced in the past in favour of municipally-prepared lists, to legislate specially for the preparation of lists for the Dominion election. It has been argued by hon. members opposite that this is done for the sake of the hon. member for Thunder Bay and Rainy River (Mr. Conmee), that this Bill, if rightly named, would be called : A Bill to elect the present member for Thunder Bay and Rainy River. They say that the hon. member has asserted of his own knowledge that the lists are unfair as they were prepared, at least in some of these districts, for the last election. But they say also that he has given no proof, and therefore that the facts as he presents them should not be accepted. I do not deal with this matter on the basis of the statements of the hon. member (Mr. Conmee). I take the statements and arguments of hon. members opposite on the floor of this House. And I ask these hon. members to judge by inference from those statements whether the lists prepared in the last provincial election were just, honest and complete lists.

Mr. J. D. REID. Of course, they were.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. member (Mr. J. D. Reid) says they were. Now, what is proposed under this Bill? Is it proposed that the government shall appoint its own creatures to prepare lists? Nothing of the kind. It is proposed that three judges of the land shall be selected and that they shall select enumerators who shall prepare the lists.

Mr. ALCORN. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

Mr. PATERSON. Let me go on——

Mr. ALCORN. I would only say that——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order. Sit down.

Mr. PATERSON. The enumerators are to prepare the lists, and when they are so prepared they are to be revised by the judges, so that only such names as are proper to be on those lists shall remain on.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT. May I ask the hon. member (Mr. Paterson) a question?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order. Oh, oh. Sit down.

Mr. PATERSON. My hon. friend from North Toronto alluded to that class of citizens who, as he says, are distinct from political parties and who, he claims, are the remnant that save the country, and declares that the people will condemn this Bill. Will the sane and fair element in the community, the people who view questions fom a non-partisan point of view, say that a measure which provides that the judiciary shall prepared the lists is a partisan outrage? Will these men say that the judges will prepare the lists in such a way as to give the hon. member for Thunder Bay and Rainy River a seat that he is not entitled to? I am a layman and I have always had an exalted idea of the judiciary of Canada. It has remained for members of the legal profession—who may aspire to positions on the bench themselves some day—to attempt to change my feeling on this subject. Is this their estimate of the judges of this country? Can they imagine themselves raised to the judicial bench, and willing, in that lofty position, to act as mere creatures of the government to make a list for the election of men to parliament who could not be elected fairly? The statements of these hon. gentlemen make me more suspicious of these existing lists than anything that the hon. member for Thunder Bay and Rainy River has said, for they tell us that on lists prepared by the judiciary, Liberals can be elected, but that Liberals would have no chance of election if the provincial lists were used. There can be no stronger argument. The hon. member may go from one point of Ontario to another—I trust I may be able to follow him or accompany him—and he will put this to the people of Ontario. What is the matter with this? Well, you are seeking an undue advantage. How so ? Because you have appointed the judges of the land, according to these gentlemen, to prepare the lists, and that task being confided to their hands, they are going so to manipulate these lists that the hon. member for Rainy River and others can be elected when the people don't want them. Will he not be in

a nice position in making that argument on the platform before the people?

An hon. MEMBER. That is not the point.

Mr. PATERSON. It is the point, and the only point that is going before the people of Ontario, that clear distinct point, and all the worked-up indignation that the hon. gentlemen get off now or will be able to get off in the future, will look very cheap and very silly in the presence of men who will understand that the whole pretended outrage consists in this, that instead of having the lists prepared by partisan officers of the government, they are prepared by the judges of the land.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. PATERSON. What is the use of saying no? Your whole argument, everything you have said in reference to this Bill, proceeds on the assumption that the judges who revise the lists will make partisan lists.

Mr. ALCORN. The judges do not make the lists.

Mr. PATERSON. Very well, then, if they do not make the lists the hon. gentleman confesses that the judges are honest men and that they have done honest work.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. In this case it is the enumerators.

Mr. PATERSON. No, the enumerators are appointed by the judges, not by Sir Wilfrid Laurier. They do their work under the direction of the judges, their work is to be revised by the judges, the lists therefore are judicially prepared lists as distinct from partisan lists prepared for the local House. I trust that next time the Ontario government revise their lists they will take a leaf out of the book of the Dominion government, and instead of appointing their partisan enumerators, will leave the task in the hands of the judges, as it is proposed to be done in this case. An insult to the Whitney government! How can it be an insult to the Whitney government? Do you mean to tell me that the Whitney government do not believe that the lists prepared by their officers are honest lists? Do you mean to take that ground? Very well then, that being so, we appoint the judges to make those lists, and those lists made by the judges, if they are what you say they are, will corroborate what was done by Mr. Whitney's officers, and bring him glory and renown, and you will be relieved of the trouble. It will only confirm the Whitney government's wisdom, it will only make the Whitney government shine more resplendently bright, that is all it will accomplish. Then I need not carry the argument further. we all grasp it. There is a special preparation. Remember that in the counties you are talking about in the unorganized district. I do not know how many Dominion ridings it will make, perhaps half a dozen; there are eighty ridings in Ontario in which you use the lists prepared by the local government, and in the other six ridings you have a special preparation of the lists. There, instead of having the lists made by partisan officers of the local government, we propose to have the lists made for these constituencies by the judges of the land. That is the proposition that goes before the people, that and nothing more; and instead of being an insult to the Whitney government, their lists being right and proper, when the revision of these lists take place, the judicial revision which every man must admit will be honest and fair, and when that confirms the righteousness of the Whitney lists, why, the Whitney government is exalted and we will be cast down, especially the member for Rainy River who does not believe that this is the case. Now is not that the whole matter, notwithstanding all the indignation that you may attempt to arouse? There is one thing to be regretted, that is, that we find gentlemen of the legal profession in this House committing themselves to this bald statement, that the judges of the land, whose selection is not left to the government, but is determined in the Bill, that these men can so forget their duty, to forget the responsibility that rests upon them, that they will deliberately prepare lists that are false and wrong in order to elect members to this House that could not be elected on proper lists. We will await the result of this revision when it is made, and if it turns out that the lists that have been prepared by the provincial House are just and right, then hon. gentlemen opposite will be able to charge that we have entailed upon the country whatever expense there may be connected with this revision, and that is the only thing they can charge us with. The whole question is simply the small amount of money that it will take to bring about these judicially revised lists in the unorganized districts, that will, or ought to give absolute satisfaction to every man in this country, whether he be Grit or Tory.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Minister of Customs has been as amusing as usual. He told us in the commencement of his remarks that he did not desire or expect to be up against the Whitney government. He did not remind us that he had already been up against the Whitney government in the two ridings of Brant, and had come back with a very crestfallen appearance.

Mr. PATERSON. We all meet with such accidents in elections.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes, and the hon. gentleman has met with a great many. So far as I understand his argument, it is this, when you condense it, that because the lists in the unorganized districts of Ontario are revised by the judges, and are therefore honest and good lists, it is the duty of this parliament to disregard them and to propose this measure. He has declared most

emphatically, so far as we could follow him, that the lists prepared by the officers of the Whitney government and revised by the judges of the land, are fair and honest lists. At all events he said no word against them and he argued that because the proposed lists to be prepared under this legislation will be equally fair and honest, therefore this legislation should go on.

Mr. PATERSON. I said more than that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. He said not a word against their accuracy or fairness.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, I said that the inference and the only inference that could be drawn from the remarks of hon. gentlemen opposite was that these lists were unfair.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does the hon. gentleman seriously ask the House to believe that this legislation is being based upon the statements of hon. gentlemen on this side? The hon. gentleman seems to be very much in error as to what the policy of his government has been in the past. He says it has been their policy to abide altogether by municipal lists and to legislate whenever they were not municipal lists. Does he not know that from 1897 to the present time, in the unorganized districts of Ontario, where the lists are not municipally prepared, the lists have been respected if they are less than a year old? That is the present law by section 7 of the statute.

Mr. PATERSON. I know it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then he is not abiding by the principles of the past when he proposes this legislation which provides that even where there are provincial lists less than a year old, those provincial lists in those unorganized territories shall be disregarded, although they are made to-day under the sanction and supervision of the judges, and that new lists prepared by this government shall take their places. Thus it may happen that these federal lists will be made in August, September and October of this year and new lists will be prepared under the provincial government next spring; then if a general Dominion election should take place next July or August the lists nearly a year old, prepared by this government, shall be used and not the new lists prepared by the provincial government and approved by the judges. That is the effect of this legislation. The hon. gentleman proposes judicial lists, lists having judicial authority. What has he to say to the action of his friends in Nova Scotia, who, year after year, have denied any appeal to the judges with respect to the electoral lists of the province? The Conservatives of Nova Scotia would be delighted to have a chance to appeal to the judges in respect to the preparation of the lists, more than once have they made that motion in the assembly since 1882, but on every occasion it has been voted down. This Bill cannot be justified under present conditions. The Minister of Justice himself has declared that these matters which have been brought to the attention of the House, asserted on one side, controverted on the other, could not be determined except upon evidence before a committee of the House. No one will gainsay that.

Mr. PATERSON. We had that evidence inferentially to-day.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister differs from his colleague the Minister of Justice, who, in putting forward these stories, on July 2nd, said that he did not put them forward as evidence of any facts, except the one fact that there was dissatisfaction on the part of some hon. gentlemen opposite. We do not know how many people were dissatisfied, it may have been one or half a dozen or fifteen in the northern ridings of Ontario. But there are the words of the Minister of Justice that these matters upon which this Bill rests are matters that cannot be known except by inquiry on evidence and that inquiry has not been made. Further than that, we have the distinct admission of the Minister of Justice that, so far as he and the government and this House are concerned, that evidence is not forthcoming and has not yet been placed before parliament.

Mr. CONMEE. It has been stated that there is a properly prepared list in the unorganized territory and that no evidence was produced in this House to show that that list was defective, unfair, improperly and illegally prepared and stuffed. I made assertions on a former occasion that it was an unfair list, that it was illegally prepared, that it took an unfair advantage of one political party, that it was prepared by political partisans, the enumerators being the nominees of the Conservative candidates in the local elections.

Mr. BOYCE. Would that be the reason for introducing this Bill?

Mr. CONMEE. No, not the whole reason; the hon. member himself gave the reason for its introduction; two years ago he spoke for nearly three hours discussing and showing the imperfections of our present Act in regard to the preparation of lists for Dominion elections. He claimed that gross injustice had been done to him in his riding. He repeated those arguments during the present session, and if a strong case could be made out for a change in the law, he is responsible for making such a case. His whole argument led to that point.

Mr. BOYCE. The very provisions that I complained of are continued in this Act.

Mr. CONMEE. I entirely differ, they are not. The Act he complained of provided that the lists must be prepared after the writs were issued and the accusation was made against this government that it was a partisan list, hasty and therefore an imperfectly prepared list, and there was a good deal of ground for some of those allegations. It was in view of that that the government, as far as I know, undertook this legislation, in order that they might be relieved from allegations of that character, in order that they might have a fair and reasonable list which would be regarded by fair-minded men as just, as between the political parties. Such a list should not be prepared during the heat of a Dominion election, when perhaps men go to greater extremes than they would at other times. These were some of the reasons, if I understood the Prime Minister aright, which justified the introductoin of this legislation. It was timely and much needed legislation, as the present law is defective. The legislation was brought down before the statements were made by me, but the reasons given, I think, are sufficient to show the necessity for it and they are additional evidence that this legislation is absolutely necessary if we are to have a fair list. Does my hon. friend think that the present Dominion law if acted upon in the same manner as in the past would produce a fair list? He is on record as saying it would not.

Mr. BOYCE. What I complained about was the corrupt administration of the law by this government, and my words are on record.

Mr. CONMEE. And what I am complaining about is the corrupt, partisan, and fraudulent administration of the provincial law. Now I call the attention of the leader of the opposition to some remarks he made in this House. He criticised the reasons for this legislation as paltry and in support of his contention he read the following statement which was placed in his hands by the Whitney government:

The enumerators for the making of the voters' lists in territory without municipal organization were appointed by a general order in council dated the 18th day of December, 1907. At this time J. Gartforth was appointed to make the list for the old district of Port Arthur and Rainy River. The work was not commenced at Port Arthur, and it was afterwards found that the name of the enumerator had been received by telegram as J. Gartforth, where it should have been J. Ashforth. On the 6th day of January an order was passed correcting the name and appointing a separate enumerator, Frank Stain, for the Fort Frances district. It was supposed by the department that there was no further difficulty; but in March it was found that Ashforth was apparently incompetent and incapable of doing the work, and on the 25th day of March his appointment was cancelled, and he was instructed by telegraph to hand all papers and money to Mr. Donald Hogarth. On the same date Mr. Donald Hogarth was appointed enumerator for the east part of the riding of Port Arthur, and Thomas Cummings was appointed enumerator for the western portion. Both were instructed to see Mr. Langworthy, the Crown attorney and the clerk of the peace, for advice.

In the first place when I was accusing the enumerators of being partisan and of preparing lists without any notice and stealing a mean advantage over their opponents, the hon. gentleman from Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Boyce) was quick to jump to his feet and contradict that statement because he said that he knew Mr. Ashforth would not be guilty of such a thing. Well that is correct. In the statement read by the leader of the opposition it is claimed this Mr. Ashforth was incompetent and incapable of doing the work, but I think my hon. friend from Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Boyce) will admit that there is no more capable man in the country than Mr. Ashforth. It was not because he was not competent that Mr. Ashforth was dispensed with: it was because he was too high class a man to do the work of the machine. That is why he never got the instructions he should have got from the clerk of the peace.

Mr. BOYCE. My hon. friend has before him a statement that Mr. Ashforth did not get the letter.

Mr. CONMEE. I have no such thing before me; I have Mr. Ashforth's own statement that he did get the appointment.

Mr. BOYCE. My hon. friend has heard it stated several times that the reason Mr. Ashforth did not act was because he did not get the letter, which was incorrectly addressed to him as 'Gashforth.'

Mr. CONMEE. No such statement has been made and no such statement is true if it is made.

Mr. BOYCE. It is on 'Hansard.'

Mr. CONMEE. My. hon. friend is wrong. It is on 'Hansard,' there was a mistake as to the name and that might have misled the gentlemen at Toronto for a short time, but nobody claimed it mislead Mr. Ashforth, so far as I remember, who told me himself he was appointed enumerator.

Mr. BOYCE. When?

Mr. CONMEE. Last February; and the document read by the leader of the opposition is proof that he had no instructions. He was referred to Mr. Langworthy for advice and instructions and he never got them. Why did not he get them? I leave hon. gentlemen to answer that question for themselves. He did not get them because he was not the kind of man they wanted. Let me illustrate that by another instance. We hear a good deal from gentlemen opposite

about the virtue and righteousness of the Whitney government and their officials and their administration. I have never attacked that administration and its record and I do not think it is a fair thing to do ; and I am going to make the remarks which I feel called upon to make now because the name of a respected citizen has been attacked in this document read by the leader of the opposition. Mr. Ashforth was a member of their license board and it was proved up to the hilt that two members of the board were bribed and had received money. An investigation was called for and a gentleman came up to hold the investigation and when he got to Port Arthur he found there was something in the rumours, and where do you think he held the investigation? In a back room 7 feet by 6 feet of Mr. Garrick's office. Two or three bold spirits found their way in there and the commissioner was just about to close his books as there was no evidence, when they called on him to subpœna Mr. Downing and Mr. Downing's evidence disclosed that he gave $400 to one member of the board and $200 to another. The man who got the $200 admitted it ; the gentleman who got the $400 did not deny it but he said it was given for another purpose. The commission of that officer was to investigate not that one charge but all the charges in regard to the license administration in that town, and he has never done it. The court was adjourned for ten days and the court never sat again and they have never come back to finish the investigation because there are lots more behind the scenes. I have the report here of the evidence taken and one of the witnesses was asked : Why did'nt you go to Mr. Ashforth, who is another member of the board. His reply was : Why, Mr. Ashforth was regarded as a particularly honest man and there was no use going to see him. That is evidence as to the character of Mr. Ashforth. And if the newspapers are correct, within the last few days they have dismissed that board and they have dismissed Mr. Ashforth along with the two men who had received the money. And why ? Because he was honest ; because the public had respect for him; because even those who were conspiring to bribe the board could not get near him because of the high character of the man. He could not be tampered with. That man is dismissed from office ; and in this House his name is dragged in as that of a man incompetent to prepare the voters' lists.

Mr. BOYCE. Who dragged it in but the hon. member himself?

Mr. CONMEE. The hon. leader of the opposition read the report. I am not responsible for it ; I am repudiating it. I want to go a step further on that point. I have under my hand a quotation from the Conservative newspaper of Port Arthur, the 'Herald,' which verifies the statement I made. The declaration I made was that Mr. Hogarth, who, according to the reports, was the office man and the partner of the candidate, and was appointed enumerator, was acting the part of a partisan by canvassing for Mr. Carrick while in the pay of the people of the province. That was my allegation. I did not make it of my own motion. I read from the newspaper in which that charge was made. As against that charge, the hon. leader of the opposition read a statement showing the date of Mr. Hogarth's appointment and giving the reasons for his appointment. Now, let me give the reasons which the Conservative paper of Port Arthur gave for his appointment. It makes this statement :

> Mr. Carrick's personal agent has not assisted in the compilation of the voters' lists. It is true that Mr. Donald Hogarth was appointed enumerator, but without the knowledge of either himself or Mr. Carrick, on April 21. Immediately after Mr. Carrick's nomination the government was wired by the candidate to this effect: 'Can you cancel Mr. Hogarth's appointment as enumerator?'

According to the document read by the hon. leader of the opposition—and I will show by sworn testimoney in a minute or two that that is corroborated—Mr. Donald Hogarth was appointed enumerator on the 25th day of March, nearly a month before the date that the Conservative paper claims that he was advised by telegraph that he was appointed enumerator. What was he doing in that month? Exactly what he is accused of doing—canvassing and preparing the list for the Conservative candidate. There can be no controverting of these facts.

Mr. W. WRIGHT. The hon. member states that Mr. Hogarth was canvassing for Mr. Carrick during that time. Where is his proof of that?

Mr. CONMEE. I will not give any proof of that. I make the statement. The newspaper here accuses him of it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. CONMEE. Yes, I can show it from the Port Arthur 'Chronicle,' which is on file in the library. The Conservative paper denies it.

Mr. BRISTOL. Had the Conservative candidate been nominated at that time?

Mr. CONMEE. Yes, he was nominated previous to this article.

Mr. BOYCE. What is the date of that article?

Mr. CONMEE. The 28th of April.

Mr. BRISTOL. The hon. gentleman said that he was canvassing for Mr. Carrick from the 25th of March.

Mr. CONMEE. I think I understood the hon. member's question quite correctly. The hon. member did not fix the date in March.

Mr. BRISTOL. I thought I did; I endeavoured to do so.

Mr. CONMEE. If that is what the hon. gentleman meant, there was no candidate at the time the enumerator was appointed. I am not talking about when the candidate was nominated; I am talking of the time when the enumerator was appointed, which Mr. Hogarth and the Conservative party and paper denied.

Mr. W. WRIGHT. How could he be canvassing for a candidate when there was no candidate?

Mr. CONMEE. Is my hon. friend so very innocent? When he is a little longer in public life he will get wise on that subject. I do not think I need waste any time in giving an answer to that question. The hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie has stated that he has not only contradicted but disproved everything I stated, and I suppose he thinks he has. I also made the statement that the enumerator, Cumming, posted his list in Port Arthur for the riding of Fort William, fifty miles away from the polling division to which that list referred—fifty miles in some cases, sixty miles in others, forty miles in others, twenty miles in others.

Mr. W. WRIGHT. Does the hon. member make the statement that it was not posted at the other places as well?

Mr. CONMEE. I did not previously make the statement but I now make that statement. I stated then that I had no knowledge of that, and the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie dared me to say that it was not posted there.

Mr. BOYCE. I say it was posted there.

Mr. CONMEE. It was not posted there. There was an investigation as to that matter, and here is a memorandum sent to me by Mr. Dowler, one of the attorneys who appeared in the action. He is a responsible man, and he is quoting the evidence. He mentions some of the cases, and then he says:

Mr. Cummings was called. The following proceedings took place. The enumerator, J. H. Cummings, was sworn, produced telegrams covering his appointment, showing appointment for part of Port Arthur and Rainy River riding west of Port Arthur.

The same evidence that the hon. leader of the opposition brought down, showing that this man was appointed by telegram, dated the 25th of March. The document from Toronto turns out, on sworn testimony, to be correct. The 25th of March is the date that both Cummings and Hogarth were appointed, and both of them concealed that date for nearly a month and went on with the preparation of the list without any notice or any warning to their opponents and behind the backs of their opponents:

And stating that he had a letter affirming it, but had not brought it with him.

I may say that later on this document shows that he did produce the letter.

No further appointment or change in territory had been made, that the two polling subdivisions, of Mattewin and Kashahowie were first visited by him between March 30 and April 18.

Mr. BOYCE. What is the hon. gentleman reading?

Mr. CONMEE. I am reading from the report of the evidence taken in the trial that took place last week.

Mr. BOYCE. Is it the evidence or Mr. Dowler's opinion?

Mr. CONMEE. It is a quotation from the evidence.

Mr. BOYCE. By Mr. Dowler?

Mr. CONMEE. If the hon. gentleman wants to cast doubts on a written document sent by a reputable lawyer, he is perpectly welcome. I am reading the statement to the House and not to my hon. friend because he seems to be privileged to deny anything and make any assertion in the most flippant manner.

Mr. BOYCE. I have not done so to the extent my hon. friend has.

Mr. CONMEE. At any rate that is my opinion, and I stand in the judgment of the House as to whether I am warranted in making that statement.

Mr. BOYCE. The hon. gentleman's statements have been proved not to be worth much on many occasions.

Mr. CONMEE. My hon. friend is often a little too bumptious and free with his denials and assertions.

(reading):

Were first visited between March 30 and April 18, and were visited the second time by him, between May 2 and 9. These lists or parts of the Cummings list were posted in his office about May 14. The other polling subdivisions were visited by Cummings on the first occasion between April 18 and 23, and on the second occasion between May 20 and June 3. When he was making the second visit to several of the polling subdivisions on the P. A. D. Dr. Smellie was with him.

Dr. Smellie was the Conservative candidate of the riding of Fort William.

(reading):

The lists prepared by him, or the parts rather, for the different polling subdivisions, were prepared separately, and posted in his

office separately, and as each was posted from time to time, copies were delivered by him to the judge, the sheriff and the clerk of the peace, Mr. Langworthy, but no copies were either mailed or delivered by him to anybody else.

That is evidence positive that no copies went to or were posted in these electoral divisions of the riding.
(reading) :

Except he thought he gave a copy to Mr. Mackenzie, of Port Arthur.

Mr. BOYCE. Is that the proclamation or copies of the list ?

Mr. CONMEE. Copies of the lists. He mailed them to the sheriff, the clerk of the peace, Mr. Longworthy, and the judge, but no copies were either mailed or delivered by him to anybody else.

A completed bound list of the different polling subdivisions as prepared by him had been made, and he had copies of the same in his office but had not posted them up, nor delivered them to anybody, neither had he advertised the completed list.

Neither has he to this day signed the declaration the law provides he should for the completion of his list.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Whose affidavit is this ?

Mr. CONMEE. The enumerator Mr. Cummings.

Mr. BOYCE. If the hon. gentleman will not state it. I may say, for the information of the leader of the opposition, that the hon. gentleman is quoting from the report of somebody else as to what that evidence is and not the evidence itself.

Mr. CONMEE. My hon. friend may hold his soul in patience. I am not going to deceive the leader of the opposition or the House.

Mr. BOYCE. You are trying to do it.

Mr. CONMEE. This is a report of the evidence sent me by Mr. Dowler, a reputable lawyer, who acted on the part of those who made the appeal.

Mr. BOYCE. Employed by you.

Mr. CONMEE. By the Liberal party, I suppose.

Mr. BOYCE. By you.

Mr. CONMEE. By me if you like. I should not wonder if I had to help to pay the bill. But that does not make this lawyer a dishonest man. We may possibly find an honest lawyer in this province. I have had considerable trouble to find one on some occasions, and I think I could bring that a little closer home if I wanted. I have no objection—although there are some statements in this not for the public—to hand this to the leader of the opposition if he would like to see it. Here is another little piece of evidence, and I cannot imagine that this gentleman would send me a statement of the evidence which was wrong. I take it for granted that it is right since I am reading it, and if Mr. Dowler is deceiving me or this country, that will not do him any credit as a member of the bar.

Francis Dubois, of Silver Mountain, was sworn and stated that there were fifty-two names on the Silver Mountain list, composed altogether of river drivers who were simply making a drive of logs down the river and were probably not in the riding over a week, and none of whom were there at the time of the election. Though there were ninety-nine names on the list, including these fifty-two, there were only seventeen that voted.

Mr. TAYLOR. They did not have a 'Minnie M' up there.

Mr. CONMEE. Evidently not.
(reading) :

He also stated that there were in the neighbourhood of eighteen to twenty names that should be on, that no voters' list came to the polling subdivision until the morning of the election, when Dr. Smellie's scrutineer brought up some copies, and that no appeal was made.

I do not wish to detain the House by reading these documents. There are other witnesses and they all say the lists were not posted in the riding. Let me say this to the committee. Will it be believed—I am repeating the statement I made previously——

Mr. BOYCE. The hon. gentleman has offered to send the document over. Will he kindly do so ?

Mr. CONMEE. No sir, I did not offer to send it to you at all. I offered to hand it to the leader of the opposition if he wished to read it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I should be very glad to have it.

Mr. CONMEE. I am making a statement because I see the hon. gentleman in his seat now and he was not there a moment ago. At that time I pointed out that this particular enumerator was appointed for a ridding to which he did not belong. He was making up the lists in the Fort William riding, and he posted them only in his office in the Port Arthur riding. That is clearly proven by the evidence. But now there appears even a worse case than that. Mr. Cummings was appointed to make up the lists for the west division of the riding of Port Arthur. He did not make up that list at all, but made up the list for the west portion of the riding of Fort William, in which he had no authority. I think that will be seen by the documents to which I refer. The man was appointed and the division of the district took place afterwards, but no change was made. I am told, on what I

believe to be reliable authority, that the reviser for a section of the Kenora division was not appointed for that division, but made up lists for a large section for which he had no authority.

Mr. BOYCE. Have you your lawyer's statement for that?

Mr. CONMEE. No, but I have just as good. Now, I state further, and I think I shall be borne out by the facts, that the reason why these appeals were not taken was because the whole thing seemed to be in confusion. Even lawyers could not tell us what steps to take; they did not know where they were at. The law had not been distributed; nobody could get it; nobody knew how to proceed in order to make an appeal. The only purpose in maintaining the appeal that has been made is to expose the conditions under which the lists were prepared. Judging from a letter which I have, I take it that the appeal will go on, but that will depend upon the judge. But I am told by members of the legal profession that, notwithstanding the defects, notwithstanding that the list was prepared by the enumerator for a riding to which he was not appointed, notwithstanding that it was never a posted list, notwithstanding that he has never made the affidavit that the law requires before the judge can give his certificate, yet the election was held. We cannot have a proper revision because the law deprives us of the opportunity. Here is a section of the Ontario Act of 1908:

The non-performance by the enumerator of any of the duties under this Act within the time appointed shall not affect the validity of the list nor shall such list be void for any irregularity if there has been a substantial compliance with the requirements of the Act.

I am told that because of that section we are actually shut out from anything further than merely an exposé of the manner in which the list was prepared.

Mr. LANCASTER. That would be because there was substantial compliance.

Mr. CONMEE. If the hon. member (Mr. Lancaster) will pay attention he will see that there are two sections in that sentence:

The non-performance by the enumerator of any of the duties under this Act within the time appointed shall not affect the validity of this list——

There is a stop there.

—nor shall such list be void for any irregularity——

That is another point.

—if there has been a substantial compliance with the requirements of the Act.

Mr. LANCASTER. In every case if there has been substantial compliance.

Mr. CONMEE. In the first you are positively shut out. At least that is the interpretation given to me. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) shakes his head. He is a lawyer and I do not pretend to argue the point with him; I leave him to his fellow lawyers. I have here a number of newspaper reports, but I shall not take up the time of the House by reading them. It is claimed that at Ignace the enumerator posted up his notice that he would be there on a certain day. He did not come until three days after the date fixed, and when he did come he took a leaf out of the Roblin enumerator's book, he secretated himself in the office of some political friend and made up his list there, and the Liberals did not know anything about it—did not even know that he was in town. Now, with regard to Mr. Eoll's list I have a fair knowledge of the facts because I took a great deal of pains to find out whether I was warranted in the statement that I made in this House on a former occasion. Mr. Eoll was appointed in December, but did not start to prepare his list until some time later. He went his first round and had begun on his second round and completely closed a number of polling subdivisions before any of the Liberals knew that he had been appointed enumerator or that any notices had been posted up. It may be asked: How could that happen? It certainly did happen, whether hon. members are satisfied with my explanation of how it could have happened or not. Mr. Eoll is not a very well-known man—I have nothing to say against him, I am not using his name for that purpose, but I never knew there was such a man until I heard that he was enumerator after this had occurred. It is claimed that he posted up on his own door the announcement that he had posted up the voters' lists at certain places at certain times. These places are isolated, some of them are twenty or thirty miles from a railway—mining camps, lumber camps or settlements. Take, for instance, the township of Marks, which is a long way from any of the towns or cities. The enumerator goes up there. There may be no schoolhouse on which to post the notice. He posts it, perhaps, on the door of some citizen—perhaps some good Conservative, though I do not make that statement, but the fact is that nobody saw that notice and no news came to the Liberals of Port Arthur or Fort William that that notice was up. That has been done over and over again, purposely, enumerators concealing their appointment and carrying on their work in such a way that the public knew nothing of it. The document which the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) read, showed that Mr. Hogarth was appointed a month before he began his duties, and the Conservative newspapers were denying it all the time. The enum-

erator would start out like a thief in the night to prepare his list unknown to the opponents of the ruling party and would make an unfair list. Hon. gentlemen opposite say to us: You ought to be content to accept these lists. I say: No, they are not fair or just lists. Surely it is within the power of this parliament to remedy an evil of that kind. No hon. member on the other side has contended that the present law relating to Dominion lists is a proper law or one that works fairly. Its operation in the past has proven it very defective indeed. I want to point out that the Ontario law is no better. What did the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. Wright) do today? What has the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Boyce) done every time he has got on his feet? Both these gentlemen have argued that there was not enough time given to prepare the Dominion lists. The hon. member for Muskoka tried to persuade the Prime Minister that under this Bill he would only have about two months and a half to prepare his lists, and that it was much too short a time.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT. Did I not refer to the Bill as introduced, providing for making those lists after the writs were issued, and it was in that connection I stated that there was not sufficient time.

Mr. CONMEE. I understood his argument to be that if elections come on this fall, this Bill will only give you two months and a half to prepare the lists.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT. When the hon. gentleman spoke some time ago his principal grievance was that there was not sufficient time under the Ontario Act, and now he is willing to adopt the same time.

Mr. CONMEE. The hon. gentleman is entirely wrong. The Ontario Bill provides that there shall be only fifteen days from the time the enumerator posts up his ists for the people to appeal to him when he holds his court the second time, to have their names put on the list, or others struck off which ought not to be there. Then there may be an appeal to the county judges if any one believes he has not received fair-play at the hands of the enumerators, or the district judge can fix ten days. I say that is not sufficient time. Whether my hon. friend takes his position on the Dominion Act, it is defective; if he chooses to take the Ontario Act, it is still more defective, you cannot have a proper list under it, there is not time enough.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT. Then the hon. gentleman does not endorse this language of the Bill in subsection 5:

In the preparation of such lists the provisions of the law of the province regulating the preparation and manner of revising and bringing into force the provincial voters' lists in like cases shall as far as possible, be observed and followed.

Mr. BOYCE. It provides that the Ontario law shall be followed as far as possible.

Mr. CONMEE. It is not the case now. This law will govern. Hon. gentlemen say: You are doing an injustice to the province of Ontario. How? The hon. member for North Toronto and others charge this government with treating the province of Ontario with indifference, that we are casting a slur upon Ontario and upon her government. I would like to know how. Why should Ontario feel wounded if this House chooses to take charge of its own electoral lists? What business is it of Ontario's, if the provincial government is not in politics to interfere with Dominion elections? The Ontario government do not want to dictate to this House as to how the lists shall be prepared on which members are elected to this House. Hon. gentlemen opposite ask: Where are your principles of provincial rights? I would like to know where provincial rights are involved. Wherein are the principles of the Reform party involved in this Bill? The Reform party was never committed to anything beyond municipal provincial lists. Where does the provincial rights question come in? The hon. member for North Toronto grew eloquent on that question, and directed toward me some remarks that I don't think he should have used. I want to say to him that I do not think his reputation is improved. I do not think he is any more spotless than a good many other members of this House. I doubt very much if there are not more dark spots on his hide than there are on some other members. He grew eloquent about the way Manitoba was going to be treated. The hon. gentleman has forgotten not so long ago when he was willing to take Manitoba by the throat and force her by coercion. The hon. gentleman made a reference to me which I feel disposed to resent. I do not usually sling out uncomplimentary remarks to members of this House. I do not think it is altogether becoming to the hon. member for North Toronto, because if there is one member of this House who lives in a glass house, it is that hon. gentleman. He has not shown that spotless character that he talks about, in the positions of trust which he has occupied, in politics or otherwise. When he was Finance Minister of this Dominion was just the time when the McGreevys and others were getting in their best work. His record is not very good, either.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the matter with it?

Mr. CONMEE. There is this matter with it, that he was supposed to be the guardian of the people's funds, and those funds were pilfered from his treasury by political friends, and either the hon. gentleman did not have ability enough to detect it, or he did not have the will, whichever position he

chooses to take. The facts are there. No one has accused me of being a traitor to my leader or to any one with whom I was associated. So I think so far as that kind of thing is concerned my hon. friend would be just as well off if he left out some of those sharp sayings. I want to say to him and to hon. gentlemen opposite that I have been in public life for a considerable time, and I defy any man, I do not care on which side of the House he sits, to bring against me anything that I am ashamed of. I do not say I am perfect, I make no claims. But some of the remarks directed against me to-day are ungentlemanly, are uncalled for, but I do not intend to refer to them any further at this moment.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have verified by documents and by the various Acts my contention in regard to these lists. If the statement the leader of the opposition read in this House is true, and I think it is, as to the dates these enumerators were appointed, then it is time that they were directed to go to the Crown Attorney for instructions. The Crown Attorney is a Conservative. I do not say that he is a bad man at all, but he is a strong Conservative. It appears that that was either deliberately or stupidly done, because the instructions were not given. The fact that these gentlemen were appointed enumerators, and that they were dealing with the rights and liberties of the electors of that district, was concealed from the opposite political party for more than a month. I want to ask hon. members if that was a fair thing. If the documents which have been brought down here have any foundation at all then these lists are the very worst kind of lists that could be prepared. They are partisan lists. In a division where there are only 99 names more than half of them were there wrongfully. In the Rainy River district I am told there was an appeal against one of the two polling divisions in which there were 180 names struck off. These are the only two polls in the whole four ridings of Thunder Bay and Rainy River. in which appeals could be taken. Under these circumstances, if hon. gentlemen can have the face to say that they should force their opponents to an election on lists of that character, then they are not the fair men I have given them the credit of being.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I wish to enter my earnest protest against this piece of legislation. It is most unfair, unreasonable and uncalled for. After listening to the arguments of the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) and others who have spoken on the government side, I am forced to the conclusion that the Prime Minister must share that view, and feel that these clauses should not be passed and that we should vote for the amendment. The Minister of Customs in the old days went about the country telling what great things the Liberal party would do when in power, on behalf of the provinces; they came into power and have gone back on every promise except this one. To-day the minister attempts to defend the action of the government, saying they are standing by provincial rights, but surely his conscience must tickle a little. This appears to be only opening the door in northern Ontario to such men as the O'Gormans, the Pritchards, the Prestons, the Jacksons, the Conmees, and all the rest to go into that country, to take advantage of the electors, and when I see the Prime Minister attempt——

Mr. CONMEE. I rise to a point of order. The hon. member has used my name in connection with corrupting the electorate. I want that statement withdrawn.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I did not hear the hon. gentleman suggest corruption.

Mr. CONMEE. He mentioned my name as going into that country and corrupting.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The hon. gentleman is a little sensitive, because there are other people of the same name.

Mr. CONMEE. The hon. member used my name and I want it withdrawn. I think I am within my rights.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. But if I did not use it in connection with the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee)—there are other Conmees.

Mr. CONMEE. You mentioned it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think a statement of that kind about a member of the House is out of order, a statement charging the member with going into the constituency and there corrupting.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I did not charge him.

Mr. CARVELL. Will the hon. member say he did not mean the member for Rainy River ?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I was going to say——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. To be in order the member should withdraw the expression.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. If he wishes me to withdraw a statement I did not make in regard to the hon. member, I am willing to withdraw it.

Mr. TALBOT. Don't be half a man, be a whole man.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That language is altogether unbecoming and must be withdrawn.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am sorry to have used that expression if it is out of order, but I cannot help feeling——

Mr. CONMEE. The hon. gentleman has not withdrawn.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understood the hon. member to withdraw.

Mr. CONMEE. He said he would but he has not done it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the hon. member knows the rules.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I withdrew any application to the member for Rainy River some time ago, how many times does he want it? The singling out of Ontario in this legislation is unfair and uncalled for and I cannot help protesting against it. The hon. member for Rainy River talks about the machine being used by the Conservative government in Ontario. Let him go back to the days of the Ross government and remember how elections were carried on under the instructions of that machine working under the men then in office. I appeal again to the Prime Minister to leave Ontario alone, to take the position that was taken many years ago. 'Hands off Manitoba,' was the cry then and on that cry we were able on this side to obtain justice for Manitoba within the last few weeks. The Prime Minister on investigation will be convinced that practically only one man behind him is attempting to defend this measure, and he cannot come to any other conclusion than that this legislation would be an injustice to the province of Ontario and that these clauses should be struck out.

Mr. McCOOL. I am surprised to hear hon. gentlemen opposite speak of a slur being cast upon the government of Ontario by asking the passage of this Act. It cannot be claimed that the reference of the list to a board of judges is casting a slur upon the provincial government. I have been amused to hear speakers opposite repeating that only the member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) was being ill treated in reference to the preparation of the lists. The enumerators appointed for the district of Nipissing did not wear wings any more than those in the Rainy River district. I have hundreds of letters here but shall read only a few, including an affidavit illustrating the evils that have existed there. I shall first call attention to the most northerly district. I have here the oath taken by the enumerator for that district, Mr. Williams Hugh, who swore,

I, Williams Hugh, make oath and say:

1. That I have set down in the voters' list for the townships of Pense, Ingram, Dack, Robillard, Marter, Chamberlain, Truax, and all territory north to proposed junction of the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific, according to the best of my information and judgment, the name of every person entitled to be entered thereon.

2. That I have not entered upon the said list the name of any person which I have reason to believe ought not to be entered thereon.

3. That I have not intentionally omitted from the said list the name of any person which I had any reason to believe ought to be entered thereon.

4. That I have to the best of my knowledge and belief discharged the duties required of me by the Ontario Voters' List Act.

WILLIAMS HUGH.

Sworn before me at North Bay in the district of Nipissing, this 13th day of April, 1908,

J. A. VALIN,
District judge, district of Nipissing.

The instructions received from the department in Toronto were that he should do what has been incorporated in this affidavit. Here is a copy of the affidavit sent to Judge Valin after the list was made.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is there any objection to the oath or to the instructions; what is the point?

Mr. McCOOL. I will leave the hon. gentleman to judge of that when he hears the affidavit.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am speaking of the form of oath and form of instructions.

Mr. McCOOL. The affidavit I have read declared this man carried out his instructions and had proceeded to the junction of the Transcontinental and Northern Ontario Railway with the Grand Trunk Pacific. This affidavit shows whether he did or not:

Original sent to Judge Valin, North Bay.

In the matter of the Ontario Voters' List Act.

I, George Shortt, of the township of Marter, in the district of Nipissing, make oath and say:

1. That I am entitled to be a voter.

2. That Williams Hugh, an enumerator for preparing voters' lists for the unorganized portion of the district of Nipissing, north of Englehart, has as I am informed and verily believe, included in his list a number of voters residing in the organized town of Englehart and the organized township of Evanturel. In the voters' lists of said organized municipalities the names of said persons should be included.

3. That as I am informed and verily believe the said Williams Hugh has never posted up a list made by him for said unorganized territory but has kept same locked up in his safe and it has been impossible to inspect the said list.

4. That as I am informed and verily believe that the most northerly point which the said Williams Hugh visited was Driftwood City on the construction of the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway.

This is 30 or 40 miles from the point he states in his affidavit he visited. All the people in that section were disfranchised.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCool) asking us to take the oath of a man who speaks from information and belief as against the oath of a man who positively swears he did something ?

Mr. McCOOL. Evidence can be brought that this man never visited that section.

Mr. LANCASTER. Well bring it and do not ask us to believe such an affidavit as that against positive evidence.

Mr. McCOOL. But he does not say in his affidavit positively that he did visit this place.

Mr. BOYCE. Is not that the statutory form of affidavit ?

Mr. McCOOL. I have no time to be bothered answering your questions.

Mr. BOYCE. Because you do not want to know the truth.

Mr. McCOOL (reading) :

5. That the said Williams Hugh never visited any point on the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway where there are a large number of voters and the said persons were never aware of the said list being prepared, and unless the said Williams Hugh goes further north, at least to the junction of the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway with the proposed line of the Transcontinental Railway a large number of persons will be disfranchised.

6. That mining operations are being carried on on Lake Abitibi, and a large number of persons are employed in the vicinity thereof transporting freight.

7. That the said Williams Hugh never visited the vicinity of Lake Abitibi, and unless he does so and prepares lists, there are a large number of persons will be disfranchised.

(Sgd.) GEORGE SHORTT.

The line of the Transcontinental passes north of Lake Abitibi and this affidavit states positively that the man never went to that section of the country at all.

Mr. LANCASTER. How does he know what the other man did.

Mr. McCOOL. What does the hon. gentleman know about it anyway ? This affidavit says positively he never visited that section.

Mr. LANCASTER. And the man who went there swears he did.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCool) give us the date of that affidavit ?

Mr. McCOOL. The original of this affidavit was filed with Judge Valin at North Bay and the date is omitted from this copy. I think we could get the original if necessary.

Mr. BOYCE. The original of that affidavit has been before Judge Valin, the district judge ?

Mr. McCOOL. Yes.

Mr. BOYCE. Then Judge Valin has seen the original and has passed upon it ?

Mr. McCOOL. I do not know whether he passed on it or not. The enumerator never went up into that district to make lists.

Mr. BOYCE. It is like the affidavit read by the member for Winnipeg.

Mr. McCOOL. When the friends of the Liberal party appealed to Mr. Hugh to have the names of men who were well known to be qualified placed on the list he said he would receive no names in that way, although they were supported by affidavits, and that these men would have to appear before the judge. That would mean a loss of four days and there are not many voters who would lose that time to go before a judge in support of an appeal. That kind of thing was done throughout the whole district. In another case a notice was posted on a school house that the enumerator would be there at a certain hour on a certain date, but it did not say what territory would be embraced, and a number of voters appeared for miles round and they were told by the school teacher that nothing was known about the enumerator except what was posted on the door. After waiting for two or three hours they went home, but the enumerator came later on and made up a numerous list supplied by one or two of his friends who happened to be there.

Mr. BOYCE. What place was that ?

Mr. McCOOL. North of New Liskeard, in Nipissing.

Mr. BOYCE. That does not give us much information.

Mr. McCOOL. Here is a letter I received from a very prominent citizen of Nipissing and this is what he says with regard to the lists :

The lists in this riding are a disgrace. In some cases the lists have been changed after the enumerators court was held. In McPherson and Kirkpatrick the names put on at the enumerator's court were afterwards left off the list, thereby disfranchising a large number of Liberal voters. About forty were left off in McPherson and Kirkpatrick, and thirty in Hugel, and the same thing occurred all through the unorganized townships. I am getting a large number of charges prepared and will be able to prove scores of cases of corrupt practices.

These names were not placed on the list and the enumerators kept them off. The enumerator was E. A. Wright who holds a dozen positions under the present government, and I think he is under suspension at present for some wrong-doing in connection with the license board, he being chairman of the license board of the district of Sturgeon Falls.

Mr. LANCASTER. That shows the Whitney government punishes wrong-doing.

Mr. BOYCE. What is the name of the writer of that letter ?

Mr. McCOOL. The name of the writer of the letter is Mr. H. E. McKee of Sturgeon Falls, barrister.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. McCOOL. Yes, and he is as reputable a man as there is in this House or out of it, that is who he is.

Mr. BOYCE. We saw him down here the other day.

Mr. McCOOL. I can give you another and the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Boyce) will probably find some fault with this man because nothing is right in the eyes of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Boyce) unless it emenates from one of his own peculiar friends. This letter says :

In New Ontario the Liberal candidates can attribute their defeat to two things, viz.:

1. Voters' lists prepared by enumerators who did not display even the slightest degree of fairness. Liberal voters in large numbers were left off lists, while many Conservatives were placed on lists although there was not any qualification possessed to entitle their names being added to lists. Foreigners in large numbers were placed on lists and they voted for Shillington, the Conservative candidate. Here in the town of New Liskeard, Wing Deer (a Chinaman) who is not a naturalized subject voted for the Conservative candidate. Let me say just how these names were collected. The police magistrate, the road inspector, the homestead inspector, the Crown lands agents, division court clerk, division court bailiff, license inspector and in fact every government official collected the names of Conservative voters for enumerators.

Lists were carelessly made up. In one poll here there was a case of one elector voting twice. The Christian names of two electors were E. and E. R. and the same individual voted at two different times in the same poll. Instead of posting lists as required by Act, some enumerators kept them locked up in safe so our men could not have access to them.

To accept such lists for Dominion election purposes would be utter nonsense. Why it would mean defeat before the campaign started.

Hon. gentlemen opposite boast of the majority of the Whitney government. I can tell them that if it were not for stuffed lists in Temiscamingue, Nipissing, Sturgeon Falls and Sudbury, Mr. Whitney would have four supporters less than he has today.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is that an affidavit which the hon. gentleman has just read?

Mr. McCOOL. No, it is not necessarily an affidavit. Hon. gentlemen opposite are as hard to please as the enumerators in that district. They want an affidavit to place any Liberal voter on the list, but any old name handed in by a Tory heeler goes on the list at once. That accounts for the fact that the lists in the district of Nipissing to-day are stuffed to the number of over 1,000. Here is another piece of rascality :

I wish to call your attention to the state in which our voters' lists are in this district. As it is likely that there will be a Dominion election in the near future it is important that new lists be made. In this small town of ours where the lists were to be made up independent of politics, we find about 25 Liberal voters' names left off, out of a total of about 125 voters. Here is the list of names omitted:

Robert Jamieson, livery owner; Henry Yarkie, livery owner; Thos. Inglis, livery owner; Thos. Barret, butcher; W. Whelan, teamster; P. Savard, boarding house; Geo. Vaillancourt, boarding house; Joe Milway, restaurant; J. Milkie, pool room; W. Searson, baggage man; Fred. Deacon, clerk ; S. Fielding, carpenter ; Joe Beaudry, labourer ; D. Roulleau, restaurant; R. Robertson, labourer; W. Kintrea, clerk; W. Lett, clerk; Thos. Code, clerk; Arthur Deschaut, labourer; R. Bruyere, labourer.

I can't just remember all of the names, but there are several more, and that is only in the little town here. All through the country it is the same way.

H. O'GRADY.

Here is something from another portion of the district :

Warren, Ontario, June 15, 1908.

Mr. C. A. McCool, M.P.

Seeing the approach of the federal election, I will take the liberty to notify you about the voters' lists which has been used for the provincial election in this district of Sturgeon Falls. It has been so tampered with that quite a few names have been taken out of it. People who have been voting for some forty years (Liberals) are missing. I consider it to be my duty to post you and the other members on these facts. Hoping to be of service,

I remain truly yours,

MEDERIC TREMBLAY.

Here is another case from the Temagami district :

In Temagami and vicinity about 100 Indians voted. They were all sworn, but took the oaths in Harley township. The poll was not opened until a quarter to ten o'clock, and some of our good friends left and came to town thinking it was not going to be opened. We have cases in which men had their fare paid and in which men voted under other men's names. When you consider that the government officials in this district, including the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway employees, amount to about 600, and the way the province went in general, what can you expect?

With regard to the Indian vote, I may say that these Indians are wards of the

government who receive their annual treaty money. At the last election I venture to say that the same trick was played at Temagami that was played at Haileybury in 1896. The Indians were on the list by virtue of the revising barrister, and three men did duty for forty voters in the town of Haileybury. I venture to say that the same thing happened at Temagami, because you could not otherwise get the Indian vote at that time of the year. I venture to say that not more than half a dozen were present. A particular friend of the party opposite has since boasted to me how he did the trick; he took the Indians each time and redressed them and got them to go and vote. The men who do such things are rewarded by the local government. I have here the 'Haileyburian,' which ought to be sufficiently Conservative to carry weight even with the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie, and in it there is a letter from Williams Hugh to his friend Mr. Farr, which reads as follows:

Englehart, Ontario, July 6, 1908.

Dear Mr. Farr,—The Hon. Frank has, through the department, directed me to open a land office at McDougall chute—now Matheson.

This is a news item, you will of course put this in your own peculiar way. I regard Mr. Cochrane's action in transferring me as approving my efforts in the settlement of this district, which you have done so much to bring to the notice of the landless.

Yours truly,
WILLIAMS HUGH.

Mr. Cochrane approved of Mr. Hugh's election work.

Mr. BENNETT. When your reputation is as good as Mr. Cochrane's, it will be a good deal better than it is now.

Mr. McCOOL. I do not have to go to the hon. member for East Simcoe to get a reputation in this House or out of it. While Mr. Cochrane is an old friend of mine, he is no angel with wings any more than is the hon. member for East Simcoe. The hon. member for North Toronto repeated what he said were the words of the premier, that occasional injustice with regard to the lists by zealous friends might be overlooked. I say the same thing. But the matter is different when it affects a whole district from one end to the other. The district of Nipissing is not all unorganized. I think only about one-third, or 7,000 or 8,000 voters are in the unorganized section. There might be an occasional slip on the part of the enumerator, an occasional leaving off of names, but when the thing is done from one end of the district to the other, it is high time the government should step in and do something to protect the lists. I am not surprised at hon. gentlemen opposite wanting to hold on to these lists, for they know just as well as I do what was done in the last election.

Mr. BOYCE. What was done?

Mr. McCOOL. I will tell you what was done in one case to my own knowledge, in the hon. gentleman's district. We have a number of men working up there in our lumber camps at Searchmount. Out of 150 men, only one man was singled out to be put on the list, and that was because the bush rangers informed the enumerator that he could be counted on to vote Tory. Just one man out of 150. It is all very well to say that these lists can be appealed, but unless the voters really entitled to vote are placed on the list in the first place. it is almost impossible to get them on later because, in the majority of cases, they have to go ten, twenty or forty miles to be registered. How many voters can afford to lose two or three days' time in order to go and register? Is it expected that the candidate will bear that expense? Why, it would cost thousands of dollars. All we ask is a fair list, a list prepared, as this Bill calls for, by enumerators appointed by a bench of three judges. We make no complaint whatever about the municipal lists, but on the other lists it is not possible for us to have a fair election. I therefore trust that the amendment will carry.

Mr. BOYCE. If there is any man who has a little to complain of in connection with the lists, it is the hon. member for Nipissing, and right well does he know it. There is not a list made up in that district as he well knows, which was not criticised in the making and which was not the subject of appeal, or in respect of which there was not an opportunity for appeal. The hon. gentleman has placed himself in a very invidious position—in exactly the same position as the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Bole) did with regard to the Manitoba lists. Did he use that declaration where it would do any good? Yes, he took it to the district judge. He or his minions took some evidence before the district judge on an appeal from the very same list, and having heard that he had some declarations, I made inquiries from reputable counsel, who was present at that court, and that gentleman said that these affidavits were laid before the court and the judge did not believe one word of them.

Mr. McCOOL. Where did the hon. gentleman get that information?

Mr. BOYCE. Yet the hon. gentleman has no hesitation in coming to this parliament and reading copies of declarations which were repudiated by the court of record on which he tried to foist it.

Mr. McCOOL. Will the hon. gentleman

Mr. BOYCE. I will not be interrupted. My hon. friend would not answer me a

question with regard to the authorship of his document and I refuse to allow him to interrupt. Forsooth there is the evidence upon which this great high and mighty Minister of Justice based his Bill. Here is the declaration and the evidence, which I presume he could not use because it was labelled with the cloak of privacy. There stands this great Minister of Justice who said that this Bill was rendered necessary by reason of certain information—some of it in letters and some of it on oath—referring to the district of Nipissing. But when asked to produce that evidence, he was ashamed to do so. But he can get it through another avenue and that is the avenue of the hon. member for Nipissing, who has no shame or scruples in endeavouring to lead the House to believe affidavits which the judge repudiated. When the hon. member for Nipissing tried to make the House believe that the enumerator had refused to go to portions of the district where there was a population and where it was his duty to go, he merely repeated what his master, the Minister of Justice, said. The Minister of Justice said that the enumerator in Nipissing did refuse to go to a district where he should have gone and where there was a large number of Liberal voters. Has there been a word to substantiate that? The enumerator is bound by the Act, and the hon. member for Nipissing knew well that neither the enumerators in the district of Nipissing or in any other district declined to go to every place where they were required by law to go. That the enumerator in Nipissing did go to every place and district set down correctly all entitled to be on the list and wilfully omitted none is absolutely proved by the affidavit of the enumerator himself. Surely that should avail against a declaration repudiated and rejected by the district judge. My hon. friend knows perfectly well that there is not one place in that district he was required to visit to which he did not go.

Mr. McCOOL. That is not true.

Mr. BOYCE. Then the converse must be the case, and my hon. friend must assert that, of his own knowledge, there were places where it was the enumerator's duty to go and where he refrained from going. Will he state what places they were?

Mr. McCOOL. Yes, at the junction of the Temiskamingue and Northern Ontario Railway with the Transcontinental Railway.

Mr. BOYCE. Will my hon. friend tell me whether that was a polling place? I am asking for information. The hon. gentleman has made some serious charges. He said that, according to his own knowledge, this enumerator had refused to go, or had refrained from going, to a place to make an enumeration where, by law, it was his duty to go. Is that correct?

Mr. McCOOL. I do not know that I catch what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Boyce) is saying.

Mr. BOYCE. I am talking at the top of my voice.

Mr. McCOOL. I understood him to ask if there was a polling place at the junction of the Temiscamingue and Northern Ontario Railway and the Transcontinental. How could there be when there was no list?

Mr. BOYCE. Then my hon. friend (Mr. McCool) is lamentably displaying his absolute ignorance of the law when he states that, to his own knowledge, an enumerator refused to go to a place where, by law, he was required to go. The hon. gentleman made that statement, and he displays his ignorance of the Act in making the charges in this wild and reckless manner. Section 60 of the Act says:

> The enumerator shall visit every part of the territory where by the statute or by proclamation of the Lieutenant Governor in Council there is required to be a polling place.

What was that enumerator to do? The Ontario government had not appointed a polling place, and he would have been derelict in his duty had he gone where there was no polling place. Let the hon. gentleman place the responsibility where it should be placed; let him go to the Ontario government and ask why a polling place was not established there, and he will get his answer from the very gentleman whose name he has reviled, Hon. Frank Cochrane, than whom there is no more honest or more capable administrator in the government of the province of Ontario. And I say it ill-becomes my hon. friend from Nipissing to revile the name of the Hon. Mr. Cochrane or to cast a slur upon him in this House. He dare not do it in the presence of or in the hearing of Mr. Cochrane. But I, for one, will take good care that the hon. gentleman's words and mine are conveyed to that hon. gentleman.

Mr. McCOOL. I rise to a question of privilege. The hon. member (Mr. Boyce) is putting words in my mouth that I never uttered. I never said a word against Mr. Cochrane.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. McCOOL. I did not say a word about him at all until his name was interjected here by the hon. member for Simcoe, except to read a letter in a newspaper.

Mr. BOYCE. I am putting my construction, for which I am responsible, on what the hon. gentleman said concerning Hon. Frank Cochrane. Was there a protest entered against the election in Nipissing? The time for it has gone by. Is the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCool) going to be like the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Bole)? These

hon. gentlemen make charges of Chinamen voting, aliens voting, and all voting Conservative. How he knows which way their votes are cast I do not know, for there are no numbers on the ballots now, thanks to the Whitney government. The hon. gentleman makes these complaints here, but where these claims would be pertinent and proper, in the courts in Nipissing or Thunder Bay and Rainy River, they are not heard of. My hon. friend from Nipissing cannot point to a protest in a court of law to show that the election was attacked there.

Mr. McCOOL. It is not too late yet.

Mr. BOYCE. Then I put it to the hon. gentleman: If he has the public interest at heart, and if anybody besides himself is enough interested in these grave offences to come forward and present the protest, let him go on and claim justice. But for nearly two hours hon. gentlemen on that side of the House have detained this committee and kept back the progress of this Bill by retailing statements on hearsay about matters concerning which they have little or no personal knowledge. The hon. member for Nipissing did pledge his personal knowledge to one statement, but it now turns out absolutely without a shadow of justification; and the hon. gentleman stands in the invidious position of not only taking up the time of this House, but of stating facts which he knew had been repudiated where they were pertinent, trying to drag them in here after they were repudiated where the facts are best known.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall section 1 be adopted?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Six o'clock.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is understood that we were to go into Supply.

Mr. FIELDING. The leader of the opposition is right in that respect, but I thought it would be approved by the House if we yielded the committee for the purpose of this Bill. My hon. friend from West Algoma (Mr. Boyce) was accorded the floor for a short time, and I thought that that would be a compensation for the change made.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Compensation for the time being, but we might go on with the matter after eight o'clock.

Mr. FIELDING. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) would prefer going on with the Bill, but admits that the arrangement was made, and, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) presses it, we will agree.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It does not make very much difference when it is done. We can go on either to-day or to-morrow.

Mr. FIELDING. We could arrange to call it up to-morrow, the first order.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. member for West Algoma has been disappointed two or three times. Once he was told that there was a cabinet meeting and that the minister concerned could not be here, but it turned out that he was here. Yesterday we understood that the Opium Bill was going on, but another Bill was brought on and——

Mr. LEMIEUX. The Opium Bill was passed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes, but another Bill was taken up instead of going into Supply.

Mr. FIELDING. We will be ready to proceed either at eight o'clock or, if the hon. gentleman wishes, the first order to-morrow.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. To-morrow.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—PRIVATE BILLS.

Bill (No. 196) for the relief of Arthur James Townsend—.Mr. Copp.

Bill (No. 198) respecting a certain patent of William B. Smith.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 207) respecting certain patents of the Metal Shingle and Siding Company, Limited.—Mr. Galliher.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

House in committee on Bill (No. 115) to amend the Dominion Elections Act.—Mr. Aylesworth.

On section 1,

Mr. ALCORN. The expression used by the right hon. leader of the government in the earliest stage of this Bill with reference to the character of the lists which are to be produced under this Bill, namely, that they were to be made entirely on judicial authority, is altogether incorrect. One would hardly believe that the government would be disposed to descend to the practice of the deceit involved in that expression. To the extent that appeals are made from the lists as prepared by enumerators under this Bill, the lists will be prepared under judicial authority. The judges will hear and dispose of such appeals as are made, but only in case either party sees fit to appeal. Apart from that, the only connection which any judge will have with any list produced

under this Bill, will be that he will appoint the enumerators. Except for that relation with these lists, the judges will never see any of them, and have no connection with them whatever. That expression has been used, apparently and necessarily, with the intent of producing in the minds of those to whom the expression is addressed, the belief that the other lists, that is, the lists produced under the provincial Act, are not the work of the judges, and that the judges have no part, lot or interest in the preparation of those later lists. The right hon. gentleman himself in using that expression, was doubtless well aware of these facts. The Minister of Customs this afternoon, who dwelt at great length on the same subject, and played upon the same string, is perfectly aware, and the press supporting the government throughout the country who have rung the changes upon that expression ever since the Bill was introduced, are perfectly well aware that the self same judges who, if there are appeals, will deal with appeals under this Bill, and with the lists produced under this Bill. These self same judges are the judges who in the past, have produced, and in future will continue to produce the lists under the provincial Act. The self same judges sitting in the same building will perform the same functions with regard to the lists which are made under this Act as they have always performed, and now perform, with regard to the provincial lists produced under Mr. Whitney's legislation, in fact, under the legislation which obtained in that regard before Mr. Whitney's government came into power. It is to be hoped therefore that no one will be deceived by being told that the lists under this Act differ in any respects as regards their judicial origin, or any part the judges may have in their preparation, from the lists which are at present produced by the same process under the provincial Act.

Now, with regard to this section 1, I wish to make a few observations, and I invite the attention of the right hon. gentleman to the points which I propose to raise. In paragraph 9 of section 1 power is taken to judge of the time of the year when this revision shall be made, and new lists made under this Act. The time of the year when these lists are made should be the same in every year, that is, in every year when the power of suspension is not exercised. The provincial Act does not contain such a clause as this, allowing the government to order lists to be made any time and every time they see fit, they are made at a particular time of the year, the enumerators are to begin their work not later than July and thereafter the procedure goes on as provided under the Act. In subclause 1 of 9a the government have taken power to make theses lists at any time, not limiting themselves to the months of July, August or September mentioned in the former part of of the subsection.

With regard to subsection 2, the committee will observe that we are to have for the production of these lists in the unorganized territory a board of registration composed of the various district court judges. It has not been explained why such an innovation is necessary, why there should be a Board of Registration in unorganized Ontario while the County Court judge, each in his own county, in all other parts of that province, performs the entire function of revising the lists in organized Ontario. I submit there is no necessity for forming this Board of Registration, but that each district judge in his own county is quite as competent as the county judge in his county throughout the rest of the province to do the necessary work under this Bill if it becomes law. It has been suggested and probably with a great deal of force. as this Act has been styled an Act for the relief of the hon. member for Thunder Bay, that this innovation is introduced for his benefit; because he is not satisfied to have the district judge in his own district act in reference to the list in that district, but desires that some person else should be called in to assist. Under section 57 of the Ontario Voters' List Act the judge does the work, and I see no necessity for the formation of a board of registration. The more reasonable course and the course consistent with uniformity would have been to have adopted the provisions of the provincial law with regard to the making of these lists and that the work of the enumerators in making their enumeration should have been conformable to the provincial law, not that these enumerators should go on and do their work of enumeration subject to the supervision and according to the directions of the Board of Registration. Surely it is preferable that the work of enumeration should be laid down in the statute and not be left to the dictum of a board of registration or of a judge. The enumeration is much more likely to be made in a uniform and proper manner, the same in each district, if it is done under a statute than if it is done under the direction and supervision, as laid down in subsection 4, of a board of registration or of a judge.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. In what respect does the hon. gentleman refer to this ?

Mr. ALCORN. Subsection 4 says :

4. Such board of registration shall appoint for its electoral district as many enumerators as are necessary, and it shall be the duty of such enumerators, under the supervision and in accordance with the directions of such board of registration, to prepare the voters' lists for those parts of the province without municipal organization in such electoral district.

The Ontario Voters' List Act lays down a procedure for the enumerators to follow. They are, within a certain time, to issue

notices that they will be at certain places at certain future times and will there make up the enumeration and place upon the list those entitled to go on. I think it would have been better to have followed that procedure in this statute rather than place the enumerators under the supervision of a Board of Registration. The effect of allowing this to be done, according to subsection 4, will be to produce a result which will not be uniform in the various districts.

With regard to subsection 5, it is provided that the provincial law is to be observed as far as possible.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. Will not that govern as to procedure?

Mr. ALCORN. It will probably govern just as far as the judges and enumerators see fit to observe it, but if any difficulty arises the likelihood is that it will not be observed. The statements of the hon. member for West Algoma (Mr. Boyce) with regard to the lists made up in his electoral district in 1904 show the manner in which the same provision, which was in the law under which that list was made, was laid aside.

Mr. CONMEE. There was no variation from the provincial law in my riding in 1904.

Mr. ALCORN. If the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) is prepared to make that statement after listening to the facts given in minute details by the member for West Algoma (Mr. Boyce) I am satisfied that he should take that position.

Mr. CONMEE. The hon. member gave details of the preparation of the lists in his own riding, but you referred to my riding and there it was not the case.

Mr. BOYCE. The same order in council regulated the procedure in all unorganized districts.

Mr. CONMEE. I do not care when the order in council was issued, the procedure in the district of Thunder Bay and Rainy River was right, under the provincial Act. That can be verified and there was no fault in the Rainy River district.

Mr. ALCORN. I desire to call attention to paragraph 5 of 9a which provides that:

5. In the preparation of such lists the provisions of the law of the province regulating the preparation and manner of revising and bringing into force the provincial voters' lists in the like cases shall, as far as possible, be observed and followed, but the revision of the said lists shall be had before the board of registration, who shall hear all appeals from the said enumerators, and no person whose name is not included in the voters' lists so prepared and revised shall be entitled to vote.

It appears to me that provision will be in direct conflict with section 13 of this Bill. Section 13 provides for the case of voters' lists in overlapping polling divisions and that any person whose name is on the general list, but by mistake has been dropped from the separate list, may, on taking a certain oath, vote. The provision here is that no person 'whose name is not included on the voters' list so prepared and revised' shall be entitled to vote. Further than that, section 11 of the Dominion Elections Act deals with the several classes of persons who are entitled to vote in Dominion elections although their names are not upon the provincial list. There is nothing to ensure that the persons named in section 11 will be upon the Dominion list to be produced under this Bill. The section of the Provincial Act enumerates the persons who shall not vote, giving a long list, including provincial officials.

Mr. LEIGHTON McCARTHY. Does the hon. gentleman contend that section 11 of the Dominion Elections Act is affected by this legislation?

Mr. ALCORN. It may be.

Mr. LEIGHTON McCARTHY. Do you really think it is?

Mr. ALCORN. Yes.

Mr. LEIGHTON McCARTHY. Where and how?

Mr. ALCORN. I am proceeding to show. Section 12 of the Provincial Elections Act contains a list of persons who shall not vote, for example; Judges, customs officers, clerks of the peace, county crown attorneys, certain postmasters, certain stipendiary magistrates and certain inland revenue officers. It is quite within the range of probability that some if not all of these may be omitted from the lists prepared under this Bill. Although they are not on the provincial lists yet they are good voters by virtue of section 11 of the Dominion Act, and section 150 of the same Act which provides that although they are not on the list yet by taking a certain oath they may be allowed to vote. It may very well happen that some or all of the persons disqualified by the provincial Act will not be on the list prepared under this Bill. The latter part of subclause 5 provides: That no person who is not on the voters' lists so prepared and revised shall be entitled to vote. There should be a provision introduced into this clause to the effect that it shall except those provided for under section 13 of this Bill, and also under sections 11 and 150 of the Dominion Elections Act. Otherwise the general effect will be that there will be two entirely inconsistent clauses in the same Act, one making a person a good voter and another declaring he had no vote. It would also have saved a great deal of work and expense if the Minister of Justice had adhered to his original proposal

to make the provincial lists the basis of the new lists to be prepared under this Bill. Under the clause he originally proposed the enumerators would have taken the provincial lists in force and have added the necessary names, and the judge would have stricken out such names as should not be on the list.

Mr. LEIGHTON McCARTHY. Is not that the practical result anyway when you have these provincial lists before you ?

Mr. ALCORN. The judge does not make the list and it would be quite within the power of the enumerator to discard the provincial lists entirely under this clause as now drafted. Then, under subsection 6 of the Bill it is provided that when the judge has completed the list the enumerator has to transmit a certified copy to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery and to him alone, whereas under the provincial Act certified copies of the list are to be deposited in the office of the clerk of the peace, of the stipendiary magistrate, of the sheriff, and of the police magistrate. Under this Bill copies of the lists are deposited only at Ottawa and not in the electoral district affected. I think copies should be deposited in the same offices as are provided for under the provincial Act. Clause 1 provides that the judges have power to divide the whole province of Manitoba and the unorganized districts of New Ontario into new polling divisions ; and that they may also make distinct and new polling divisions every time they make a Dominion list. I believe there is no necessity for the judges either in Manitoba or New Ontario altering the polling divisions in any respect except where overlapping takes place, and I think that was the agreement arrived at.

Mr. BOYCE. It seems to me that the amendment of the Minister of Justice providing a definite period for the preparation of the lists, obviates the necessity for the last words in section 1 which read : Or be had during other months of any year. The Ontario Act provides a definite period in the year during which these lists are to be made, namely, that the enumerator shall start to prepare the lists on or after the first day of June and not later than the first day of July, and the very essence of the Bill is to provide that the time should be made as definite as possible for the making up of these voters' lists. If we have a definite period for the preparation of these lists, as suggested by the Minister of Justice, between the 1st of August and the 15th of October, why enlarge that or run the risk of enlarging it, and make it absolutely indefinite by adding the words, 'or be had during other months of any year.' If the lists could not be made up betweeen those dates, they might be made up in the depth of winter. I therefore move that the section be amended by striking out these words.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Those words were not inserted without purpose. It might be impracticable to conduct the preparation of the lists during the specified months. No one can tell what might happen. There might be an unexpected by-election taking place in the month of June or in any other month of the year in any riding in respect of which it might be important that the lists should be modern, or should not be of an age they would otherwise have if we were compelled always to rely on the last lists prepared. In these circumstances that is a latitude which can do no possible harm. There would be no object, unless there were a necessity, of having a revision of the lists oftener than once in the year, and there is power in the Governor in Council by proclamation to dispense altogether with the preparation of the lists in any year when such a preparation seems to be entirely unnecessary.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There does not seem to be any provision for the publication of the proclamation. I would move that the words, 'to be published forthwith in the Canada Gazette,' be inserted after the word 'proclamation' in the tenth line.

Amendment agreed to, and subsection 1 as amended agreed to.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It has been already suggested by my hon. friend from Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn) that this work of preparation, revision, and so forth, should be confided to each judge for his own district ; otherwise in so enormous a territory there will be a great deal of confusion. I do not know whether the government have taken that into consideration, but it seems to me that there is a great deal of force in what the hon. gentleman has urged.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. There is a practical difficulty about the working out of any such suggestion as the hon. gentleman has made, and it was only after considering the difficulties that it seemed to me it was much better that there should be a board consisting of more than one judge, as the Bill proposes. There are six constituencies in question. I think there is not one of them in which there is not a greater number of voters voting upon ordinary municipally-prepared or ordinary manhood suffrage lists than will be voting under the provisions of this statute. Perhaps I am wrong in thinking that in every constituency it will be less than one-half of the whole number of voters to whom this statute will be applied. But there is none of the six constituencies with regard to which this Bill will have universal application ; and I think that in the greater number of those six constituencies, there is more than one district judge having jurisdiction. You

do not want to single out in an Act of parliament an individual judge by name; you do not want to say either the junior or the senior; you cannot do better than, adopting the language I have selected, make the senior judge, who has jurisdiction in any part of the territory, ex officio chairman, so to speak, or one at all events of the board, and let him select his colleagues from his neighbours. The only possible objection is, that it will be slightly more expensive, but that as an objection is offset by the manifold advantages. I am not sure of the exact number but I think there are, counting the two new district courts in these six constituencies, eleven district judges. Then there are to be six boards of three formed out of those eleven judges. Surely in that way, seeing that some of those judges will be on more than one board, it will be better to have a board of some sort, acting by its full body or its majority, than that each judge should be responsible for the work in his own district. These are very large districts, there would be in many cases a tremendous extent of territory which it would be necessary for a judge to cover, but this would be the best practical way of working it out.

Mr. BOYCE. I do not know whether the minister has considered the position in which these judges will find themselves at this period of the year. Take the electoral district of Thunder Bay and Rainy River, there will be three judges in that district having territorial jurisdiction, none of whom will go outside the district of Thunder Bay and Rainy River.

Mr. CONMEE. There are not three judges at present.

Mr. BOYCE. There will be.

Mr. CONMEE. Yes, in all probability.

Mr. BOYCE. The senior judge will be Judge Chappel of Rainy River. Suppose he chose for his board Judge Johnston of the Soo and Judge O'Leary of Port Arthur. It will be seen that, both for the purpose of appointing enumerators and the consideration of appeals, Judge Johnston would be taken away from the Soo and Judge O'Leary or Judge Chappel taken away from either Port Arthur or Kenora for a considerable time. That is not all. During that period another judge will be taken away from Manitoulin for instance. A judge might be taken from Sudbury into the eastern part of the district. Great confusion would result, and just at the time when judges are required for the revision of the organized municipal lists. From the 1st of August to the 15th of October is the period during which the municipal lists in the organized portions of the district are being revised. Why create all this confusion when, at this time and in conjunction with his own duties, the district judge, revising the lists in his territory, could himself revise the lists in the ordinary way without calling in two judges away from the performance of their judicial duties. I really suggest that the assigning to the judge in each district the appointment of an enumerator in the territory within his jurisdiction and giving him, under this Act for the purposes of revision, the same power as under the Ontario Act, would save expense and a great deal of inconvenience and confusion.

Mr. CONMEE. The idea of a board of judges is not mine, but I can see many advantages in it. We are trying to get a fair list. It is generally admitted that a board of three judges is more likely to be fair. Does my hon. friend think that Judge Chappel does not know the whole of the districts of Thunder Bay and Rainy River?

Mr. BOYCE. Each judge would exercise jurisdiction where he does know everybody, and the gentlemen he would call to his assistance would be strangers who in reality could only render him formal assistance.

Mr. CONMEE. I do not understand it that way. This is different from revising the lists. These judges now conduct the preparation of the lists, they allot the polling places, appoint enumerators, issue instructions to the enumerators regarding their conduct and the preparation of the lists by them. That is far different from revising the list after it is prepared. They will do that also.

Mr. BOYCE. Who will be best fitted to judge the enumerators—the judge of the district or two outside judges?

Mr. CONMEE. The Bill gives the judge the selection from the judges nearest to him.

Mr. BOYCE. He must take strange judges.

Mr. CONMEE. He must in the case of my riding. Judge Johnston is far more familiar with Thunder Bay district than Judge Chappel. There are many other reasons why a board of judges would be much preferable. We are very proud of our judiciary and I think we have the best system of any country; but judges are human after all, and the principle acted on by this and previous governments is that it is better, when appointing a judge, to take a lawyer away from the district where he practises. It is better that the judge should be away from those who were his clients when he was practising at the bar, and there are social and family considerations and others which make it more reasonable perhaps to have a board of judges than a single judge.

Mr. LANCASTER. But the cases are not parallel. It has been suggested by my

hon. friend from West Algoma that the judge should know personally the enumerators he appoints. That is a very different question from deciding cases. Of course, he is called upon to decide questions between strangers; but, in appointing men to positions of trust, he should appoint those whom he knows.

Mr. CONMEE. It is not merely the appointment of the enumerators, but the general procedure in the preparation of the lists. The provincial law governs that to a great extent. This board of judges must give instructions and these instructions should come from a disinterested body. The complaint against the present provincial lists is that they have been prepared by partisans, that the instructions were given purposely to take advantage of the opposite political party. I did not suggest the idea, but I can see a good deal of fairness in it.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. The hon. member's local knowledge is much better than my own. In the district of Thunder Bay and Rainy River where there are three judicial districts, would it not be better to have three judges meet and formulate their scheme for enumerators and have the same system for each judicial district? The only possible argument against it would be, not one of fairness, but of the little initial expense. It seems to me that the scheme formulated would give uniformity in the constituency. First get the judges together, and you will have uniformity of instructions to the enumerators, and, as the result of that, you will have uniformity of decisions afterwards on points raised before the board.

Mr. LANCASTER. What about the selection of enumerators?

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. They are suggested by the three judges.

Mr. LANCASTER. Would not one who knows them make a better selection than three, two of whom do not know them?

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. But the board as a whole would yield, no doubt, to the suggestions of each member concerning his own district. And, by having the three judges you would have fairness and uniformity of decision.

Mr. BOYCE. There are two reasons against it. The hon. gentleman will see that the time allowed for making up the lists is, comparatively speaking, short. The hon. member for Thunder Bay complained of this. You have now from August 15 to October 15. What are you going to do when you are cornering up all the judges?

Mr. CONMEE. They appoint the enumerators.

Mr. BOYCE. Yes, but instead of having three judges working in one district, he could have the three working in their several districts, and each carrying on this work in connection with his regular district duties. Again, would it be better to allow the judge to attend to his judicial duties and the work assigned him in the place where he exercises jurisdiction, or would it be better to take him away from his district at a time when, it may be, his district court sessions are being held or he is revising municipal lists, and give him work elsewhere, clogging the judicial machinery, not only by taking the judge away from his own work but by making slower the work that is assigned to him? Would it not be better, instead of having three judges, to have each judge work in his own territory where he has knowledge of the conditions and of the people?

Mr. CONMEE. I do not agree with the hon. member (Mr. Boyce). I think this will expedite matters. The three judges meet only for the purpose of selecting the enumerators, formulating the rules and fixing the polling places.

Mr. BOYCE. What about appeals?

Mr. CONMEE. They come before the judges in the ordinary way.

Mr. BOYCE. They come before the board of judges.

Mr. CONMEE. Not necessarily.

Mr. BOYCE. That is what the Act says.

Mr. CONMEE. Yes, the hon. gentleman is right. I had not quite realized that point. But I am glad of it. This is tantamount to an election trial. Formerly the provincial law provided that an election trial might be held before one judge. That seemed unfair and now the law provides for two judges. The board of three judges will deal with these matters better.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the government are disposed to insist upon a board of registration which will probably be unworkable, they will have to take the responsibility of it. Having made our protest and shown that this Bill will be, in our opinion, unworkable, I do not know that we can do any more. That it will be unworkable must be plain to hon. gentlemen who heard the discussion this afternoon. The hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. McCool) declared that the process of appeal could not be carried out effectively because, he said the population is too scattered and the judges too far away. If with one judge sitting, it is impossible to give an effective judicial revision you can imagine what the result will be when you require the attendance of three judges to hear every appeal. The case need only be stated to see the consequences. However, we have made our protest. I believe the provision will be unworkable. But the government insist upon it, so let it pass in that form.

Mr. BENNETT. The government should remember that Judge McCurry is an elderly gentleman and it is not reasonable to expect him to go out of his own district. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) must know that.

On subsection 4,

4. Such board of registration shall appoint for its electoral district as many enumerators as are necessary, and it shall be the duty of such enumerators, under the supervision and in accordance with the directions of such board of registration, to prepare the voters' lists for those parts of the province without municipal organization in such electoral district, and the Governor in Council may confer upon each enumerator so appointed any powers necessary for the discharge of his duties.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This will be subject to the same objection as has been pointed out by other hon. gentlemen with respect to subsection 3. Apparently, it is designed to make this procedure as cumbrous and unworkable as possible. I do not know whether there is any ulterior motive behind it. Some of my hon. friends think it is designed for the purpose of postponing these elections on the ground that the lists cannot be prepared in time.

Mr. BOYCE. That is it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not suggesting that as my own idea, but I know that some hon. members on this side are impressed with it. There is not the slightest doubt that if the present provincial system is liable to delay, and is found to be practicably unworkable as has been alleged this afternoon, the system now proposed of three judges will be much more unworkable. I do not know that we can say anything about it. if the government insists upon absurdities of this kind, it is only necessary to remind my hon. friends on this side of the House that they could not possibly listen to any greater absurdities than those which were alleged this afternoon as a basis for proceeding with the Bill at all. Therefore, inasmuch as the Bill is founded on the most grotesque absurdity that could be imagined, it seems eminently proper that every provision should be of an equal absurdity.

Mr. ALCORN. Not the least absurdity of the procedure will be the very simple question as to the right of a man to the franchise, a question which will come up over and over again in the courts, will have to be decided upon by three judges, as if it were not possible for any person of ordinary intelligence, having an ordinary acquaintance with the right of franchise, to decide such questions for himself.

Mr. BOYCE. I want to say this to the right hon. gentleman and to the Minister of Justice, that having lived in that country for twenty-four years, and having in view the provisions of subsection 1 of this Bill, and knowing the conditions which exist in that country, I can only say to him that it will be absolutely impossible to get those lists made up within the time the Minister of Justice has fixed therefor, and to have anything like a reasonable time for the preparation or revision of those lists. The thing is physically and absolutely impossible.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am not in a position to judge of my hon. friend's statements. He gives me one version, and my hon. friend behind me gives me another version. Which one shall I accept ? The matter has been carefully looked into, and I am advised that the Bill can be worked.

Mr. BENNETT. Take the case of the district of Muskoka. In that large riding there are only three or four townships that are unorganized, and what will be the result if the lists are not completed ? You disfranchise a splendid riding for the sake of two or three townships where there is only a handful of votes. You say under the Act that you may go outside the district for judges. Every person in that country knows that Judge McCarry, of Parry Sound, is a very old gentleman, and I do not believe that he would leave his home in Parry Sound and go down a number of miles to the district of Muskoka to take a hand in these three or four scattered polls. Where are you going to get another judge ? The next nearest judge will be at Kenora, or else Sault Ste. Marie. But the senior judge of Sault Ste. Marie will be at Thunder Bay.

An hon. MEMBER. North Bay will be closer than that.

Mr. BENNETT. The judge at North Bay will be occupied in the Nipissing district. If the lists are not completed in Parry Sound, you are disfranchising a splendid, well settled riding, all because perhaps thirty or forty voters who reside in the organized districts have not been placed in the lists in their polling divisions.

Mr. BOYCE. I suppose there will be not less than thirty polling subdivisions where the lists are prepared in the district of Rainy River. I think there might be as many as that. Then there are thirty polling subdivisions in which the board of judges has to sit for revision.

Mr. CONMEE. They do not have to sit at every polling subdivision.

Mr. BOYCE. They have got to sit somewhere in that riding, they have got to appoint days for hearing appeals in these thirty subdivisions. The probabilities are that there will be appeals in each, we must contemplate appeals in each one of the thirty subdivisions. Then, under this law, the senior judge at Port Arthur chooses the senior judge in my district, Judge Johnston

and off he goes to Port Arthur on a revising trip. If he takes two appeal courts a day, it would take him fifteen days to complete the tour ; if he takes one a day, he is away thirty days. Now that is only one instance. But that is done with regard to six ridings, and there is where the confusion is involved, and there is where the Act is unworkable. In the first place, you have not only got to contemplate one set of three judges and the inconvenience that will exist in their territory by their absence, but you have to contemplate more than that. Take this territory between Thunder Bay and Algoma. You have to contemplate that Judge Johnston may be designated by the judge of Port Arthur, and that Judge Johnston later on may be chosen by Judge McCallum, or by Judge Valin in Nipissing. Supposing that Nipissing has thirty to fifty polls, and you only have sixty days for the notice, for the appointment of enumerators, for the enumeration, for the notice of appeal, for the appeal itself, for commencing the lists, sixty days, covering a territory twice as large as the settled portion of the province of Ontario.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. I think the hon. gentleman's fears are unfounded. I am acquainted with the district of Nipissing as well as the hon. gentleman. He supposes that there are thirty polling subdivisions, but it is not for a moment to be supposed that the board is going to sit in every polling subdivision. They will divide the territory into districts. In my own riding, a township with twelve subdivisions, the judge only sits at one place in the whole township. Take the whole county of Simcoe. Last year the voters' lists in that whole county were revised by one judge, although the county has a population of 70,000 or 80,000. So I do not think the fears of the hon. gentleman are well founded.

Mr. BOYCE. What are the distances there ?

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. The distances are not as great as yours, I admit. But the mode of travel is very rapid. The hon. gentleman suggests fifteen or thirty sittings in one district, or one constituency. I do not think that would be necessary at all.

Mr. BOYCE. Does my hon. friend know the country? Take the polls along the line of the Grand Trunk Pacific and you get there in a day.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman makes a false assumption that the judges will sit in every polling division. They will form districts and sit at central points. The difficulties are not as formidable as he presumes, but I suppose they will be greater than in the more densely settled portions. It will not take three judges any longer to get to these various places than it will one.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT. The Act provides that they shall follow the procedure under the Ontario Act, and that has been that the judge sits for appeal in every place where the enumerator sits.

Mr. CONMEE. My hon. friend is perhaps borrowing a little trouble. He asked if the judges would not have to hold their courts along the line of the National Transcontinental Railway. It does not follow that there are any courts along the National Transcontinental Railway. He is assuming that there will be an appeal in every place where the enumerator sat.

Mr. BOYCE. It is a fair assumption.

Mr. CONMEE. It is not. There will not be appeals in half the places. Court may be held in two or three places in Thunder Bay, three or four places in Rainy River and the same number in Nipissing. Outside of these districts the difficulties will be very small. About two and a half months are allowed for the preparation of the lists.

Mr. BOYCE. I have not heard the hon. member state his objections to having the judges exercise jurisdiction in the territory over which they preside.

Mr. CONMEE. I do not want a judge hearing an election trial.

Mr. BOYCE. Now we are getting at it. The hon. member says that the judge who revises the lists in the cities and towns in his riding well and satisfactorily would not be a satisfactory officer to revise the lists in the unorganized territory.

Mr. CONMEE. I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. BOYCE. That is the hon. gentleman's position. The principle is that this should be consonant with the Ontario Voters' Lists Act, and to introduce any other procedure is to render it complicated, unworkable and highly expensive. What are the judges to do with their courts while they are doing this work?

Mr. CONMEE. There are junior judges.

Mr. BOYCE. There are none in your district.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. The judges have to make the voters' lists anyway.

On subsection 5,

In the preparation of such lists the provisions of the law of the province regulating the preparation and manner of revising and bringing into force the provincial voters' lists in the like cases shall, as far as possible, be observed and followed, but the revision of the said lists shall be had before the board of registration, who shall hear all appeals from the said enumerators, and no person whose name is not included in the voters' lists so prepared and revised shall be entitled to vote.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I wish to refer to subsection 5 by way of comparison with subsection 3 of the Bill as originally introduced. This subsection is practically the same as subsection 2 of the original Bill. Subsection 2 was followed, and it seems to me this should be followed by a provision of this character—I am quoting now from subsection 3 of the original Bill:

3. In the preparation of such lists the voters' lists which were prepared for the several polling divisions situate wholly or in part within the electoral district or wholly or in part within such unorganized territory as such polling divisions were established at the last preceding provincial election, and which under the laws of the province, are then or were last in force for the purposes of provincial elections, shall be taken . . . and the names of all persons who are not qualified to vote in the said electoral district shall be struck off the said lists, and the names of all persons qualified to vote in the said electoral district and not already on the said lists shall be added to the said lists.

Why is that omitted? It seems to be a proper provision, having regard to the scheme of the Bill in the first instance. Even in the Dominion Franchise Act, as the hon. gentleman will remember, the basis was to be the municipal lists, and the hon. gentleman thought it was strange they were not strictly adhered to. But then, although they were not adhered to, they were taken as a basis; we took such provincial lists as were available and adopted them as a basis.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The clause which we have in the Bill as reprinted is drawn upon a different footing altogether from the clause in the Bill which was originally introduced. As I explained when I moved the second reading of this Bill, to my mind the clause I originally framed was a perfectly fair clause. Taking the Ontario Voters' Lists Act as an example, if the Ontario Voters' Lists Act is a fair measure, providing, as it does, for the preparation of the lists in the unorganized territory by men appointed as enumerators and selected for the work by the Ontario government, I am absolutely unable to understand why that same measure ceases to be a fair measure and becomes an utterly partisan, nefarious, iniquitous, monstrous and wicked scheme, when the very same thing is done by the Ottawa government instead of being done by the Toronto government. Either both of these methods of preparing the lists are entirely partisan or unfair, or each of them is an equally fair way of preparing lists for the purposes of an election. Adopting the principle that whatever the government in power in any province or any parliament did was fair, I prepared the original clause upon the footing that the enumerators should be appointed in accordance with the provisions of whatever the provincial law was, and starting with these provincial lists as a basis, that they should prepare the lists upon which the Dominion elections should be carried out. That was objected to very vehemently, and it was said on the other side of the House and accepted upon this, that to be absolutely fair we should depart altogether from the system of government enumeration or of government appointment of enumerators and have judicially appointed enumerators and so have lists that were perfectly impartial and perfectly pure. Upon that footing I prepared this clause and I ignored altogether the partial—and impure if you like—lists prepared by partisan enumerators and started the judicial enumerators upon their work of preparing their lists from the ground up. I think that is a consistent position, and I have drawn this clause in order that these enumerators acting under judicial direction, upon judicial appointment, with judicial supervision from first to last, and subject to judicial control, shall prepare lists which shall be fair to each party and with regard to which no one will have ground for any complaint.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the Minister of Justice would give us a little less rhetoric and a little more information he would do something to facilitate the progress of the Bill. I pointed out that even in the Dominion Franchise Act which these gentlemen opposite railed against, you always took the provincial municipal lists as a basis and that was the provision in this Bill when first introduced. The Minister of Justice seems to have no idea about this matter except the idea of party or partisanship. I was not discussing it from the standpoint of partisanship; I was discussing it from the standpoint of the rights of the people whose names are on the provincial lists to have their names remain there unless some good reason is shown for taking them off. That seems to be an intelligible principle, but apparently it does not penetrate the mind of the Minister of Justice. There is no possible reason for departing from the original scheme of the Bill in that respect. However, I have placed my views before the House and if the government without any reason whatever see fit to insist that the voters in these northern ridings whose names are on the provincial lists without any question or complaint, shall be put to the inconvenience and trouble of seeing that their names are put on these new lists, the government will have to take the responsibility of imposing that burden upon them.

Mr. ALCORN. If the government do not see fit to adopt the provincial lists as the basis for the first list, surely there can be no objection to taking the first Dominion list as the basis for all subsequent lists.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The Minister of Justice who has given a good deal

of attention to this, has come to the conclusion that he wants to have the lists prepared by the judges from the bottom up, and I do not know that there is much objection to that. Of course any man appointed by the judge will want all the information he can possibly have before him in preparing the lists.

Mr. ALCORN. The lists are prepared by the enumerators and not by the judges.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is all the difference in the world between the enumerators being appointed by political machinery or by judicial machinery.

On section 6,

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have heard many absurd reasons given on the other side of the House for this legislation, but I have heard no reason whatever given for departing from the provincial polling divisions.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I suppose the judges will accept the local polling divisions which are generally known to the people unless there is good reason to alter them. However, in new districts they may have to be changed from time to time as settlement and population increases, and they certainly should have power to change the polling divisions under such circumstances.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Section 24 of the Dominion Elections Act provides that the polling divisions shall be those provided under the laws of the province for the purpose of a provincial election, the only exception being where the polling divisions are intersected by the boundary between two electoral districts.

Mr. ALCORN. Under this Bill new polling divisions may be constituted for each successive Dominion election. I do not see why judges should be empowered to change them except where there is overlapping.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. In the unorganized territory the lists are prepared by a system of registration and the Ontario statute provides that the name of each voter is to be entered in that part of the voters' lists the polling place for which is most convenient for him. Is it to be the enumerator or the judge who shall decide that? I should think that the better authority would be the judge.

Mr. ALCORN. The question is not about the allotment of voters in particular polls, but about the changing of polling divisions by the judges where there is no overlapping. Why should the judges interfere with provincial polling divisions except where there is overlapping?

Mr. CONMEE. That difficulty has been met in the past in the province by the Lieutenant Governor in Council fixing the polling places. There never was an election in which new polling places had not to be provided. Under the Dominion law the Governor in Council would do the same. If we are taking the matter out of politics, would it not be better to take that out of politics also?

Mr. BOYCE. That is not the point. The boundaries of the polling subdivisions are under the Dominion Act to be those provided by the provinces; but under this Act they may, as my hon. friend from Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn) says, be sub-divided differently for each election, so that it will be a case of confusion worse confounded at each election, respecting the place where a man will vote. With regard to section 7, why not use the provincial lists if they are more recent?

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. Section 7 has been considered and passed.

Mr. BOYCE. The hon. gentleman, who is speaking for the Minister of Justice, says section 7 is passed. We are in this position, that we have a deaf Minister of Justice, who listens to his own side of the House, and turns a deaf ear towards this side. When there is any objection raised on this side of the House, the hon. gentleman takes advantage of his infirmity and will not listen. I do not think there is anything worse for any country to suffer from than a deaf Minister of Justice.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman should withdraw the expression 'taking advantage of his infirmity.'

Mr. BOYCE. If that be out of order, I will certainly withdraw it; but I say that this House has suffered from it, especially during this debate, and the country has suffered, and the country will resent it, and will lay it to the charge of the right hon. gentleman who persists in retaining that minister.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think I will accept that responsibility without any hesitation whatever.

Mr. BOYCE. I was proceeding, when I was interrupted by the hon. gentleman who is assuming the functions of Minister of Justice, to ask why this government sees fit, where there is a provincial list prepared regularly and not more than three months old, and where there is a Dominion list eleven months old, to declare that you shall have the Dominion list, and that the people cannot vote upon the provincial list, which is more recent. It seems to be a proposition that would shock the common sense of most people, especially in view of the pronouncement of the right hon. gentleman that these provincial lists must be accepted as the lists upon which the Dominion elections shall take place. One of the excuses of the Minister of Justice for this

legislation is that he wants fresh lists ; and in the case I have mentioned you are going to prefer a stale list and are going thereby to disfranchise all the voters who come into a constituency in the meantime. They cannot get on the list and the right hon. gentleman proposes to leave them disfranchised.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. Surely the hon. gentleman who has been prattling this whole afternoon has got this into his head at last. Not content with continually prattling——

Mr. BOYCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The word 'prattling' is not in order.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. I withdraw the word 'prattling.' The hon. gentleman who has been continually and volubly speechifying on this Bill all this afternoon, and not content with this continuance of his volubility, which but for your ruling I would continue to call prattling, does not understand the first principle of the Bill ; he now tries to insult the ministers of the Crown. The hon. gentleman has followed the example of the hon. member for North Toronto, who made similar insinuations this afternoon, but no attention was paid to them. Such insinuations are not worthy of this House ; they are certainly beneath the dignity of members of the House of Commons. Surely if a man be ill and while ill is prepared to sit in this House and do his duty to the country, it ill becomes these hon. gentlemen to allude to the fact as they have done to-day. The man who seeks to make such arguments is beneath the dignity of manhood, in my judgment.

Mr. BOYCE. I must again rise to order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the expression 'beneath the dignity of manhood' should be withdrawn.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. I will withdraw the expression, and if there were another word that I could substitute for it, within the parliamentary rule, I would adopt it.

Mr. BOYCE. I protest again, and I will continue to protest as often as the hon. gentleman makes these remarks.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. I have withdrawn the expression. As to section 7 of this Bill, the hon. gentleman asks again, why not use the provincial lists ? This whole Bill is based on the assumption that we will not accept the provincial lists, for reasons given in this House this afternoon ; and when we have passed the clauses providing for the necessary machinery, why reiterate what has already been said ? That is why I ventured to make the remark that we had passed section 7.

Mr. BOYCE. Now that this wise Solon has spoken, this independent gentleman who came before this country professing to be absolutely independent of either party, this gentleman who entered this House professing no allegiance to the Liberal party, but who has so absolutely surrendered to the exigencies of the party in power, I will proceed. This gentleman, who has taken advantage of his position to cast insults across the floor of this House against me when I am endeavouring to discuss the clauses of this Bill, might well take a lesson himself. There are transactions with which he has been connected and which have been referred to in this House, which might possibly stand a great deal more criticism than any of my actions.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman had better come back to the question.

Mr. BOYCE. I can only say that I very much regret I am prevented from referring to some instances in the political career of my hon. friend. With reference to this particular section I may say that it is the evidence of a desire to discriminate against the province of Ontario as much as possible.

On subsection 8, section 1,

8. It shall be the duty of the board of registration forthwith after the completion of the revision of the said lists to transmit to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, by registered mail, a statement and description showing the limits of the polling divisions so defined and established, together with a copy of the voters' lists so finally revised certified under the hands of the members of the said board, and the provisions of sections 13 and 14 of the Dominion Elections Act shall apply to such certified copy.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT. There ought to be greater publicity. The list, as completed ought to be sent to the candidates or to somebody in their behalf.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The ordinary provision of the Election Act will apply, under which, as soon as the new lists are sent to the King's Printer and are printed, copies are sent by him to the candidates.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT. It has not been the custom in the past to have those lists, which are made up in the unorganized districts, sent down here to be printed. It will be impossible to do that under this Bill because there will not be sufficient time.

Mr. BENNETT. I would move that these words be added to the subsection after the words 'Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, the sheriff of the district, the member elect and the defeated candidate.'

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I do not know that there is any objection to what is proposed except the inconvenience and delay. These lists, as they leave the board of registration, will consist in the greater part of

printed names, but no one can tell how many names will be added. There may be hundreds. The idea is that as soon as the board completes its revision, it shall transmit a certified copy of the list with the changes and additions to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. Then the general Act applies. Section 15 of that Act provides that it shall be the duty of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, immediately on receipt by him of any certified copy of a list of voters, to have it printed by the King's Printer. Then, immediately after it is printed, the King's Printer shall send by registered mail, twenty copies to each candidate. But to have the printed list with all the changes and additions made by the board of registration copied over again before it is sent to the King's Printer, and these copies sent to the candidates, would cause not only considerable expense but consideable delay.

Amendment rejected.

On subsection 9 :

9. In the province of Manitoba the several judges of the county courts shall constitute a board, of which a majority shall be a quorum, which board shall during the month of July in each year meet in the city of Winnipeg on a day to be named by the senior of such judges and appoint for each Dominion electoral district in the said province a committee of one or of three of such judges, and such committee shall thereupon proceed to define and establish the polling divisions into which, for the purposes of the next following Dominion election, the electoral district for which it is appointed shall be divided, and shall distribute among such different polling divisions the names of the voters entitled to vote in such electoral district as such names appear on the last revised lists of electors for the several provincial electoral districts in the said province, so that each voter shall be assigned to his proper poll as established for the purposes of such Dominion election.

Mr. AYLESWORTH moved that the subsection be amended by striking out in the twenty-seventh line the words 'on a day to be named by the senior of such judges' and inserting instead the words 'such distribution shall be completed before the first of October each year.'

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). I desire to offer the same objection regarding this section as that offered by my hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, in connection with a similar section referring to the unorganized districts of Ontario. I do so with all the greater confidence that it will appeal to the reasonableness of the First Minister by reason of his statement that in a newly organized territory, where the conditions are changing, it would be necessary for the judges to depart very largely from the existing conditions and make alterations from time to time which in an old district are not necessary. In Manitoba the provincial subdivisions should be adhered to except where it is necessary for the judges to make a departure in the cases of intersections of polling subdivisions by reason of their overlapping each other. In such cases it would be necessary to have new polling subdivisions and those should be made by the judge. This is a suggestion I made some time ago and which the First Minister said he was willing to accept. But he is now going further. This section allows the judges to disturb the boundaries of the polling subdivisions, as arranged for provincial purposes, throughout Manitoba and in every election. I do not think that that is a wise power to confer on them. My right hon. friend may say that they will not make any departure except where it is necessary. But as the judges differ in their interpretations of any Act, I think the Prime Minister ought to consent to inserting something which would point out definitely and distinctly that the judges are only to prepare new polling subdivisions where there are overlappings and not disturb the existing polling subdivision. He will readily see that if the polling subdivisions for Dominion purposes should be made different from those for provincial purposes, the electors will scarcely know where to poll their votes. I appeal to the Prime Minister if this is not a reasonable suggestion. I would remind him also that the present provincial polling subdivisions have been created by the judges—not by the Lieutenant Governor in Council nor by the returning officers, but by the judges. There can be no party advantage in arranging polling subdivisions ; my objection is based upon the confusion likely to arise in having different polling subdivisions for the Dominion from those established for the province.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. Is it the hon. gentleman's contention that in a polling subdivision in which there is overlapping—which means, I suppose, that it must be divided between two constituencies—you would leave only that portion of the polling subdivision in a constituency as a polling subdivision, or attach it to some other ?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). I would leave it to the judges, where there is overlapping, either to make it into a separate polling subdivision or attach it to an adjoining one.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. Would not the judges do what was required in that way ?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). The hon. gentleman is taking too much for granted. In the enactment of a law you should be specific. As I have said, there can be no advantage in arranging polling subdivisions, though there may be an advantage in fixing the polling places ; but so far as that is concerned, I would not object to giving the

judges power to establish the polling places. But I do object to having confusion created in the minds of the electors by having different polling subdivisions for the Dominion and for the province.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. I may state, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. W. J. Roche) is not aware of it, that at present the judges do not arrange the polling subdivisions, but the government arrange the registration districts and the polling divisions. The reason why we had it subdivided in my district was that they were partisan divisions. Take the township in which I have lived for twenty-five or thirty-five years: We have had two polls in that local division for seventeen years, but as soon as the Roblin government came into power, they removed one and put all the voters in that township in Stonewall poll and made some of the electors go a distance of twelve miles to vote. In the last Dominion election, we put a polling place in the middle of the division as before. We want the judges to lay out these polls for the convenience of and the defence of the people.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). As usual the hon. gentleman (Mr. S. J. Jackson) is speaking without full knowledge when he says that the judges do not fix the polling subdivisions, except in districts where there has been a redistribution and where the returning officer has done it. But the original polling subdivisions through Manitoba have been defined by the judges.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. The hon. gentleman is altogether mistaken.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). If I am mistaken, then the prime minister of the province of Manitoba is mistaken——

Mr. CRAWFORD. He often is.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette)—and so are the judges. Are the judges mistaken too? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Crawford) will find that he is wrong in this as he was in a matter previously discussed between us. I stated that the judges fixed the time and place of the courts of revision. The hon. member denied it. But I have in my possession original letters from the judges saying that they named the date and fixed the place for the court of revision. And the Prime Minister, I think, has seen those letters. I handed them to the leader of the opposition to show——

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. That is the courts of revision. But the judges do not lay out the polling divisions.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). The hon. gentleman is coming around. He has admitted that——

Mr. CRAWFORD. I take exception to the hon. gentleman's statement that the judges fix the courts of revision. They do not; these are fixed by order in council.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Then, I will show the hon. gentleman the judge's letter.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It is all subject to the approval of the executive council.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). And the executive council have not in any instance departed from the recommendation of the judges. They have embodied those recommendations in orders in council, but the object is to give the information to the electorate. This is necessary——

Mr. CRAWFORD. Why did the attorney general disfranchise electors by tearing off part of the voters' lists which the judges had authorized?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). That is a mere figment of the hon. gentleman's imagination. He is merely reiterating these worn-out statements that have been met and shown to be without foundation. I do not want to enter into an argument upon a question that has already been threshed out. I simply desire to say, and I can show the papers to the Prime Minister to prove, that the judges have established the present polling subdivisions, except where it was necessary to make an alteration and the returning officer was authorized to do that. And, as the polling subdivisions were originally established by the judges, I do not see that it would be right to give them the power to rearrange them for Dominion purposes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I desire to make a correction of the statement of the hon. member (Mr. W. J. Roche). The judges in 1903 made certain registration divisions and afterwards the Manitoba government adopted these and made them into polling subdivisions.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). The hon. gentleman is getting there. I will soon convince him. I would ask him: Has he any objection to the present polling subdivision in the main? If not, what is the use——

Mr. CRAWFORD. I have objections to a number of them.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In my humble judgment, the point is not worth raising The general power is given to the judge to fix the polling divisions. It is necessary that the judge should have that power. The hon. member knows as well as I do that the judges will not interfere with the polling divisions unless there is some good reason for so doing. The reason the general power is given and especially in a province like Manitoba where the population is so rapidly increasing, you may have a polling division which is sufficient to-day but to-morrow it will be found not sufficient. If you

give the general power to the judges they will not abuse it, and I think it will work out satisfactorily.

On subsection 10,

10. It shall be the duty of each such committee, forthwith after the completion of such distribution, to transmit to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, by registered mail a statement and description showing the limits of the polling divisions so defined and established, together with a copy of the lists of electors as so distributed among the said polling divisions certified under the hands of the members of the said committee, and the provisions of sections 13 and 14 of the Dominion Elections Act shall apply to such certified copy.

Mr. LANCASTER. I should think the same amendment might be made to this as was proposed by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) in regard to section 8, to provide that the elected member, the defeated candidate and the sheriff should have lists sent to them. We amended section 8 which relates to Ontario on the motion of the hon. member for East Simcoe and this section which relates to Manitoba can be amended in the same way.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. These are the provincial lists which are being dealt with, copies of which will be forwarded by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery under the general law. Each of the candidates in the previous election will have twenty copies. To make the amendment proposed, it seems to me, would be to put work upon the judges without any good reason.

On section 13—person on general list, but omitted from separate list.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Some amendments were suggested to various sections which I undertook to have prepared when the Bill was resumed. One of them would have a proper place as the next following section of this Bill. A discussion took place at a previous sitting with regard to what is now section 13. That provides for the case of a man whose name had been dropped from the list in transcribing, and it was suggested that there ought to be some provision by which the general list of voters applicable to that poll should be in the hands of the deputy who was conducting the election at that poll. I pointed out at the time that this section 13 of the present Bill was a corollary to section 25 of the statute, and I propose to amend section 25 of the original Act by adding the following words:

And shall deliver to the deputy returning officer for such polling division a true copy, certified by the returning officer, of the lists of voters for the provincial polling subdivision as received by him from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that an answer to the question put the other day by the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Clements) to cover the case where an elector votes in a municipality, half of which is in one county and half in another county?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The amendment, which was moved by the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Clarke), is incorporated in this Bill, and seems to have been adopted.

On section 3—nomination paper to state address of candidate for service.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. This section was left open to decide what penalty there ought to be on a candidate who does not comply with it, or who may give a fictitious address. A suggestion was made by the leader of the opposition, with which I agreed, that he might be made to forfeit his deposit. I prepared an amendment carrying out that suggestion, but on thinking about it, it seems to me a pretty severe penalty—$200 is a substantial fine. This idea occurred to me as an alternative, that the election petition or other paper, which would be served by leaving it at his address, if it were a real one, might be left for the candidate with the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. If that suggestion meets with the approval of the committee, I have prepared an amendment on those lines. The idea of publishing it in the 'Canada Gazette' was also suggested, but that perhaps is an unnecessary expenditure. My proposition would be to add this as a subsection:

If the nomination paper of any candidate gives a fictitious address, or does not state any address as required by the preceding subsection, leaving a copy of such process, notice or other document with the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery for such candidate, shall be deemed equivalent for all purposes to personal service upon him of such process, notice or other document.

The candidate could then go to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery and get the document.

Mr. LANCASTER. I draw attention to the language of the Act in the section which is being amended:

And leaving a copy of such process, notice or document at such address.

I would suggest that the following words be inserted in the 17th line: 'a grown person.' It would be unfair to leave the copy of such a document at a house where there was no one residing to receive it, or to throw it upon the verandah or into the back yard.

Mr. ALCORN. I would suggest to the minister that after the word 'Chancery,' in his amendment, he should add the words 'at his office in the city of Ottawa.'

Mr. BERGERON. Do I understand that a candidate in the Yukon, for instance, would be obliged to accept service in the office of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery at Ottawa? Would a bailiff, for instance, have to come all the way down to Ottawa? Why should it not be done by registered letter instead of forcing a man to come down here?

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. It is only in the event of the candidate giving a fictitious name. If he does that he is liable to punishment.

Mr. BERGERON. He would not be the loser, the man who gives the fictitious address is the man elected. Does the man who is contesting an election have to come down to Ottawa? It seems to me that service might be made by registered letter.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT. What is implied in the term 'address'? In small villages, for instance, there is no street number. Suppose a farmer is a candidate, and must he give the number of his lot? In villages or towns the address would mean only a post office address.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I expressed the opinion when the Bill was in committee before that if a man lived at a country four-corners where there was only one building and that a post office, if he gave the name of that post office it would be an address and the paper might be left at that post office; but I should think that every candidate would take care in giving an address, to give some specific address, such as his place of business, or, if he preferred, his residence, defining where it was; it would be his interest to do so.

Mr. LANCASTER. What about my amendment requiring it to be left with a grown person?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. This was all discussed at the previous sitting of the committee. The whole idea of this clause which was framed on the suggestion of the Elections Committee of two years ago was to make it easier to serve the candidate who was elected, and with that object this provision is inserted. If you are going to whittle it away by throwing conditions in the way of service you may as well not have it.

Mr. LANCASTER. I suppose the committee want somebody served.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The idea was that service might be made by mail and when discussing this two weeks ago that is what hon. gentlemen were contending for.

Mr. LANCASTER. We are not talking of sending by registered mail; the minister is treating this with a flippancy not becoming the Minister of Justice——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. ALCORN.

Mr. LANCASTER——when he says one is trying to whittle away the section, whereas I am trying to do my duty.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman misunderstood if he thought the Minister of Justice was flippant. I would ask the leader of the opposition if he concurs in what the member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) is saying, because the Minister of Justice says this section is drawn to meet what the leader of the opposition and the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) thought was a proper provision when sitting on the Elections Committee of two years ago.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The leader of the opposition of course was not a member of the Committee on Elections to which I referred. The view of that committee, as expressed here a few weeks ago, I think by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) was that a man should be made to give an address and if when the process server came to serve him the place was locked, that might be a plot by the candidate to defeat service and the proposition was that he should leave it in the letter box or somewhere about the premises. If the committee want to force personal service we can at once strike out the clause.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I do not wish to be understood as assenting to the proposition that any man who has gone through the difficulty and trouble of an election should be liable to having his seat contested or to have a cross petition filed against him by a document being alleged by some process server to have been thrown in his door, of which he never heard. This would not throw out the personal service, it is only a supplementary service and I think this law should provide that where an address is given by a candidate it should be left at that address with some adult person. Any other proposition is unfair.

Mr. BRISTOL. We could easily put the alternative to be left with some grown person or if there is no one in to be nailed up at the address. That is a common way of serving.

Mr. ALCORN. If personal service cannot be effected and we are going to quarrel about the particular method of service, we had better strike the amendment out altogether and let the law stay as it was.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I move that the clause be amended by providing in terms that service can be effected by leaving the paper at the residence named by the candidate with some adult person, or in the event of no adult person being there posting it to the door.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. I am inclined to agree with the hon. member (Mr. Alcorn) that the amended section should be withdawn.

Mr. LANCASTER. My objection applies whether the amendment of the Minister of Justice goes in or not, because he is only providing for service on the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. I suggest that the amendment be accepted to the main clause, and that the amendment of the Minister of Justice be withdrawn. That will satisfy every one.

Mr. BRISTOL. To close the matter I move that after the words 'at such address,' you insert the following:

With some adult person at such address, or in case there be no adult person there, then by posting same up at such address.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. It seems to me that if you are going to have all this complication you had better leave the law as it is.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would think that the proposal of the Minister of Justice in the first instance was a good one because the difficulty of effecting service in election petitions has become a scandal throughout the country. We cannot spend too much time over it and unless we can settle on something very soon we had better leave it as it is.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Dropped.

On section 8a,

Mr. AYLESWORTH. When the Bill was before the committee previously the leader of the opposition called my attention to section 6 and section 8 asking me to make sure that there was no conflict as to the times for taking these various steps in the Yukon. I have made myself satisfied in that regard and I think there is no room for difficulty. But in the course of that examination I observed that sections 49, 50 and 51 in the original Act as they now stand apply to the Yukon as well as to Saskatchewan and Alberta. They ought to be all three limited to Saskatchewan and Alberta, because we are now making provision in this Bill by sections 6 and 8 for these steps in the Yukon. I have prepared an amendment which strikes out the Yukon from these three sections, because by this Bill we are otherwise providing for the correction of the lists in the Yukon.

On section 17—rejection of ballots.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. When the Bill was in committee before I stated that I would prepare an amendment which would make it an offence on the part of any deputy returning officer to attempt to mark a ballot so as to identify a voter. I propose to accomplish that purpose by inserting a provision in section 20 which amends section 255 of the principal Act, to make the deputy returning officer punishable, without the alternative of a fine, by an imprisonment of not less than one year and not more than five years, who places on any ballot paper except as authorized by this Act any writing, number or mark with the intent that the voter to whom such ballot paper is to be or has been given may be identified thereby. That will cover the case of marking the ballot paper either before it is handed to the voter or after the voter has voted and returned the ballot paper to the deputy for deposit in the box.

Mr. LANCASTER. When this matter was up before the hon. leader of the opposition suggested that the onus should be on the deputy returning officer who had the custody of the paper to show that he was guiltless. That is not usual, but in a case of this kind I think it is right. The deputy returning officer has the custody of these ballot papers and it ought not to be possible, if he has ordinary intelligence and is an honest man, that this thing could happen.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is possible unfortunately.

Mr. LANCASTER. No, because he knows that he has no right to put a mark on the ballot paper for the purpose of identifying it. You could not make the penalty too heavy. We say he should be guilty of a serious criminal offence if he puts on a ballot paper any mark by which he can identify any voter. He is the custodian of the ballot papers, and at the end of the poll he it is who decides whether the ballot shall be counted or not. He is the sole judge until you get a recount. When that ballot is laid on the table, that deputy returning officer knows whether he put a mark on it or not. If he did, he will not say so, because he would thereby make himself liable to prosecution for this criminal offence. Suppose there should be a mark on John Smith's ballot and John Smith says he did not put it on, it is not unfair to put on that deputy returning officer the onus of proving that he did not interfere with the ballot.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. There is this difficulty. John Smith might have some vindictive feeling against the returning officer and might put a mark on the ballot himself in order that the deputy might be convicted of a criminal offence. The deputy cannot know that John Smith put a mark on the paper because he cannot unfold it, and it would be very unfair to put the onus of proof on him that he did not put the mark on the ballot, when he is the only one who could have marked it, if John Smith's denial be accepted.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What I suggested has not very much to do with what has been just discussed. The discussion has related to the question of determining whether or not the deputy returning officer put the mark

on the ballot. But that is entirely a question of evidence, and I do not propose to interfere with that in any way. In the absence of proof to the contrary, it should be presumed that the mark was put on the ballot for the purpose of identification by the deputy returning officer, and the amendment I suggest relates solely to the intent and not to the proof that the deputy actually made the mark. I propose that the amendment of the Minister of Justice should be altered so that if the deputy returning officer should place on the ballot paper, except as authorized by this Act, any writing, number or mark, the intent that the voter may be identified thereby, shall be presumed in the absence of proof to the contrary. This leaves it open to the deputy returning officer to prove that he had no such intent, but such intent would be presumed in the absence of proof to the contrary. The deputy returning officer should have sufficient intelligence to know that if he puts any mark on the ballot, the ballot may be identified thereby, but he would be given the opportunity to prove that he had no such intent in doing what he did.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend from Lincoln said a moment ago that any honest man with common intelligence could not make such a mistake as to put a mark on the ballot unless with the intention of finding out for whom the voter cast it. Our experience is to the contrary. Take the cases of St. Hyacinthe and Wentworth. In the latter the returning officer was a political friend of the Liberal candidate. At his particular poll he put his initials on every ballot, and at that poll there was a majority in favour of his political friend. He was an honest man, as far as I know, and an intelligent man also, but evidently had not given the close attention he should to his duties, and he has been lamenting ever since what he did.

Mr. LANCASTER. What he claimed was that he thought it was the right thing to do because it had been done under the provincial Act.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. He had probably been accustomed to act as deputy returning officer in the local elections in which the ballots were numbered, and he did the very same thing in the Dominion election. But take the case of St. Hyacinthe. Our Quebec law is the same as the Dominion, yet the returning officer put his initials and numbers on all the ballots in his particular poll. He is an honest and an intelligent man, yet he made that mistake.

Mr. LANCASTER. What reason did he give ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know that he gave any but he did it without malice. The only objection I have is that to make a man liable to prosecution for having committed such an error, is a very serious punishment. Not only that but you put on him also the onus of proving his own innocence. I thought at one time that we might impose a slight penalty on the deputy returning officer in the case of every ballot he thus marked so as to punish him for his negligence, if not for his malice, but on the whole I do not think we can do much better than accept the amendment proposed by my hon. colleague the Minister of Justice.

Mr. BERGERON. The great difficulty is the little care taken in the appointment of deputy returning officers. They are generally strong party men and very much occupied with the election. The night before polling, they are generally up late, and, instead of studying the law and preparing to do their duty, they are canvassing all day for the candidates of their choice. They go into the poll without knowing the law. And, in the St. Hyacinthe case, the man did not know what he was doing.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Possibly.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If ignorance of the law were proved there could be no fraudulent or criminal intent. Therefore, all those returning officers to whom the hon. gentleman has alluded would be discharged by any judge before whom they were brought. Of course, this does not add anything to the risk of prosecution ; they would be subject to the risk of prosecution in any case under this section. The section merely provides that the man shall be presumed to know the consequences of his own act. We should have returning officers who will be sufficiently diligent to make themselves acquainted with the law. I admit that the penalty is severe, but I think we might try this for a year and see how it works.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Would the hon. gentleman suggest that the man should be held guilty before he is proven guilty ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No. But if he puts a mark on a ballot by which a voter can be identified, it will be presumed, in the absence of some reasonable excuse——

Mr. MACPHERSON. That he is guilty ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Putting on the mark constitutes the offence.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. He is not held to be guilty, because it remains to be determined whether he can discharge himself of the burden the statute puts upon him. That is not an unreasonable burden. He is acting for the people of the whole polling division or the whole riding. If he violates the law which has been placed in his hand for his information, by putting a mark which would lead to the identification of a voter, the duty is put upon him of giving

a reason why he marked that ballot. That is the whole effect of my amendment.

Mr. BRISTOL. Section 17 provides for the amendment of section 173 of the Act, which provides :

In counting the votes, the deputy returning officer shall reject all ballot papers——

(a) which have not been supplied by him; or

(b) by which votes have been given for more candidates than are to be elected; or

(c) upon which there is any writing or mark by which the voter could be identified other than the numbering by the deputy returning officer in the cases hereinbefore provided for.

To this section this amendment is proposed in the Bill :

Provided, however, that no ballot paper shall be rejected on account of any writing, number or mark placed thereon by any deputy returning officer.

I would suggest that there should be added to that—so that the deputy returning officer's notice will be called to it——

—but any deputy returning officer placing any writing, number or mark thereon shall be subject to the provisions of section 255.

This would put the enactment right in the place where the deputy gets information as to how he is to count the ballots. His attention will be called to the provision of this penalty.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is a good suggestion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Show it to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth).

Mr. AYLESWORTH. With regard to the question whether the intent to do wrong ought or ought not to be presumed in the absence of proof to the contrary, it would strike me as a pretty serious proposition. We are dealing with not less than ten thousand deputy returning officers all over the country. They are men presumably wishing to do their duty ; but they are confronted, when they take charge of their work on election day, with a statute containing some hundreds of clauses which they are supposed to familiarize themselves with and by which they are instructed in a very great number of sections as to exactly what they must do under different circumstances. It would be a marvellous thing if they did not occasionally make mistakes. I suppose that we all agree that where it is an innocent and honest mistake of which we have seen repeated instances in recent times, the man ought not to be punished by the infliction of such a serious penalty as this we have provided. But there might be circumstances under which it might be very difficult for him to prove his innocence. I instanced, the other day when this clause was under discussion, the case of a possible discussion at a poll with regard to some particular voter—such things, in practice, frequently occur. A man comes in whose right to vote is questioned, and some wiseacre suggests that the man's ballot ought to be endorsed with a memorandum so that if it turns out that he had no right to vote his ballot can be found and rejected. Now, if, pursuant to that arrangement made by consent of all parties at the poll the deputy returning officer were to write upon the ballot, if you like, 'This is John Smith's ballot,' that would manifestly be a writing upon the ballot for the purpose of identifying John Smith. But I would think that the deputy returning officer ought not to be punished if he did that honestly.

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

Mr. AYLESWORTH. It may be said that he could readily prove his innocence. I do not know that he could do it so readily. If indicted for this offence, he could go into the witness box and assert his honesty, but whether his assertion will be believed or disbelieved is another story. What you are proposing to do by this amendment is to put the burden of proving himself innocent upon the man who is accused of this particular offence. That is a very serious departure from the ordinary principles of the law. This clause is framed to make it an offence for the deputy returning officer to put upon any ballot paper a mark calculated to identify the voter with intent that the voter shall thereby be identified. The intent is the gist of the whole offence. If the intent is absent the charge falls to the ground. If it is a mark put on inadvertently, of course nobody is to be prosecuted. If it is not done with intent to identify the voter, there ought to be no prosecution. If it is done with intent to identify the voter, that intent may be honest, although in most cases I think it would be dishonest. But to prove dishonest intent, to prove intent to commit the offence struck at by the statute, it seems to me is a thing which ought to be upon the prosecution. Ordinarily it may be the surrounding circumstances will suffice to satisfy the jury of wrongful intent. But if they do not, if the surrounding circumstances as disclosed in the evidence leave the jury in doubt, ought we then to say that a man should be presumed guilty unless he is able to satisfy the jury or the judge that he was acting honestly ? I think not. I think we are going the full length when we penalize the man who does this with wrongful intent, and leave that intent to be established by the prosecution, just as it is established in other criminal cases.

Mr. LANCASTER. Take the case of one man shooting another. If he points a revolver at him and pulls the trigger, he is presumed to have intended to shoot the other man. The deputy returning officer ought to be in the same position. He actually commits an overt act, he puts a mark upon the ballot which he ought not to put

there. Is it not fair to assume that he did it with that intent? Why should not the onus of proving that he had not that intent be upon him? When the deputy returning officer places his mark he actually commits an act which he cannot commit legally, and it ought to be assumed that he would know that it would have the result of identifying that ballot.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. Whatever the presumption of the law is, it would still be the same under the amendment of the Minister of Justice. The leader of the opposition proposes to make that presumption go one step further than the law does. The man who places a mark on the ballot is presumed to have done it with intent, just as the man who presents a gun. I would suggest that if you prove that the man did mark this ballot you have nearly proven your case, and the intent will be presumed. But the onus of proof will be shifted.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If I am not mistaken, both the Customs Act and the Inland Revenue Act furnish many cases where the burden is put upon the defendant of proving that he had no intention of defrauding the revenue laws. That is done in the public interest. It is necesary that the public revenue should be protected. The facts are peculiarly within the knowledge of the man who is accused. This is a case in which we have something quite as important as the protection to the revenue, that is, the protection of the secrecy of the ballot. The deputy returning officer has the law placed in his hands weeks before hand, and if he sees fit to put a mark of identification upon the ballot, it is not imposing a serious burden upon him to ask that he shall show some good reason to the court why he contravened the law in that way, and in the absence of some good reason, it should be held that he put it there for the purpose of identification.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. It is a question whether the court would not infer, by reason of the fact that the returning officer had placed a mark upon the ballot paper, that he had done so wrongfully, because he did it in contravention of the statute. I think the amendment of the leader of the opposition is a matter of surplusage. Any judge would think that a man who commits an act in infraction of a statute did it with wrongful intent. It might appear in the course of the prosecution that the intent would be rebutted by the circumstances, that is, any possible inference that might be drawn by reason of the fact that the mark was on the ballot would be rebutted. But I want to point out to the leader of the opposition that an infraction of the revenue laws is not quite similar to an infraction of the election law. This election law deals with an act which can only be committed once in every four years, whereas violations of the revenue laws may take place every day.

Mr. LANCASTER. Where is the difference?

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Ninety-nine out a hundred deputy returning officers are perfectly honest, and if one is guilty by inadvertence he ought not to be put into the position of disproving his guilt.

Mr. LANCASTER. We want to stop these marks from being put on by deputy returning officers.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. With intent.

Mr. LANCASTER. We want to stop them being put on if they have the effect of identifying the voters. If a returning officer does put such a mark on a ballot, we do him the justice of saying that he must do it with wicked intent. But what we are at is not the intent of the man so much as to prevent the voter from being identified, by making it a criminal offence. Of course, it is only fair that it should only be made a criminal offence when the man does it with a wicked intent.

Mr. LENNOX. The amendment proposed by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) simply means that in the absence of a satisfactory explanation by the deputy returning officer he shall be presumed to have intended the consequences of his act. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) said that it would be unfair that the judge should be allowed to draw an inference of innocence from the circumstances surrounding the act.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Not that, but that he should be prevented from drawing an inference from the facts and circumstances appearing.

Mr. LENNOX. If the facts and circumstances appearing show or tend to show that the man did not do it with wrong intent, he would be free and the judge would be bound to tell the jury that these circumstances appeared; but if it is clear that he did mark the ballot and that thereby he did identify the voter and marked it with that intention, then he must stand the consequences.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. If a deputy is charged with having marked the ballot, then at the preliminary examination the magistrate would have no discretion but would have to send the man for trial, because if the amendment of the leader of the opposition carries, the magistrate would have to assume intent to commit a wrong and not having the right to sift the evidence would be bound to send him up, whereas if it is left open and the magistrate is allowed to judge, the whole thing could be cleared up.

Mr. LENNOX. If the magistrate had power to try the case he would have the same power to deal with any case as an ordinary trial judge. To say that if a deputy returning officer places on any ballot paper, except as authorized by the Act, any writing, number or mark with intent to identify the voter, it shall render him liable to a penalty, is absolutely idle if you do not follow it with the provision that it shall be presumed he did it with that intent until the contrary appears.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I know of no reason why witnesses should not be called in the first instance before the magistrate.

Mr. CARVELL. The hon. gentleman must know that if a question of fact is raised before the magistrate and there is any evidence on which to justify the conclusion of guilt, the magistrate has no jurisdiction only to send the man for trial.

Mr. LANCASTER. The Criminal Code says he must hear witnesses.

Mr. CARVELL. It has been held he must send him up for trial.

Mr. LANCASTER. Held by whom ?

Mr. CARVELL. By Judge Gregory of Nova Scotia.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is no reason why witnesses should not be called so far as I am aware. The observations of the hon. member for Carleton, New Brunswick seem to be very much beside the mark. We have many similar provisions in the Customs and Inland Revenue Acts. Take this section of the Customs Act :

Any person, who, without lawful excuse, proof of which shall be on the person accused, sends or brings into Canada or has in his possession, any bill-head or other paper purporting to be a bill-head or blank capable of being used as an invoice——

——shall be subject to a very severe penalty. There you put the burden of proof on a man in respect of a very ordinary transaction. It is not prohibited by law to have a bill-head in your possession but if he has it brought in from abroad the burden of proof is on him to show that it is not in his possession for a fraudulent purpose. Then section 264, a most comprehensive section, imposes the burden of proof under every possible condition and in every possible variety of suit or proceeding upon the man who may be accused of smuggling or of some infraction of the Customs Act. It seems to me we would be going no further here but would be acting along the same line of policy in the public interest. The rights of the person charged in every such case are sufficiently protected by the right given to him to bring forward every circumstance to show there was no criminal intent in his mind when he committed the particular act complained of.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not argue that there is not a good deal to be said in favour of the view advocated by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). I have given a good deal of thought myself to this subject, and I thought at the time some punishment should be inflicted on the returning officer who puts any mark upon a ballot quite innocently, without malice, simply as a punishment for his negligence. I call my hon. friend's attention to the Bill as drafted. First of all the offence is created which is quite proper. But look at the penalty, it is not a fine but it is penitentiary, one of the highest penalties the law can inflict. When the offence is of such a nature and of such consequence it seems to me that, as he has to stand his trial, if he is innocent he is already punished sufficiently for his negligence, and I do not think under such circumstances you should put upon him the further burden of proving his own innocence.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have listened to many finely drawn arguments as to what the judges and the juries of the country think of any infraction of clause 17, and I have come to the conclusion that there is only one remedy to apply in disposing of this clause. The right hon. gentleman says there were about 10,000 officers in an election carrying out the law, comparatively few of these men are lawyers, and it would not be surprising if here and there mistakes should be made. Some thirty years ago I was acting for the registrar who was returning officer, and I went through the county appointing deputy returning officers and I made it a point to instruct every deputy carefully as to his duty. In the recent provincial election in Halton I advised the returning officer to take that course and I believe that in every instance he spent an hour with each deputy returning officer carefully instructing him in his duties. The work was well performed and nothing occurred that in any way tended to void the election. I think we might include in this law a clause making it incumbent on every returning officer to instruct his deputies carefully, more particularly with regard to the more technical particulars, and if such were done we would not have a repetition of what occurred in the county of Wentworth, or many years ago in the county of Hastings where in one case at least the election had to be set aside.

For many years in Ontario we had been cursed with the marked ballot. Working men were coerced by their employers to vote as the employers wanted. I have myself seen a voters' list that was marked from the ballots that were returned to the city of Toronto. Every man's name was marked exactly as he voted, and in a bye-election during the same year on the same list, that list was used in the village where I lived and the electors were coerced by

means of it. We had a marked ballot for thirty years in Ontario, a ballot worse than open voting. We cannot tolerate for a moment any such thing being introduced into the Dominion election law; we protest strongly against anything that will tend to make the vote of any elector known to his fellows. There is no question in my mind but that by means of this clause 17 the vote of the elector can be known. Suppose it is not made known that would not be the worst feature of it. The bad feature of this clause is, that the employer can go to his workmen and say: This is not a secret ballot, and we will know how you vote and every man can be coerced. The only means of giving us a fair and square election law is to expunge that clause from the Bill and without taking up any more time I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Blain: That section 17 be stricken out.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson) has misconceived the meaning of section 17. It is in no sense intended to create what was called in Ontario the numbered ballot and which did exist previous to the advent of the present administration.

Mr. CROCKET. It validates any ballots that may be numbered by the returning officer.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. In that sense it does not. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson) tell me if he is content with the Ontario Election Act as it at present exists?

Mr. HENDERSON. I am only satisfied with the secret ballot.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. Have you not contended that the present election law of Ontario gives an absolutely secret ballot?

Mr. HENDERSON. I say that what I want is a secret ballot. If this clause is in the Ontario election law I want it struck out there too.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. That statement may be useful hereafter, but if the hon. gentleman reflects for a minute I believe he will come to the conclusion that this is a fair law. Does he realize what power the present law places in a deputy returning officer, who wants to do something that is not proper? Does he not know that it absolutely places in those who have control of the machinery unlimited power to void ballots. In the county of Wentworth in the last Dominion election because the deputy returning officer put a number on the ballots the local judge threw out one poll and changed the whole result of the election. I am glad to say the judge in the county of Simcoe did not follow that ruling, but held that if these numbers were put there with fraudulent intent it would come up properly on a protest; that he could not take cognizance of it and would count the ballots. In the Ontario Election Act the verbiage of the clause relating to this matter is practically the same in effect as paragraph 17 of this Bill. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson) reflects what teriffic power he would place in the hands of the deputy returning officer who wanted to act improperly, without this saving clause in the Bill, I believe he will come to the conclusion that the provision is a wise one. It is to the advantage of the party in power that that should be so if they want to do anything dishonest; but it is not fair, and the law should make fairness its aim; and if you place such a provision in the Election Act as exists in both the Ontario Act and this Act, you will do what is fair and right and prevent the deputy returning officer defeating the intention of an elector.

Mr. HENDERSON. Ever since confederation we have got along pretty well with the ballot which we have at the present time, and I think we can leave that as it is without opening the door in the way proposed by section 17.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. I do not think the question has been raised more than three times since confederation; but this section is inserted in the Act for the purpose of preventing it being raised.

Amendment of Mr. Henderson negatived: Yeas, 22; nays, 57

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bristol), who has been obliged to leave the chamber, has asked me to impress upon the House what he suggested in regard to assisting the deputy returning officer not to make the mistake of marking the ballot; and I would urge on the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice what seems to me to be the wisdom of adopting the suggestion, by adding to the section these words: 'but any deputy returning officer placing any mark thereon shall be subject to the provisions of section 255.' The only thing that can be said against that is that it is a repetition; but the virtue of it is that by section 255 we are providing that that shall be a criminal offence, and the result of making this addition, although it is not absolutely necessary to carry out the law, will be to reduce to a minimum the probability of a deputy returning officer doing what we want to prevent him doing. His attention will be drawn to the matter, because he will read it in connection with his duties at the close of the poll.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The hon. member for Centre Toronto saw me with reference to this suggestion, but I pointed out that this section 173, which section 17 is amending, is a directory section, directing what should be done after the closing of the poll in counting the ballot papers, and it

does not seem to me that there would be any propriety in tacking on to such a section a statement that a deputy returning officer would be subject to a penalty provided in another section of the Act. We have provided for the penalties in one clause and for the directions in another clause in another part of the Act.

Mr. LANCASTER. He is sure to see section 173 in order to learn what his duties are, while he is unlikely to see section 155 if he is an honest man not expecting to be penalized.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. It is not at all likely that a deputy returning officer will turn up section 173 the first thing in the morning, as he has no occasion to use it until the polls are closed in the evening, when it is too late to warn him. It would be much more to the purpose to attach this rider to one of the earlier sections. But he will read the whole statute and try to understand it. I do not think this is necessary in any way. We do not spread all over the statute-book finger posts at every section pointing to this, that or the other penalty. The penalties are there, and he must read and inform himself in that regard.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There may be some force in what the minister observes, though I would have preferred to have the whole penalties at the end of section 173. At least my hon. friend should undertake in his instructions, to draw the particular attention of the returning officers to the penalties and that would perhaps answer the purpose.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I will undertake to draw the special attention of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to them, but I do not want to undertake a responsibility I may not be able to discharge.

Section as amended agreed to.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I move the following amendment:—

Forms O and P in schedule 1 of the said Act are each amended by striking out of form O the sixth paragraph thereof and out of form P the last paragraph thereof and substituting for the said paragraph in each form the following:

If a voter fraudulently takes a ballot paper out of the polling station or fraudulently delivers to the deputy returning officer to be put into the ballot box any other paper than the ballot paper given him by the deputy returning officer, he will be disqualified from voting at any election for eight years thereafter and be liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding three years and not less than one year, with or without hard labour.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. There are some errors in the French version which it is necessary to correct. Section 112 of the statute provides for a stamp which is sent to each returning officer, and the provision is that this stamp is to be specially made for each election and sent the returning officer by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery so that it may reach him on or about the day of nomination. In the French version it is translated 'on that day' and I move that it be amended by inserting the words 'le ou vers.'

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. In the French version section 197 has been rather freely translated. In the English it is continuous and in the French it is separated into two sections. I propose to make it continuous by striking out the figure 2 and substituting therefor the word 'et.'

Then section 254 in the French version is an exceedingly free translation. The English clause and the French clause no doubt mean the same thing but do not follow each other in phraseology. A new translation has been prepared making the French version literally correspond with the English.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I move in amendment:—

That the said Bill be amended by adding thereto the following sections: Sections 75 and 76 of the said Act are repealed and the following sections are substituted therefor.

This amendment will be found on page 1238 of the Votes and Proceedings. It is to provide that in the first place the writ for an election shall be dated and be returnable on such day as the Governor General determines, or the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery may determine in cases where such clerk has authority to so determine, pursuant to the Act respecting the House of Commons. That would be required to be followed by an amendment I have already presented, providing that after certain delay, in case there should be a vacancy in the representation, the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery shall have authority to issue the writ himself so that no constituency shall remain unrepresented for a longer period than three months. The next section 76 provides that the returning officer shall be one of a certain class. In Ontario the sheriff or registrar of deeds, in the province of Quebec the registrar or sheriff or prothonotary, in the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, the sheriff, in Saskatchewan, Alberta and the Yukon Territory, the sheriff or registrar or deputy registrar or the superintendent of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police. There are further supplementary provisions for any case in which a sufficient number of officers cannot be found or in case of their disqualification, or disability or refusal to act. The object of the section is, in fact, that persons of a particular class and qualification shall be selected, and in that way, it is

believed, some of the unfortunate occurrences which occasionally have taken place in this country will be prevented in the future, because this will assure the country that men of responsible position are selected for this important post.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. So far as I am able to observe from a brief examination of the amendment, the principal difference between our present law and the amendment seems to be as to the persons to whom the writ of election shall be directed. Our present law provides that the writ shall be directed to the person appointed by the Governor in Council as the returning officer. The proposition in the amendment is that certain named officials shall be appointed returning officers. I am not, at the moment, able to say how long our statute has been in its present condition, but it is certainly many years—I should say at least twenty-five or thirty years—and, during that time, the writs have been addressed at each election to such returning officer as was selected for the purpose by the Governor in Council. In Ontario, with which province I am more familiar than with any other, the opposite rule prevailed, and, for a great many years—probably for quite as long a time—the writs were required to be addressed to officials just as is proposed in this amendment. That system seems not to have been satisfactory; two years ago the legislature of Ontario, under the leadership of the present government, changed it and adopted our system. In these circumstances, the experience of the past and the trend of legislation would seem to be in favour of continuing the system which we have maintained so long in Dominion elections, and I would submit that no good reason for the change appears.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. HENDERSON. I move the following amendment :

Section 77 of the said Act is amended by adding the following paragraph:
(i) persons who are aliens.

Section 77 provides that none of the following persons shall be appointed as returning officer, deputy returning officer, election clerk or poll clerk :

(a) Members of the King's Privy Council for Canada or of the executive council of any province of Canada ;
(b) Members of the Senate or of the legislative council of any province of Canada ;
(c) Members of the House of Commons, or of the legislative assembly of any province of Canada, or of the Yukon Territorial Council;
(d) Ministers, priests or ecclesiastics of any religious faith or worship ;
(e) Judges of the courts of superior, civil or criminal jurisdiction, judges of any county or district court, or insolvent court, and any local judge of the Exchequer Court on its admiralty side, and in the Yukon territory, police magistrates .
(f) Persons who have served in the parliament of Canada in the session immediately preceding the election or in the session in progress at the time of the election ;
(g) Persons who have been found guilty by the House of Commons, or by any court for the trial of controverted elections, or other competent tribunal, of any offence or dereliction of duty in violation of this Act or any provincial Act relating to elections, or under the Disfranchising Act ;
(h) Persons convicted of any indictable offence.

I desire to add to this list 'persons who are aliens. I think it only reasonable that persons appointed to these offices should be British subjects.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What is the reason for this amendment ?

Mr. HENDERSON. We consider it a good, loyal thing to do.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think so too. But is there any occasion for moving the amendment ?

Mr. HENDERSON. We are apprehensive that there may be occasion.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. CROCKET. I move that the Bill be amended by adding thereto the following section :

Section 77 of the said Act is further amended by adding thereto the following subsection:
2. Every person who, at a time when by this or any other Act he is disqualified from acting as returning officer, deputy returning officer, election clerk or poll clerk, nevertheless so acts, is, disqualified from voting at any Dominion election during the period of seven years from the date of his first official act as such returning officer, deputy returning officer, election clerk or poll clerk, and he is also guilty of an indictable offence, and shall, on conviction, be liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding one year nor less than six months, with or without hard labour.

By reference to the notice of motion at page 1239 of the Votes and Proceedings, it will be seen that I am changing the motion as there given by striking out the words 'without prosecution for or conviction of any offence.' It seems to me that this is a proposition which ought to commend itself to the judgment of the House.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. ALCORN. I move the folowing amendment :

Section 114 of said Act is repealed and the following is substituted therefor :

Section 114 of the Act, I may say, reads as follows :

The returning officer shall, at least two days before the day fixed for polling, furnish to each candidate or his agent a list of all deputy returning officers appointed to act in such election with the name or number of the

polling station at which each of them is to act.

This must be done two days before the polling, and all he has to furnish is the names. Unless he gives the residence and occupation, the name is of little use. I propose that the following be substituted :

114. The returning officer shall, at least three clear days, next before the date fixed for polling, deliver to the official agent of each candidate, a list of all the deputy returning officers and poll clerks who will act in such election, stating the post office address and occupation or addition of each such officer, and the name or number of the polling station at which each of them is to act.

Then I propose to repeal section 116 of the said Act and substitute the following therefor :

116. Each deputy returning officer shall furnish to the returning officer, not later than nine o'clock in the morning of the fifth day prior to the day fixed for polling, the name, post office address and occupation, or addition of such poll clerk ; and the returning officer shall, not later than twelve o'clock noon of the day on which he receives such particulars, post up in his office a list of the deputy returning officers and poll clerks, with the post office address and occupation or addition of each, showing the polling station where each is to act, and shall permit free access to and afford full opportunity for inspection of such list by any candidate, agent or elector at all reasonable times, until the polls are closed. No person shall be appointed a deputy returning officer or poll clerk who is not a resident of and a voter in the municipality, parish, or other local territorial division wherein the polling subdivision in which he is to act is situate, or, in the case of unorganized territory, who is not a resident of, and a voter in the electoral district.

This latter provision as to residence is taken from the Ontario statutes and is certainly a very necessary one. Cases have arisen, and the Minister of Justice is well aware of them, where the absence of such a provision has worked great hardship and allowed frauds to be practised.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I have not been able to follow fully the alterations that my hon. friend is proposing, but so far as I can understand them, the change is with regard to what the returning officer is to do in the way of delivering to the agents a list of the deputies from two days to three days before the election. Now, is it worth amending a statute for the sake of changing two days to three days, and about a matter of this character? I think any one who has had any experience with elections knows that it is frequently difficult enough for a returning officer to get the whole list of his deputies complete even two days before voting day. I have known many an instance in which the day before voting day it was uncertain who was going to act as deputy at a particular poll. It is not always possible to make your arrangements perfect two days before the election, and where the returning officer has 40 or 50 polls to look after, and some perhaps more than that, many miles away from where he lives, you are putting a needless burden upon him to say that he must do these things three days before election day. Then section 116 of the Act as it stands is the one which provides what the returning officer must do as to the poll clerks. The deputies, under the Act as it now stands, are to furnish to the returning officer not later than 9 o'clock in the morning of the day before voting, the name and occupation of each poll clerk, but that is not applicable to the provinces of Saskatchewan, Alberta and the Yukon. But my hon. friend is proposing to make that applicable to the whole Dominion, to strike out the words 'if practicable' and make it imperative upon these officials to do what, in all human probability, is going to be impossible over half the constituencies in the country.

Mr. BERGERON. Something might be done if my hon. friend does not wish to accept the amendment altogether. I do not think that in the whole Act there is one clause which is so much transgressed as this one. It is difficult to get the names of the deputy returning officers even one day before the election, and in some cases there is deliberate neglect. There might be added a penalty for a returning officer not doing it according to the old law, say three days or two days, but impose a penalty. I can give an example in the election in St. James, Montreal, where, to my knowledge, ten or fifteen deputies were changed during the night preceding the votation. I happened to be a candidate there and I asked the returning officer for the names of the deputies. They were changed three or four times, and the last time about 8 o'clock at night previous to the day of election. When I got the names the last time I said to the returning officer : Now, surely these are the men who are going to act to-morrow ? He promised they would, and still some of them were changed again on the morning of the day of votation. This, as I say, was done for a purpose, because it was shown afterwards that the election was stolen, and it was due in great part to the deputy returning officers. There should be a penalty attached to that clause by which a returning officer, if he does not give the names of his deputies two days or three days before the polling, should be punished. It seems to me that we are all interested in securing that the elections should be carried on as honestly as possible, and the best way to secure that end is to see that at least the officials appointed by the government shall do their duty. Now, evidently parliament is convinced that something of that sort should be done, because we

have a law saying so. But if the government does not want to go as far as the amendment of my hon. friend, at least they ought to add a penalty for neglect of duty by the returning officer. I would suggest that the returning officer, within two days preceding polling, should give the names of all his deputies, and if he changes any one of them after having given the names to the candidates, he shall be condemned to pay a penalty.

Mr. CONMEE. I submit that no good purpose can be served by that amendment; in fact, what object is there in having the names of the deputy returning officers? Why should any one want them?

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend is convinced that the law as it exists to-day is useless?

Mr. CONMEE. I would rather see the provision taken away than enlarged. I want to tell my hon. friend that he cannot carry that law out in the riding I represent, nor even in any riding in New Ontario, because of the great distance.

Mr. BOYCE. It is carried out in provincial elections.

Mr. CONMEE. It is not carried out in provincial elections. I have known returning officers to be sent away three or four days before the day of polling and not be able to reach the polling place. The electors gathered there had to elect their own returning officer to conduct the polls. That has occurred frequently, and the law provides for it.

Mr. BERGERON. The returning officer has eight days in which to choose his deputies. Why should he not choose them before? In a county where it is known there is to be an election the returning officer should be prepared the day after nomination to give the names of his deputies to the two candidates.

Mr. CONMEE. In a district like mine there might be great difficulties, a man might agree to act as deputy and then be prevented by absence or illness. Then the object of knowing the deputy might be a bad object.

Mr. BERGERON. The object would be to see that he is an honest man.

Mr. LANCASTER. Many of the worst evils in the Ontario elections were due to the employment of outsiders to do work which no man in the constituency was base enough to do.

Mr. ALCORN. The minister did not refer to the last five lines of this amendment.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. That is the requirement that no one shall be appointed deputy or poll clerk unless he is a resident of and voter in the municipality, in the polling division. That would be very objectionable. Many of our best poll clerks and deputies are young law students, not 21 years of age, who are sent from county towns into the country and conduct their polls perhaps more satisfactorily than any one else.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. BOYCE. I beg to move the amendment No. 17 on page 1239 which provides:

Section 36 is amended by striking out all the words down to, and including the word 'and' in the fifth line, and by striking out the words 'its reception in the other electoral districts of Canada' in the seventh and eighth lines, and by inserting in lieu of such last mentioned words, the words 'the reception of the writ.'

(2) Section 89 of the said Act is amended by striking out all the words in subsection 1, from and inclusive of the word 'except' in the fifth line thereof.

(3) Section 90 of the said Act is repealed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What does the Prime Minister say about the necessity of postponing these elections?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am told there are some provinces where it would be absolutely impracticable to hold them all on the same day. The member for Yale-Cariboo said it would be impossible in his own riding.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have information of an absolutely different character with regard to every riding in British Columbia. I made careful inquiries there last autumn and I find that all the provincial elections are held on the same day without difficulty. Mr. Smith-Curtis, a Liberal candidate, is thus reported:

Mr. Smith-Curtis particularly emphasized his desire for a clean campaign and emphatically declared that he did not favour a deferred election in the Kootenay Riding, believing it to be in the true interests of every elector that the voting in Kootenay should take place on the day of the general elections throughout Canada.

That is strong testimony from a Liberal candidate in one of the postponed ridings and I have not heard anything in this House or elsewhere to induce me to believe that the Kootenay is in a different position from the other deferred ridings in British Columbia.

Mr. MACPHERSON. My hon. friend's information was certainly very bad. In my first election in Burrard, the returning officer was not able even in a by-election to get the ballot boxes into the northern part of the riding, which is now Comox-Atlin until four days after the date set for holding the elections. How could the ballot boxes leave say Nanaimo and get into Telegraph Creek and Atlin, which is 14 days in the winter, and at the same time get into the Squamish Valley? It is a phy-

sical impossibility to have the Comox-Atlin election at the same time as the others and the same thing applies to Yale-Cariboo.

Mr. FOWLER. The local elections are held on the same day and why could it not be done in federal elections ?

Mr. MACPHERSON. The local constituencies are smaller. If a polling booth is not represented you may upset the election.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not understand when the provincial elections can all be held on the one day why the Dominion can not.

Mr. MACPHERSON. It is impossible to reach the remote parts of that constituency in a week with the ballot boxes. I assure the leader of the opposition, who wants to be fair, that the information is not correct that you could reach any point in Comox-Atlin and get your ballots printed and distributed within the time stated.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have no doubt of the sincerity of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macpherson) but I am a little inclined to discount statements of that kind because I was assured two years ago of the absolute impossibility of bringing about the election in Kootenay on the same day as the others, and now I find the Liberal candidate in Kootenay saying there is no difficulty whatever. In every local constituency in British Columbia the election takes place on the the same day, and it is a perfectly simple thing for the sheriff by employing a sufficient force of men to send the ballot boxes throughout the three or four local constituencies comprised in one Dominion riding.

Mr. MACPHERSON. That is different.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is not the slightest difficulty about doing the same thing in a Dominion election provided you employ enough men to do it. I have a telegram from the premier of British Columbia stating that not the slightest difficulty was experienced in the last provincial election. If the returning officer employs four men to do the work which four returning officers did in the four provincial constituencies, it follows logically that what was done in the provincial elections can be done in the Dominion elections. I would say to the Prime Minister that I have a telegram dated the 4th of this month from the Prime Minister of British Columbia in which after referring to a report in the local press of a statement in this House that the elections in Yale-Cariboo could not be held simultaneously with those in the rest of the province he says :

I desire to give the strongest denial to this. Provincial elections held simultaneously gave every satisfaction and proved there is no difficulty in carrying this out.

He goes on to say that there is no reason whatever why the election in Yale-Cariboo should be held at a later date than the elections in the rest of the province.

Mr. MACPHERSON. You have got to have your ballots printed at a given point and the ballots have to be sent to a different polling subdivision. There are 1,500 miles between the southern and northern districts of Comox-Atlin and if the ballots are printed in Nanaimo how can you get into Surprise lake without a flying machine in the time allowed. The best possible time that can be made to Surprise lake is 11 days, and if there is ice upon the river as there was during my own election when the man who carried the ballot boxes was obliged to break the trail for 80 miles with dogs, how can you overcome a difficulty like that. When the Prime Minister of British Columbia states it is possible to do that, he states what any man who knows the country knows to be incorrect.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I suppose he knows it is correct because it has been done and done in the winter during the last provincial elections. Let me point out that the difficulty is not with regard to the ballots but in posting the proclamations announcing the elections. You have seven days additional to distribute the ballots. I repeat that by employing four men to do the work which the four returning officers would do in the provincial elections you can undoubtedly accomplish in a Dominion election what was accomplished in the dead of winter during the last provincial election.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The hon. gentleman who represents the district (Mr. Duncan Ross) has stated that he saw no personal advantage in having the election held after the other elections because as he said the organization has all gone to pieces the moment the result of the general election is known. We have the testimony of Mr. McBride on the one side and the testimony of the hon. member (Mr. Duncan Ross) on the other, and I think we might as well let it go as proposed.

Mr. BERGERON. Let me point out that in the county of Gaspé we formerly had the nomination a fortnight before the election.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Once.

Mr. BERGERON. Yet it worked well. The nomination was held a fortnight before the election and the election was held on the same day as the other elections thus carrying out the principle which the Prime Minister has so often advocated, that all elections should be held on the same day.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This exception applies to only 5 constituencies out of 221.

Mr. BERGERON. And the less we have of these exceptions the better.

Mr. FOWLER. The argument which my hon. friend (Mr. Macpherson) has used with regard to Comox-Atlin does not apply to Yale-Cariboo because no such difficulties exist in that constituency.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does the Prime Minister press this provision with reference to the election in Kootenay, notwithstanding the declaration of his own candidate that there is no necessity for it ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know the particulars about it.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. LENNOX. I propose to move an amendment which has to some extent the same object as the one that has just been discussed. It is an alternative amendment numbered 17 in the Votes and Proceedings, and is found on pages 1239, 1240 and 1241. The object of this amendment is to secure the holding of all the elections in Canada on the same day except in the Yukon Territory. It will apply to the five or six electoral districts in which the elections are now usually postponed. The object is accomplished by advancing the preliminary stages of the election, the proceedings as to those which require a greater amount of time for preparation being taken at an earlier stage. For instance, writs of election shall be despatched to the returning officers in the case of those electoral districts in time to allow the lapse of twenty-one clear days between the day of their receipt by the returning officer and the day fixed for the nomination of the candidates. The nomination day will be fourteen days instead of seven days before the election. The general provision found on page 1240 as subsection 2 is that in the case or cases of any electoral district or districts in which the Governor in Council may, after due inquiry conclude that the proclamation aforesaid cannot otherwise be posted up so as to allow the required time between such posting up and the nomination day, the Governor in Council shall fix the day of nomination in the way that I have referred to ; so that it is left to the Governor in Council to determine in any special case whether these special provisions shall apply, and in such cases he shall have them to apply in such a way that we shall secure all the elections in Canada on the same day.

Mr. FOWLER. Surely the Prime Minister will accept this amendment. Has he lost confidence in the schemes that have been concocted, that he requires the elections in those districts to be held after the general election ? Is it because he knows that if the elections were held in those districts on the day of the general election, each of them would return an opponent of the government ? I think we are voting some $238,000,000, excluding the lead bounties ; and surely with that amount of money the government party ought to have confidence that they can win the country, particularly in these hard times, when they have lost the old cry of 'Luck and Laurier,' and ought to be willing to have all the elections held on the same day.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am satisfied, I am sure, but there are some doubting Thomases in this House. I heard this afternoon that some hon. gentlemen were only waiting for the elections to put us out. Therefore they will have all the advantages.

Mr. FOWLER. Many other people must share the feelings of these doubting Thomases.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. LANCASTER. I propose :

(18) That the said Bill be amended by adding thereto the following section :—

Section 129 of the said Act is repealed and the following is substituted therefor :—

"129. The printer, and in case of an incorporated company, one of the executive officers of the said company, shall, upon delivery of the ballot papers to the returning officer, file in his hands an affidavit of such printer or executive officer, sworn before such returning officer, setting forth the description of the ballot papers so printed, the number of ballot papers supplied to such returning officer, and stating the facts that no other ballot paper or ballot papers was or were printed or have been supplied to any one else or remain in his possession or under his control."

The object of the amendment is manifest with the reading of it, and I will not trouble the House with any enlargement.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I am not able to see what improvement there is in the amendment as compared with the existing law. In the present law the printer is required to make the affidavit. The proposition is that the printer, or, if it is an incorporated company, one of the executive officers of the company, shall make the affidavit. I think it would be much better that the printer should make the affidavit than some officer of a company who probably knows nothing about it, except what the printer tells him. Under the present law the printer who makes the affidavit is certainly some man who might be prosecuted for perjury. If the printing is done in the printing office of an incorporated company, the present law would require somebody who answered the description of the printer of these ballot papers to make the affidavit accounting for them. The other provision of this amendment is to require the affidavit to be made before the returning officer. I do not know why one officer should be preferred to another for swearing the affidavit before. I do not know the purpose of the amendment unless it is simply for the purpose of making amendments.

Mr. BERGERON. The Minister of Justice must know that many of these ballot papers are very badly printed, and in some cases there are not enough ballots. They are printed, I understand, in various offices, the paper is sometimes poor, and sometimes the ballots are spoiled before they are used. Surely we cannot take too many precautions to see that we have proper ballot papers.

Amendment negatived

Mr. BENNETT. In accordance with the amendment of the hon. member for West Hastings I propose clause No. 19. As the motion of the hon. member was accepted, this follows as a consequence.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I do not suppose any one can have any objection except that it is difficult to understand how this is necessary. Under the present law the deputy returning officer is required, in the presence of the candidates, their agents, and such electors as are present to open the ballot box and ascertain that there are no ballot papers or other papers therein. It is not made any stronger by requiring him to see that the ballot box is absolutely empty. Piling up adjectives and adverbs does not make the thing stronger.

Mr. BENNETT. There may be in the ballot box, as there were in the ballot boxes at Addington, secret compartments or mechanism by which the ballot papers may be secretly stored in the box.

Mr. FOWLER. This will call the attention of the deputy returning officer to the fact that such appliances might be there. He may never have heard of such cases having arisen, and it may be well to call his attention to the fact that appliances of that sort have been devised by scoundrels to defeat the will of the people.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. ALCORN. I beg to move amendment No. 21 which will be found on page 1241 of the Votes and Proceedings. It requires the printer's affidavit to form part of the return made by the deputy returning officer to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. DANIEL. I move the following amendment to be found on page 1241 of the Votes and Poceedings:

(22) That the said Bill be amended by adding thereto the following section :—

Section 226 of the said Act is repealed and the following is substituted therefor :—

"226. No person who has voted at an election shall, in any legal proceeding questioning the election or return, or before any parliamentary committee or any commission, be required to state for whom he voted, but he may so state, and if he do so, his statement shall be received in evidence."

The present law states that no one who has voted at an election shall be required to say for whom he voted, and I understand that even in cases where the voter was willing to make such a statement, it has been held by the court that counsel had not the right to put the question to him.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. This would certainly destroy the secrecy of the ballot because if you have a poll of say 100 votes and there have been 48 ballots cast one way and 52 the other, and you allow each one of the 52 men to state for whom he has voted, that would disclose at once how the other 48 voted; and while the 52 men may be quite willing to make the declaration the other 48 may not, and they may be just those around whom the law throws the protection of secrecy. Would it be advisable to change that? The present law extends to no collateral proceeding. It does not extend to any prosecution for a criminal offence where it may be important to determine how the ballot was marked but only to a proceeding to unseat the successful candidate. In any proceeding questioning the election the voter is protected by its being illegal to ask him in court how he voted. I think it would be a very serious step to change that and make that inroad upon the feature of this Ballot Act, to which every one, apparently, attaches the utmost importance, unless you are prepared to do away with the element of secrecy altogether and say that the voter, if he pleases to do so, may mark his ballot openly on the table before everybody or identify himself by some writing on the paper.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. So far as secrecy is concerned, if it is once conceded that you can obtain the information in some collateral proceeding you leave the door as open as in the case proposed. It makes no difference whether the information is acquired in a proceeding questioning the election and return or in some collateral proceeding, the secrecy of the ballot in the case mentioned by the minister will be departed from to that extent. The question came before the committee that investigated or tried to investigate—or some members of which tried to investigate—the West Huron and Brockville election frauds, and, after a great deal of discussion, it was decided that the witnesses might be asked for whom they voted. The object of this amendment is to make it clear that the witness cannot be compelled to state for whom he voted, but may do so if he is willing. It seems to me that this is better than the law at present.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. ALCORN. I move that the Bill be amended by adding a section immediately after section 258. This section, No. 258, is the section dealing with secrecy of the poll and containing provisions as to cases which are declared to be illegal in that con-

nection. The effect of this amendment is to increase the penalty upon the election officer who is guilty of any infraction of the provisions of this section.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What is the present penalty?

Mr. ALCORN. A fine not exceeding $200 and imprisonment for not more than six months. This provides for a fine of not less than $100 or more than $200, imprisonment for not less than six months and not more than twelve and disfranchisement.

Mr. LALOR. I wish to call the attention of the committee to the way the secrecy of the ballot poll is sometimes carried out in the county I represent—and I do not think the penalty can be too severe on the election officers in the poll for failure to carry out the secrecy of the polling booth in their charge. In the county of Haldimand—and I do not say that the Liberal party is altogether responsible for this state of things, for I fear the practice might have been tried to some extent before the Liberal party got possession of the polling booths—a system of telegraphing is carried out, and has been for years, by which a sign is thrown from the deputy returning officer to the constable and from him to somebody else, and in that way it is known how the elector votes; and, if there is any money going, he is paid. I hope the government will make the penalty for violating the secrecy of the polls as great as it ought to be, for we want secrecy.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This practice that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lalor) speaks of is an illegal practice. Have there been any prosecutions for the violation of the Act?

Mr. LALOR. I do not think so. But, notwithstanding, I state the facts on my responsibility.

Mr. BERGERON. Is there any description anywhere in the law of what should be the divisions of the polling booths?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Oh, yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Then it is not carried out. Generally a polling booth is one room. A curtain is hung in one corner. Of course, if anybody wants to go behind the curtain and make his cross his ballot is secret, because those in the booth cannot see through the curtain, nor can they see over it, for it is generally six feet or more high. But if the voter must have his cross made by the deputy returning officer and goes behind the curtain accompanied by the deputy and the two agents, when he states for whom he wishes to vote everybody in the booth can hear him, so that there is clearly no secrecy about such a ballot. I understand the law to mean that there shall be an entirely different room, so that when it is necessary to ask a voter for whom he votes his answer may be heard by the deputy returning officer, but not by others in the polling booth.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The only objection I can suggest to this amendment is that it is making anomalies and discrepancies in the different penalties even greater than they are. It is in the direction of greater severity, and I am content.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. ALCORN. I desire now to move an amendment to which I will ask the particular attention of the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I propose to insert the following as section 278a:

278a. Every person who, directly or indirectly, by himself or by any person on his behalf before or during an election, in order to induce, or in such manner as might induce any voter or class of voters in a particular electoral district to vote for or against any candidate, or to refrain from voting by public speaking, by any writing, by any printed publication, or otherwise, offers or promises, or offers or promises to procure or endeavour to procure, or suggests the probability of the expenditure of the public moneys of Canada, within the electoral district or districts, if and in case only such voter or voters procure or assist to procure the return of a particular candidate or of a candidate of a particular political party, or who, with the intent or in manner aforesaid, threatens or promises to impede, delay, hinder, prevent or diminish such expenditure, is guilty of the indictable offence of bribery, and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding one year and not less than six months, and shall forfeit the sum of one thousand dollars to any person who sues therefor, with costs.

This is a new provision not found in the present law. I am not wedded to the exact phraseology, and if the government approve the principle and desire to make any modifications I am willing. But the principle is one that no government can afford to ignore.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I must confess that my hon. friend, in advocating this amendment, is rising to a height that I am entirely unable to reach. I cannot look upon what he depicts in this amendment as in the nature of a corrupt practice. To my mind it is not more than any public man with propriety may do in discussing a matter of public interest in the electoral district in which he may happen to be addressing the electors. Every candidate in offering himself for the suffrages of any locality or district, is identifying himself with that locality, is undertaking either tacitly or expressly, that he will exert himself to the utmost in the interest of the electors of the locality which sends him to parliament. If he, as a member of parliament, by advocating the expenditure of public money upon some public work in that locality, is able to benefit

his constituency, I am unable to see any impropriety in his doing so, in parliament or anywhere else. He is not doing that for the benefit of one political party more than another, he is advocating the cause of the electors generally of the constituency that sends him to parliament and it seems to me he is doing a legitimate thing. I regard that as a public question upon which any one who offers himself as a candidate for a public position is expected to have views, and ought to express those views with freedom and with candour. I wish to say and I wish to say it without any intention of giving offence, that I can see no difference in principle between advocating a public building, a public wharf, or any other public work in a constituency, and advocating the giving of better terms in any manner you please to any province of the Dominion, either in giving to a province an increased subsidy, or in giving to a province better terms as to control over its public lands or any other public property. If the one is a corrupt practice, it seems to me the other is. But I think that neither of them is corrupt, and that such candidate is simply advocating in a proper manner that which he believes is in the public interest, either of a whole province, or of a smaller section, or community, township, or any other local subdivision.

Mr. ALCORN. The Minister of Justice entirely loses sight of the purview of the amendment. The question is not whether a public man has a right to advocate the erection of a public building, or the expenditure of public money in a particular locality, but the question is whether he has the right to do so with the view of influencing votes in that electoral district. If it is represented that this work will be erected if a certain man is returned, and that it will not be erected if he is not returned, that is what the section is aimed at.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The section is not designed to touch discussion in parliament at all, it is not designed to prevent a candidate from declaring a particular policy in regard to any subject such as the Minister of Justice has suggested, but it is designed to prevent wholesale bribery of a community by saying that if this particular candidate is elected then a certain expenditure will be made and if this particular candidate is not elected that particular expenditure will not be made. It seems to me there is no difference between inducements of that kind held out to a whole class or an entire community, and the individual corruption of bribery of electors one by one.

Mr. FOWLER. I think my hon. friend from Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn) must be very sanguine if after looking over the list of supplementary estimates and the long list, the treble column list, of subsidies to railways and things of that sort he expects the Prime Minister to accept this amendment. If he remembers some of the promises that were held out by a certain candidate in the election of 1904, he must have a good deal of faith if he thinks the Minister of Justice would be inclined to accept that, or if he remembers the time the citizens of a certain section were to get the present of a magnificent clock if they voted for a certain candidate, and when it was held out to them that if a certain candidate were elected a canal would run in a certain direction, whereas if he were not elected, the canal would not run in that direction. All these promises have been held out by candidates upon the government side, and my hon. friend must have been very hopeful to expect that the Prime Minister and his colleagues would accept the amendment.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is something in that. Demands for public works of every description are growing upon the government. I have had so many demands from hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House during the present session that it has been a great sorrow to us not to have been able to gratify them all. I think the hon. gentlemen from Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler) himself was pressing upon us a demand for certain works and it was quite proper.

Mr. FOWLER. More than that.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is enough then.

Mr. FOWLER. Surely the Prime Minister must admit that a member of parliament may interest himself in getting certain public works for his constituency. Why, even the Minister of Public Works reproached me on altogether false premises for not having asked for what I had repeatedly asked. The Minister of Public Works was not in the House at the time, he was devoting himself to another sphere of politics where he was very active. However, a member of parliament certainly has a right to ask for these things for his constituency, he has a right to try and influence the government to put public works of a necessary character in his constituency. But surely the Prime Minister sees a difference between that and a candidate going into a constituency and saying, if you elect me the canal shall come out at Port Hope, and if you do not elect me, it is going to come out at Trenton. Would the Prime Minister say that was a proper thing? Is not that holding out a bribe to the constituency to vote in a certain way? And where do you distinguish between that and the offer to a poor voter of a $5 bill? The only difference is that you are doing it by wholesale in the one case, and you are doing it by retail in the other, and that is precisely what the amendment of my hon. friend from Prince Edward desires to prevent.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. BERGERON. I would have been glad to see in the law a provision preventing a candidate from presenting himself in more than one county. But I understand that cannot be done, especially since a man may be put into nomination without his consent. I have an amendment in the Votes and Proceedings to the effect that when a man has been elected in one or more counties he should be compelled to send in his resignation of the county or counties for which he does not elect to sit within thirty days after he has been so elected, that resignation to be sent to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, as there would be no Speaker at the time. In case he does not do this within thirty days, the seat can be declared vacant, but the fact of electing to choose one county will not prevent the member from having that election tested before the courts. If one election is contested no writ will be issued until the petition is disposed of.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am not aware that there have been very many abuses of this kind. I remember Sir John Macdonald was elected in 1882 for Carleton and another constituency, but I think a couple of years elapsed before he was elected, because one of the elections was controverted.

Mr. FOWLER. The Postmaster General did the same thing.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Suppose his election is controverted, would you force him to elect while the petition was before the courts?

Mr. BERGERON. There are the cases of Sir John Macdonald and Mr. Prefontaine who sat a couple of sessions before electing for which county he would sit. The object of this is to prevent a county from being unrepresented in this House for two sessions.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Suppose a member is disqualified on a petition from one county, what would my hon. friend do ?

Mr. BERGERON. If my hon. friend was elected for Gaspé and Nicolet and according to this amendment would have sent in his letters to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, saying he has made choice of the county of Gaspé, it would not prevent any one protesting his election in Nicolet. If he was disqualified for any act done in Nicolet, he would be deprived of two seats, because no man who is disqualified can sit in parliament.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend is arguing against an old maxim in England that a man can stand for one, two, three or four counties.

Mr. BERGERON. That does not prevent that.

Mr. FOWLER. It does not prevent him standing, it only prevents him sitting.

Amendment, Mr. Bergeron, negatived.

Mr. FOWLER. I beg to move amendment No. 26 at page 1243 of the Votes and Proceedings. That amendment reads:

Subsection one of section 269 of the said Act is amended by striking out all the words from and including the word 'shall' in the 15th line, and by adding the following words in lieu thereof : ' is guilty of a corrupt practice, and liable to a penalty of $200 to any person who sues thereof with costs, and shall also upon conviction be imprisoned for one year.

This is an amendment to the intimidation section and it makes intimidation a corrupt practice. The law provides for the forfeiture of $200 and there is added to this that he shall also be imprisoned for one year.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I cannot see the reason for this amendment. It provides that undue influence shall be a corrupt practice, but that is expressly made so now by section 278 and is frequently a corrupt practice which avoids an election. The amendment reduces the present penalty, as it is now an indictable offence which makes the offender liable to five years' imprisonment besides the penalty of $200.

Amendment negatived.

Bill reported.

USE OF TOBACCO BY YOUNG PERSONS.

Consideration of amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 173) to restrain the use of tobacco by young persons.—Mr. Aylesworth.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). The most important amendment made by the Senate is the reduction of the age from 18 to 16 years. The Bill as introduced in this House fixed the age at 16 but by amendment in committee it was made 18 years. The Senate has also amended the provision of the Act with regard to the confiscation of tobacco which may be in possession of a young person of 16 years so as to include the chewing as well as the smoking of tobacco and to authorize the constable to confiscate any tobacco which he finds in possession of a young person under 16, either smoking, chewing, or about to smoke or chew. There is an addition of a subsection to the third section which imposes a penalty on juveniles smoking in any street or public place. To that is added :

It shall be the duty of the justice to examine upon oath or affirmation all persons brought before him who are found guilty of a violation of this section, as to where or from whom such persons purchased or obtained the cigarettes or cigarette paper or

tobacco found in the possession of any such person, and the refusal to give such information to the satisfaction of the justice shall be deemed a contempt of the court.

I think this latter provision does not add anything to the general law. If any person under oath is asked such a question he would have no privilege to refuse to answer and he would be guilty of contempt of court if he did not answer. I beg to move the adoption of the amendments.

Mr. MILLER. I move:

That the amendments of the Senate be not received and that the Bill be referred back to the committee of the House for further consideration.

Mr. FOWLER. This amendment of the Senate refers to juveniles smoking or chewing or 'about to smoke or chew tobacco.' How is it possible to say whether any one is 'about to smoke or chew tobacco.' I do not think absurdity could possibly go further than our friends of the Senate have gone.

Mr. MILLER. I particularly object to the Senate amendment by which the age limit is changed from 18 years to 16. Hon. Senator Power introduced that amendment and his strongest argument was based on the statement that 16 years was the limit in the provinces. I beg to point out that 18 years is the age limit in Ontario and New Brunswick. The Hon. Senator referred to the use of tobacco as being a minor offence. I do not think it is the desire of this House to punish youths for smoking tobacco because it is a moral wrong, but rather because the use of tobacco by persons of that age produces ill effects physically. Senator David in support of the 16 year age limit stated that boys of 16 years are very often earning their own living——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The position of the matter is that this House has passed a Bill and sent it to the Senate and the Senate has amended it in certain respects. That being so this House must either concur in or reject those amendments. The House cannot go into a discussion of the proposed amendment with a view of referring the Bill back to committee. It is a question of concurrence or non-concurrence in the amendments made by the Senate.

Mr. MILLER. Then I beg to move that the amendments made by the Senate be not concurred in.

Mr. FOWLER. That kills the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion of the Minister of Justice is that the amendments be concurred in. If that motion is negatived it would have the same result as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Miller) seeks to attain.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Motion (Mr. Aylesworth) concurred in; amendments read a second time and agreed to.

RAILWAY ACT—AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 204) to amend chapter 38 of the statutes of 1907 in amendment of the Railway Act—Mr. Aylesworth—read a second time, and the House went into committee thereon.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. An Act of last session, chapter 38, provided for the deposit with the Secretary of State of mortgages on railway property to secure debentures. The statute provides the effect of such deposit to be in substance the same as the effect of filing a chattel mortgage in the office of some official of the county in which the property is situated. It makes it valid as against the claims of subsequent creditors, mortgages or purchasers. The next clause in like manner provided that a mortgage on rolling stock given by the railway company and filed with the Secretary of State should be a valid security against the claims of subsequent creditors. Then comes the provision which it is desired to repeal. That is a provision that in the case of any company possessing rolling stock and mortgaging it for the purpose of securing such debentures, the like deposit shall have the same effect as in the case of a railway company. That provision seems to me to be of very questionable validity. It is doubtful, at all events, whether this parliament has any jurisdiction under the British North America Act to pass any such provision relating not to the undertaking or property of a railway company, but simply to property within the province. The other clauses of the Act are in connection with legislation upon a subject which is within our jurisdiction, that of railway law generally, and are certainly valid with reference to Dominion railway companies. This clause is, however, of at least questionable character, and as soon as it was observed, attention was called to it by the Deputy Minister of Justice writing a letter within a day or two after prorogation to the legal gentleman at whose instance these clauses were inserted in the Bill. They were inserted in the Senate, and the retention of this particular clause was through some misunderstanding between that legal gentleman and the deputy minister, who was conferred with on the subject before the amendment was introduced. It would possibly be a snare to companies possessed of rolling stock, who might rely on this provision if it remained on the statute-book, and it was thought that it should at the earliest opportunity be repealed. This Bill was prepared to be introduced earlier in the session, but was delayed because it was thought that it might have

place in some general Bill to amend the Railway Act, but in the absence of any such general Bill, it was thought advisable to introduce it in this shape.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

BOUNTY TO SOUTH AFRICAN VOLUNTEERS.

House in committee on Bill (No. 109) to authorize a bounty to volunteers who served the Crown in South Africa.—Mr. Oliver.

On section 2,

Mr. OLIVER. This section stood for revision, with a view to including in the benefits of the section not only the volunteers who had enlisted in the Canadian corps for service in South Africa, but also Canadians or persons resident in Canada who have served in South Africa in any British corps, and also for the purpose of including nurses who were attached to military forces. The amendment as drafted to cover these points reads as follows :

This Act shall apply to all volunteers then domiciled in Canada who served with the British forces in South Africa during the years 1899 to 1902, or who, being so domiciled, enlisted with or were appointed to Canadian corps that arrived in South Africa for the purpose of so serving, but owing to the close of the war were not on active service.

2. Volunteers shall be deemed to include nursing sisters.

Mr. FOWLER. Were there not some teachers who went out there during the war and taught the Boers in concentration camps ?

Mr. OLIVER. There were teachers ; but it is not my intention to include any but those who are mentioned in this section.

Mr. LEFURGEY. As I had the honour of first bringing to the attention of the House the suggestion that all volunteers who went to South Africa, whether coming from the prairie provinces or other parts of Canada, should be entitled to this grant, I am pleased to know that the government has at last decided to give effect to this policy by introducing the present motion.

Mr. BERGERON. I approve of this very much, and I am only sorry that my hon. friend has not found himself in a position, with all the lands we have in the Northwest, to offer something to the men who fought on the frontier in 1866 and 1870. There have been many demands made on parliament since that time, and these men were promised consideration which has never been given them. Canada can afford to reward those who have taken up arms in her defence and certainly ought to do so ; and by so doing we would be furnishing an incentive to the patriotism of our youth by giving them some assurance that their services to their country, in times of stress, would not be overlooked or forgotten.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would it not be better to add the words 'both inclusive' after 1902. It says during the years 1899 to 1902, and I presume both these words are included.

Mr. HERRON. In the event of a volunteer selling to a substitute will the volunteer have to appear at the land office to locate the land as in the case of the half-breeds?

Mr. OLIVER. No, that is the difference between the two. In the case of the half-breed scrip it was specially provided that the scrip was not assignable, whereas in this case it is expressly provided that it is assignable.

Section agreed to as amended.

Bill reported.

GRAIN INSPECTION AND SALE ACT.

Bill (No. 203) to amend the Inspection and Sale Act with regard to grain—Mr. Oliver—read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. STAPLES. I protest against our going on with this Bill at this late hour of the night. It is one that particularly affects the prairie provinces and one of the most important measures that have come before this House. There are very few members here, and to rush through this Bill now is not treating our agriculturists in the manner they are entitled to. I am as anxious to get away as any one, but I purpose staying here to guard the interests of the farmers to the best of my ability.

Mr. BERGERON. There are many members from the west who wish to discuss this Bill and I do not think we ought to proceed with it to-night.

Progress reported.

JUDICIARY OF MANITOBA AND ONTARIO.

Bill (No. 206) to amend the Judges' Act—Mr. Aylesworth— read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. This proposes to strike out the words 'sixty-seven' in the Act and substitute 'sixty-nine' in order to provide for the additional district judges.

Mr. BERGERON. The other day I asked the right hon. the First Minister if he intended acting upon the recommendation of the Quebec local legislature, which declared that two more judges were needed in the district of Montreal and one in the district of Quebec. He replied that the government had decided to confer with the different provinces before granting their de-

mands. He thought there were sufficient judges in Quebec and the other provinces if the systems in these provinces were changed. I find it strange now that he should call on us to appoint judges in the other provinces and not in the province of Quebec.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I read in the 'Hansard' the other day the answer made by the leader of the House to the hon. gentleman's question. I have really nothing to add to what the First Minister then said. I am aware that the Quebec legislature has passed the necessary legislation providing for additional judges and that these additonal appointments have been the subject of correspondence between the Department of Justice and the Department of the Attorney General of Quebec. The matter is one of considerable importance and practical difficulty. Under the British North America Act we have no voice in the passing of legislation which calls for additional judges in any province.

On the other hand, responsibility is upon the Dominion for the payment of judges and the providing of pensions. In these circumstances, while it may be that under the letter of the constitution, it was not contemplated that the province should in any way consult the Dominion on the subject before passing its legislation calling for additional judges, it certainly would seem something that would conduce to harmony in the administration of the respective functions of the different governments if there could be an understanding beforehand, and if there could be some general arrangement by which it could be understood in practice that, before legislation of the sort I have described were passed, there would be at least a discussion of the necessity for it with the Dominion authorities. And I may say that steps in that direction have been taken, and an effort will be made to devise some means whereby there will be no danger of either the local legislatures taking action which might not afterwards be carried into effect as promptly as the local legislatures think it should be, or of taking action to provide for the appointment of additional judges where the necessity for them is not very apparent. Now, in the case of the province of Quebec, upon all the information I have been able to obtain, there seems no actual lack, numerically speaking, at any rate, of judicial strength. The number of judges of the superior court already appointed throughout the province is considered to be ample to discharge the judicial work of the courts of the province if these were distributed in some different way. Business, as it stands, is congested in the cities of Quebec and Montreal, while in the rural districts there are, I am given to understand, more than one instance of judges who would be the better perhaps with a little more to do; and, at all events, where there is not such an amount of work that the judges as they are to-day are not able readily to overtake it and still have time on their hands. In these circumstances, if it were possible to work out some scheme by which there could be a somewhat more even distribution of the work by which the judges from the rural districts might be assigned a share in the heavier work of the cities, there would not seem to be the necessity for adding so considerably to the expense of our present judicial system as would be the case if a number of additional judges were appointed. The same condition of things exists in the province of Alberta, where the staff of judges was provided only a year ago; the provincial authorities are asking for additional judicial help in the superior court. This is a continually recurring difficulty, and, in view of the situation I have attempted to outline, it was thought that, for the present year at all events, we could not properly propose to the House to provide for additional judges where there were existing courts and a certain number of judges in those courts to do the work. As a result, this measure is restricted to providing salaries for two judges for the new courts which have recently been established in New, or Northern Ontario, where settlers have gone in a long distance from any other court, and where an absolutely new court has in the case of two districts been estabilshed ready to go to work on sending a judge for that purpose. In the same way, the new court in the northern part of the province of Manitoba, where an increase of settlement has caused an increase of judicial work, is called for by the legislature, and we have proposed, under this Bill, to provide a salary for that county court judge. But where there are existing courts and a certain number of existing judges, we have thought that the province ought to get along for another year at all events by making some change or otherwise, without asking the expense to be put upon the Dominion, which providing for additional judges would involve.

On section 2—Manitoba—judges of county courts.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This section simply increases the county court judges in Manitoba by two, I understand?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. By one. There was an increase of one last year, making the number seven; it is now made eight.

Mr. STAPLES. When will the additional judge be appointed?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I can only say that as soon as the Act is passed providing the salary the matter will be taken into

consideration. It has not yet been considered.

Mr. STAPLES. Then the hon. minister cannot tell us who the proposed judge is?

On section 3—pension or chief or assistant chief of Board of Railway Commissioners if previously a judge.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understand that this amendment is to include the assistant chief commissioner,—though perhaps that has been enacted already—and to reduce the period by which the pension shall be earned from fifteen years to twelve years? What is the reason for that?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. When the office of chief commissioner became vacant by the death of Mr. Killam, and it was a question of finding a successor, the position was offered to the present incumbent, Mr. Mabee. He at once pointed out that he would, by assuming the office, forfeit any right that was accruing to him to the enjoyment of a judicial pension. The Railway Act provides no pension. And that was a consideration which weighed very much in his mind. The statute provides for fifteen years' service as railway commissioner or five years of service as a judge and ten years' service as railway commissioner. This would not cover the case of Mr. Mabee, as he had not been five years upon the bench. But he thought that some provision ought to be made in order that he would not, if he accepted the new work, forfeit the right which was accruing to him. It was thought that that was a reasonable request upon his part, and this change is made entirely in that view. Mr. Mabee had been something over two years upon the bench, and would be covered by this provision if the amendment is made.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not see anything in section 21 about a period of five years.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The change is made substituting 12 for 15, or 2 for 5. The enactment was made in the first place on the occasion of Mr. Justice Killam leaving the Supreme Court and taking this position. In his case it made no difference, as he had seen service on the bench for more than five years. I do not know why a period of 15 years or 5 years service on the bench was fixed.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 210) to amend the Northwest Territories Act—Mr. Aylesworth—read the second time and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. AYLESWORTH.

On section 5,

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understand the Bill merely extends the jurisdiction of the courts of these three provinces to the territories northward, subject to the provision that leave of the court must be obtained for the purpose of issuing processes.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. That is the effect, that it gives every plaintiff an option as to the province he will select. No matter where in the Territories the cause of action might arise, the plaintiff might apply to the courts in Ontario, subject to the power of the court to refuse to entertain his cause of action, and to send him to some more convenient province.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CANADA SHIPPPING ACT AMENDMENT.

House in committee on Bill (No. 183) to amend the Canada Shipping Act.—Mr. Brodeur.

Mr. J. D. REID. Could not the minister let this Bill stand over until next session? I do not see any need for it now. The marine interests of the country are not suffering by letting this Bill stand for a few months.

Mr. BRODEUR. There are some very important amendments.

Mr. J. D. REID. There is a law now that will do until parliament meets again. The Bill has been prepared by one of his officers and while in theory it may be all right, in practice I do not think it is, and I think, in the interest of the marine, it would be well to let the Bill stand.

Mr. BRODEUR. There are some amendments which are absolutely necessary to be passed, for example the provisions regarding gasolene launches. It is of the utmost importance that this provision should pass this year or our vessels will be discriminated against as compared with American vessels.

Mr. J. D. REID. I do not agree.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. The member for Leeds (Mr Taylor) the other day urged the passage of this Bill and complained of delay. Another important feature is that the imperial government has passed two clauses amending the Merchant Shipping Act which it is necessary for us to get in our legislation in order to have the two conform. For instance we have the deck load and the registration of ships.

Mr. J. D. REID. I protest against going on at this hour of the night with a Bill of this importance.

Mr. LEFURGEY. The introduction of this Bill is ill-timed. Neither the minister nor his department has information sufficient to pass good legislation upon the subject and the marine interests are not fully seized of the provisions of the Bill, so as to be able to assist in securing the proper legislation.

Mr. BRODEUR. The Bill has been before the Senate for four months.

Mr. LEFURGEY. But the people and the shipping interests have not become seized of it. It is an imposition to bring it down at this stage of the session.

Mr. CONMEE. The law as it stands without this Bill is defective. I am not in love with the Bill but it is better than nothing. In my part of the country great hardship will be worked if it is not adopted. The marine board adopted a regulation some years ago limiting the style and size of gasolene, steam or electric launch that may be built. This regulation was not enforced until last year when they tied up a large number of these boats. Under the present amendment that class of vessel would be relieved.

Mr. J. D. REID. The hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) opposed this Bill the other evening but supports it to-night. What has influenced him ? I move the committee rise and report progress.

Mr. CONMEE. Even if it is a little defective, after two or three months we can amend it.

Mr. J. D. REID. No, I want it made right. The hon. member (Mr. Conmee) is willing to put anything through, right or wrong.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. How idle it is to say this Bill should not pass. Two of its proposals have been before the House for five or six years, the section relating to masters and mates and to marine engineers.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I suggest you should take something easier. What about the Canada Shipping Act ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is impossible to postpone this Bill until next session because there are some of its provisions which are absolutely needed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. We only ask postponement until to-morrow.

Progress reported.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT—AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 209) to amend the Canada Shipping Act—Mr. Fielding—read the second time and the House went into committee thereon.

Mr. FIELDING. The section of the revised statutes which it is proposed to repeal provides that the Governor in Council may deal with the ships of any foreign country which gives us reciprocal coasting trade, but it does not apparently give us any power to discriminate either as to the different waters of Canada or as to the sizes of the vessels. The history of this measure is that some months ago we passed an order in council designed to repeal other orders which granted the privilege of our coasting trade to certain foreign countries. The United States do not give us reciprocal privileges and it does not apply to them. There are a number of foreign countries which grant us the privilege but it is practically of no value to us because we do not use their coasting trade. An order in council was passed declaring that after the 1st of January next these privileges granted by orders in council should be withdrawn. The order applies largely to Norwegian vessels, although its terms are broader than that. It has been represented to us that the Norwegians have adapted themselves particularly to the coal trade of the St. Lawrence, that many of the vessels in that trade are under the Norwegian flag, that some although built in the United Kingdom sail under the Norwegian flag, and of course, are only entitled to such privileges as Norwegian vessels may have. Many of the ships in the coal trade have been built specially for that trade and it has been represented that before the time fixed in the order in council the coal companies would be unable to obtain British ships of a proper class in sufficient numbers to handle the trade, and that if we adhere rigorously to the order in council we will practically prevent the coal companies getting tonnage to carry their coal. Of course nobody wants to do that. We have thought therefore that it is a case in which there should be some elasticity. We do not desire to extend the privileges of the coasting trade to these vessels without any limit, but it has been suggested that it might be expedient that the government should allow them to have the coasting trade for a limited time, and perhaps with regard to a limited class of tonnage, for instance, the smaller class of vessels would come into competition with our Canadian vessels while the larger vessels would not. It has been suggested that we might allow these larger Norwegian vessels to continue in the coasting trade for a limited period, and what that period should be is a fair matter for consideration. What we propose in this amendment is that instead of the existing clause in the revised statutes we should introduce a substitute clause which would give the government the power of discrimination. For example we might give the privilege to a Norwegian vessel in Atlantic waters and refuse her the privilege in the lake trade, or we might give her the privilege in the lake trade and refuse it on the Pacific coast or, we might agree

that Norwegian vessels up to say 1,000 or 2,000 tons should be excluded, but that vessels above that tonnage might be permitted temporarily to engage in the coal trade for a sufficient time to permit the coal companies to secure either Canadian or British bottoms. In other words the purpose of this amendment is to allow elasticity in the law, whereby the government might adapt themselves to the special conditions which might be brought before them. But while we desire that, we wish to say it is not the intention of the government to recede from the general principle which has been laid down that these coasting privileges shall only be continued for a special purpose and for a limited time and under such circumstances as I have briefly mentioned to the House.

Mr. LEFURGEY. This is a very important measure which deeply concerns the shipping interests of the maritime provinces. We have continual protests from Canadian shipping interests against the encroachment of foreigners and the minister knows that this has been a great detriment to the shipping interests of the maritime provinces. The action taken by the order in council prohibiting Norwegians from coming into our territory was possibly a temporary step in the right direction, but it did not get down to the root of the evil. What Canada wants is some national idea to encourage the building of ships in the Dominion. Years ago when we had wooden ships built in the maritime provinces, we were one of the first maritime nations in the world and we had sufficient vessels to carry on our coasting trade. But now the Norwegians have come in, our shipping has become decadent and we are in this deplorable condition that the coal interests which this Bill is designed largely to benefit must have foreign tonnage.

The only way we can deal legitimately and nationally with that is to encourage shipbuilding in this country, and that is a question the government should take up instead of dilly dallying with measures of this kind. This question goes further. We have some remnants of the coasting trade left around the coasts of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island; and under the system in vogue for a number of years past that coasting trade has been so oppressed by these large corporate interests, who have paid no attention to the local needs of the people, that it is not able to subsist, and will go out of business unless this government remedies the evils that assail it. These large foreign vessels come over under the coasting privilege, and as the minister has told us, there is no relative value between the privileges we give to them and those accorded to us in the countries from which they come. Under the large incorporate interests which employ them, they shut out altogether the possibility of the small coasting tonnage of the maritime provinces getting its legitimate trade. Take the coal trade of Sydney, Inverness and Pictou. The hon. minister is surely aware of the disadvantages that smaller craft are suffering on account of the privileges given foreign tonnage and the abuse of those privileges, the large corporate companies supplying the coal of the maritime provinces to this foreign tonnage and to the prejudice of both the smaller coasting vessels and the people that they accommodate. Those evils are going on to-day just the same as last year and the year before.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Would the hon. gentleman permit me to say that two weeks ago, while at home, I made inquiries into that subject, so far as Pictou was concerned and I learned that every schooner that came there from Prince Edward Island or anywhere else had been loaded without the slightest delay, and the only trouble with our coal miners is that the schooners do not come as often as they like. The same thing is true of Cape Breton.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Pictou has not been the aggressor in this respect so much as Sydney and Inverness.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to say that so anxious is the Dominion Coal Company at Sydney to obtain this schooner trade that it has standing advertisements in the newspapers calling on schooners to go to Glace Bay, where they have made special arrangements for loading them. They are anxious for this trade, and it is not fair on the part of my hon. friend to say that they are not. The only discrimination of a serious character that has occurred in this connection happened at Inverness last fall, and that is not likely to arise again.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I am not prepared to take the assurances of the hon. member for Pictou nor of the hon. member for Cape Breton; but I am glad to hear these hon. gentlemen say that some redress has been given to the grievances under which the coasting trade has suffered in the past. However, there is no guarantee that they will be free from such abuses in the future.

Mr. JOHNSTON. What guarantee can you give them?

Mr. LEFURGEY. You can give them the guarantee that the foreign coasting trade is not to come in to fill their places. The schooners have to lie at Sydney or Inverness for six or eight weeks, waiting for their load, while the steamers load up and carry their cargo up the St. Lawrence and come back and load up again.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Would you shut up the coal mine?

Mr. LEFURGEY. There must be some way out. I believe the State of Massachu-

setts had a law some years ago compelling the vessels to load in rotation, the only exception being that of a steamer which come in for bunker coal. I cannot pick up a paper from the maritime provinces without seeing that the agitation of this question is going on from day to day. Some stringent regulation should be put upon the management of the coal shipping piers, and one of the best ways of rehabilitating our shipping interest is to have a bonus on ship-building so that we may rebuild our shipping and maintain our ships as we did some twenty or twenty-five years ago.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend has discussed two questions which are important, but which have no relation to the Bill. The first is with regard to a shipping bounty, a very important question, but it is not involved in this measure at all. If we give a bounty of $50 a ton, we could not get vessels built fast enough to meet the requirements of the coal companies. The second is the difficulty between sailing vessels and steamers at the piers. I believe that difficulty occurred only at one pier at Cape Breton, and I am assured that a remedy has been supplied. But even if there were no remedy, that does not touch the object of this Bill at all. Then my hon. friend says if we only stop these Norwegian steamers, we will have the business for our own vessels. That was his argument.

Mr. LEFURGEY. No, it was not.

Mr. FIELDING. He wants to shut out these Norwegian steamers altogether. We want to shut them out in a general way, but the coal companies say that if we do not give them reasonable time, they will have no vessels to carry their trade. I represent a constituency which has a good deal of shipping, but if we only carried our coal in the wooden vesesls which we build there, the coal companies could not do a profitable business at all. If they could not use large steamers in carrying their coal, we could not have any coal trade up the St. Lawrence. It is only by building special steamers adapted to the trade, that we can make anything out of it.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Let us build Messageries maritimes.

Mr. FIELDING. And in the meantime shut up the collieries.

Mr. LEFURGEY. You have not begun any.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, we have launched this day in the town of New Glasgow, a magnificent steel ship and without giving any bonus. It was built by enterprising people and I wish them every success.

Mr. LEFURGEY. But you have not aided them in any way.

Mr. FIELDING. I am not going to discuss that question. It may or may not be good policy to aid ship-building. There are certain privileges which have been granted for many years, and whatever advantages there may be in these will go to the splendid steel ship launched by the firm of Carmichael & Co.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Only one steel ship.

Mr. FIELDING. Well, there has to be a beginning to everything.

Mr. BLAIN. Since the Minister of Finance is going into a discussion entirely away from the Bill, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. FIELDING. I think my hon. friend is right.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Might I inquire what is the tonnage of this vessel ?

Mr. FIELDING. She is quite a good sized vessel.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know that this Bill is much less controversial than the other one we have considered. The subject is a very important one ; but coming back to the immediate purpose of the Bill, perhaps it might be said that its advantages will depend all together on the way it is worked out by orders in council.

Mr. FIELDING. That is true.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Minister of Finance has announced, but only in a very general way, what the policy of the government is likely to be. I would suggest that the Bill might be reported and stand for third reading, on the understanding that if any hon. gentleman who is not present desires further discussion, we can refer it back to the committee.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Might I point out a fact which would perhaps avoid any discussion on the third reading, and that is that in the original Shipping Act passed in 1870 the power to alter, amend and repeal any order in council that might be passed under the terms of this section were contained in the original Shipping Act. But when they came to revise the statutes in 2 Edward VII., the words giving to the Governor in Council the power to alter, amend and repeal were struck out. The proposition now is only to revive the powers which had previously existed.

Progress reported.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to again bring to the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the return I mentioned yesterday.

Mr. BRODEUR. I found out that it had been handed to me some time ago and has been mislaid. I have given instructions to have it recopied and will lay it on the

table to-morrow or the day after. It consists only of a few letters.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business to-morrow ?

Mr. FIELDING. Supply will be moved in the morning.

Motion agreed to and House adjourned at 2.55 a.m. Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, July 15, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

DAM AT GRANDES PILES, QUEBEC.

Mr. ROBITAILLE—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. What amount was voted last year for the foundations of the dam on the St. Maurice at Grandes Piles?
2. What amount was voted and expended during the past eight years ?
3. For what were such amounts expended ?
4. How much did that portion of wharf built at Grandes Piles cost?
5. How much did that portion of wharf built at La Tuque cost ?
6. What salary during the past four years was paid to Mr. Eucharistc Crête, of St. Jean des Piles, and what for ?

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

1. $40,000.

	Voted.	Expended.
2. Previous to 1904		
1904-5.., ...	$10,000	$1,529 20
1905-6..	16,000	
1906-7..	20,000	
1907-8..	40,000	

3 and 4. Above expenditure was for labour, timber, hardware, smithwork, dynamite, soundings, cartage, &c., in construction of wharf, costing, $3,937.50, balance being charged against St. Maurice slides and booms.

5. $3,502.02.

6. In 1904-5, $2 per working day, as captain of stone lifter.. ..	$430 00
In 1905-6, three months at $75, as captain of stone lifter.. ..	225 00
In 1905-6, four months at $55, as conductor of works at Rapid Manigance..	220 00
In 1906-7, four months and five days at $75 per month, as captain of stone lifter..	312 10
In 1907-8, seven months at $75, as captain of stone lifter.. ..	525 00
In 1907-8, four months at $35, as caretaker of stone lifter, dredge and plant..	140 00
	$1,852 10

Mr. BRODEUR.

DREDGING AT DORVAL.

Mr. BOYER asked :

How much material has been taken out by dredging at St. Lawrence yacht club, at Dorval, since 1867?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). 59,180 cubic yards.

GRAZING LEASE OF H. RIVIERE.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON asked:

1. What is the exact location and area of the grazing lease held by Mr. H. Rivière in township 4, range 1, west of the 5th meridian ?
2. Did H. Rivière apply for any other lands in township 4, range 1, west of the 5th meridian ? If so, why were these other lands not granted ?
3. Has any other person any interest in this lease ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Section 25, the northeast quarter of section 26 and section 27, comprising an area of 1,440 acres.
2. (a) Yes.

(b) The other lands applied for were not granted Mr. Rivière on account of a conflicting application, and a protest having been received from some ranchers living in the vicinity.

3. I do not know.

WHARF AT MILFORD HAVEN, N.S.

Mr. BLAIN asked :

1. When was the wharf at Milford Haven, or the Intervale, Guysborough county, constructed ?
2. What has been the total expenditure on this wharf ?
3. How many vessels have been moored at the wharf since its construction ?
4. Who is the wharfinger or caretaker, and what has he been paid each year since its construction for services ?

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

1. In the years 1904-5 and 1905-6.
2. $2,049.94.

3 and 4. Department has no information as to number of vessels moored at the wharf since its construction; no wharfinger has been appointed.

IMPORTATIONS OF FARM AND GARDEN PRODUCE AT SAULT STE. MARIE.

Mr. BOYCE asked :

1. What quantities of farm and garden produce were entered for consumption at the port of Sault Ste. Marie during the fiscal year ended March 31, 1908?
2. Of what classes were such importations, respectively?
3. What duties were paid upon the same, respectively?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

Statement showing the imports at the port of Sault Ste. Marie during the fiscal year ended March 31, 1908, of hay, potatoes, and other farm and garden produce, showing also the duty collected thereon.

Articles.	Unit of Quantity.	Quantity,	Value.	Duty.
			$	$ cts.
Hay	Tons	3,837	56,526	7,674 00
Beans	Bush.	57	92	14 25
Pease	"	10	13	1 00
Eggs	Doz.	12,304	2,558	369 12
Apples	Brls.	43	207	17 20
Berries	Lbs.	2,224	284	44 48
Cranberries	Bush.	76	219	54 75
Grapes	Lbs.	4,653	444	93 06
Peaches		15,290	1,065	152 90
Plums	Bush.	77	441	23 10
Fruits, green, n.o.p.	Lbs.	8,535	492	42 67
Cheese	"	4,588	990	137 64
Melons	No.	2,852	560	85 56
Potatoes	Bush.	13.814	8,739	2,762 20
Tomatoes, fresh	"	278	479	143 70
Vegetables, fresh	$	.....	5,077	1,523 10

NEW APPOINTMENTS IN DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS.

Mr. ROBITAILLE—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. Since Hon. Wm. Pugsley has held the position of Minister of Public Works, how many new appointments to office have been made in his department?
2. What are the names and salaries of the said appointees?
3. How many French-Canadians are in the above list, and at what salaries?

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

1. Sixteen.
2 and 3.

Names.	Salary.
Arthur Winslow	$ 800 per annum
R. A. Sauriol	800 "
J. H. Parent	1,500 "
K. Brown	500 "
F. McGovern	700 "
O. A. Beauchemin	1,200 "
J. N. Levesque	1,250 "
G. Macdonald (also $400 as private secretary to minister)	1,200 "
Allan Taylor	900 per annum
M. Laframboise	800 "
A. McLeod	500 "
F. C. Sullivan	1,500 "
E. St. Jorre	600 "
J. G. Taylor	1,200 "
L. Nicolson	600 "
J. H. Wattsford	900 "

I have no official information as to which of the above are French-Canadians. My information, however, is that they are all Canadians.

MARINE STORES ON SUSSEX STREET, OTTAWA.

Mr. FOWLER—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. Has the Department of Marine and Fisheries a warehouse for the storage of marine stores on Sussex street? If so, how many employees are engaged in said store, and what are their names and salaries?
2. Who is the janitor of the building, and what is his rate of pay?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries):

1 and 2. The Department of Marine and Fisheries has a warehouse on the first floor of a building on Sussex street. The warehouse is under the control of the inspector of lighthouses above Montreal and the materials stored are in connection with this service. The only employee at this store is the janitor and storekeeper, Albert Corbeil, who is paid at the rate of $50 a month. This building is also used as offices for certain branches of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

LEASE OF BROWN, BEDINGFIELD & COMPANY.

Mr. CRAWFORD asked:

1. How many acres of grazing land is held under lease by Brown, Bedingfield & Company? If so, how long does the lease run?
2. What is the name and address of each member of the above firm?
3. Is this a close lease?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. (a) 55,427 acres. (b) 31st March, 1926.
2. John Garrett Cory, Gilbert Plains, Manitoba; Joseph Harrison Brown, Pekisko,

Alberta; Frank Bedingfield, Pekisko, Alberta; Glen Campbell, Gilbert Plains, Manitoba.

3. Yes.

IMPORTS FOR HOME CONSUMPTION.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. What are, respectively, the values of and duties on imports into Canada for home consumption for the months of January, February, March, April, May and June, for the years 1907 and 1908?

2. What are the value of exports of the produce of Canada from Canada for the same periods?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs) :

—	Dutiable.	Free.	Total.	Duty.
1907.	$	$	$	$
1. Jan..	17,519,883	11,012,095	26,531,978	4,096,788
Feb..	16,012,541	9,395,525	25,408,066	4,295,297
Mar..	21,944,669	14,897,407	36,842,076	5,911,820
Apr..	16,317,187	12,018,100	28,335,287	4,330,018
May..	20,023,760	14,783,480	34,807,240	5,258,673
June.	20,222,272	13,881,313	34,103,585	5,281,575
1908.				
Jan..	14,358,394	8,915,081	23,273,475	3,930,941
Feb..	14,469,163	6,535,570	21,004,733	4,081,227
Mar..	18,284,714	11,767,518	30,052,232	4,988,355
Apr..	11,917,416	8,284,193	20,201,609	3,297,741
May.	13,259,036	10,165,648	23,424,684	3,572,166
June.	13,815,451	11,479,363	25,294,814	3,768,391

	1907.	1908.
2. Jan..	$ 16,721,081	$ 20,467,317
Feb..	12,620,857	14,636,818
Mar..	14,760,273	17,943,487
Apr..	9,751,849	10,294,828
May..	16,905,057	13,906.472
June.	19,309,851	19,887,476

DREDGE 'KING EDWARD.'

Mr. BLAIN asked :

1. Has the dredge 'King Edward' been employed in dredging the harbour of Lunenburg?

2. Is the government aware that dredging operations in that harbour have obstructed access to and from private docks by the throwing up of mud?

3. Is the government aware that this has prevailed to such an extent that in some cases vessels have been unable to get in and out of private docks for a certain period?

4. Is this dredge or any dredge now employed in Lunenburg harbour?

5. In what portions of the harbour have dredging operations been carried on, and to what extent and at what cost since January 1, 1907?

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

1. Yes.

2 and 3. No.

Mr. OLIVER.

4. Yes, the 'King Edward.'

5. (a) Entrance to harbour and around the wharfs. (b) 254,617 cubic yards were removed. (c) contract, $101,846.80; inspection &c., $1,045.53 ; total, $102,892.33.

DUTY ON TOBACCO.

Mr. HENDERSON asked :

1. What was the total amount of duty collected on tobacco for the year ending March 31, 1908, by the Department of Inland Revenue?

2. How much of this was due to the additional duty imposed by the legislation of 1897?

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue) :

1. $6,841,060.19.

2. $2,143,190.60.

AMERICAN QUARANTINE ON SHEEP.

Mr. ELSON asked :

1. Does the United States place Canadian sheep under quarantine when going into their country? If so, for what length of time?

2. Would it be sufficient to dip Canadian sheep once or twice during the season to remove the cause of quarantine, and allow Canadian sheep to enter the United States without quarantine restriction?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). The United States authorities have recently imposed a quarantine of thirty days on sheep entering the United States for breeding purposes. In regard to the second question there is no alternative to the quarantine in the United States regulations and we have not yet succeeded in inducing them to make any change.

WHARFAGE DUES AT BRONTE.

Mr. HENDERSON asked :

1. What was the amount of wharfage dues collected at Bronte harbour during the fiscal year ending March 31, 1908?

2. What was the amount of rental collected at Bronte harbour during the fiscal year ending March 31, 1908, for ground on which fish houses have been built?

3. How much of such collections has the wharfinger retained for his services, or how much has such official been paid for such services during said fiscal year?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. $90.40.

2. $50.

3. $22.60.

IMPORTS OF SUGAR, 1908.

Mr. HENDERSON asked :

1. What was the total amount of sugar, raw and refined, respectively, imported into Canada during the fiscal year ending March 31, 1908?

2. What was the amount of duty paid on raw sugar and refined sugar during the same year, respectively?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

	Quantity.	Value.	Duty.
	Lbs.	$	$ cts.
Sugar above No. 17 D.S., in colour, and all refined sugars of whatever kinds, grades or standards	32,945,709	987,454	273,819 71
Sugar n.o.p. not above No. 16 D.S. in colour, sugar drainings or pumpings drained in transit, melado or concentrated melado, tank bottoms and sugar concrete	412,505,413	8,950,400	2,323,573 85
Raw sugar as described in preceeding item, when imported to be refined in Canada by Canadian sugar refiners, to the extent of twice the quantity of sugar refined during the calendar years, 1906, 1907 and 1908 by such refiners from sugar produced in Canada from Canadian beet root	22,056,516	491,463	115,794 71

CORRECTION OF ANSWER TO QUESTION—PURCHASE OF STEEL RAILS.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). I rise to what might be called a question of privilege, to make two corrections, in answer to the questions asked by Mr. Boyce on June 18:

1. From what manufacturers has the National Transcontinental Railway Commission purchased steel rails for use in the construction of the railway?
2. What were the prices per ton, respectively, paid under such contracts?

The price of steel rails purchased from the Algoma Steel Company 32,000 gross tons should read $34 per ton, and not $54 per ton, as it appears in 'Hansard.'

In answering a question by Mr. Boyce on the same subject more information was given than was asked for and the result may be confusing. The question was:

1. From what manufacturers has the National Transcontinental Railway Commission purchased steel rails for use in the construction of the railway?
2. What were the prices per ton, respectively, paid under such contracts?
3. What contracts for rails are still incompleted?

The correct answer is:

1. 65,371·2 gross tons.
2. Dominion Iron & Steel Company—

	Per ton.
Delivery at Quebec	$35 00
" " Levis	35 00
" " Moncton, N.B.	35 85
" " Edmundston, N.B.	37 60

Algoma Steel Company, Limited—

Delivery at the junction of T. & N. O. Railway	40 00

PURCHASE OF SEED OATS IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Some days ago a question was asked by Mr. Fowler in reference to the purchase of seed grain in Prince Edward Island, but only the first two parts were answered. The balance of the question reads:

3. How much money was paid the Prince Edward Island Railway Company and winter steamers for freight on said oats?
4. When were the oats inspected, by whom, and what was the cost of inspection?
5. What was the price charged to the farmers of the West for these oats?
6. What commissions, if any, were paid, and to whom paid?

The answers to the other parts are:

3. The freight charges on the Prince Edward Island Railway and winter steamers on said oats were paid by Jos. Read and Company. The amount is not known to the department.
4. Between February 25 and March 16, 1908—S. J. Moore, seed inspector for the maritime provinces—No additional cost for inspection.
5. Eighty-five cents per bushel.
6. No commissions paid.

CORRECTION IN VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS.

Mr. BERGERON. I find in the Votes and Proceedings an error which might be serious. In the report of the money voted day before yesterday I find the name of Jules Chaconguay as junior second-class clerk at $800 per annum. The name in the estimates was Evanturel. The circumstances stated and the amount are the same, but the name is different, whether intentionally or not I do not know.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is an error.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved that the House

do to-morrow go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolutions :

1. Resolved, that the government of Canada may aid and assist the construction of a line of railway of the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Company, hereinafter called 'the company,' from a point on the company's line of railway, or on the line of railway of the Edmonton and Slave Lake Railway Company, at or near Edmonton or Strathcona, in the province of Alberta, thence, in a generally western direction, to the coal areas, situated at or near the Brazeau river and the headwaters of the McLeod river, for a distance not exceeding one hundred and fifty miles, by guaranteeing the principal and interest of the bonds, debentures, debenture stock or other securities, hereinafter called 'securities,' secured as hereinafter mentioned, of the said company, or of its successors by amalgamation as hereinafter provided, to the extent of thirteen thousand dollars per mile for the first fifty miles of the line so aided, and, for the remainder of the said line, to the amount of twenty-five thousand dollars per mile, not exceeding in all one hundred and fifty miles, the interest upon the said securities to be at the rate of three and one-half per cent per annum, payable half-yearly, the principal to be payable in fifty years.

2. Resolved, that the said securities so guaranteed shall be secured by a deed or deeds of trust, by way of mortgage or charge, to a trustee or trustees, approved of by the Governor in Council, and such deed or deeds of trust shall respectively grant a first mortgage or charge upon the said line of railway so aided, and the right of way, station grounds, or other real estate and interest therein, buildings and other structures and improvements, rolling stock and equipment, plant, machinery, tools, supplies, materials, and other personal properties, present and future, acquired for the purposes of the said line so aided, and in connection with operating, repairing and maintaining it, and the tolls, incomes and revenues of the company arising and to arise from the said line, and the rights, privileges, franchises and powers of the company now or hereafter held with respect to and in connection with the said line and the operation maintenance and repair thereof.

3. Resolved, that the deed or deeds of trust shall also create a mortgage, or charge, upon all other lines of railway and properties of the company, and upon all the property and franchises, tools, incomes and revenues connected therewith, to rank thereon next after the bonds, debentures, debenture stocks or other securities theretofore issued by the company, and next after any existing deed or deeds of trust by way of mortgage or charge securing them : provided always that, with respect to lines of railway or parts thereof now constructed and in operation, for the mileage of which no bonds, debentures, debenture stock or other securities have yet been issued, the company may issue first mortgage securities at a rate not exceeding twenty thousand dollars per mile, and may secure them by deed or deeds of trust by way of first mortgage or charge, having priority over the mortgage or charge created by the deed or deeds of trust hereinbefore mentioned.

Mr. GRAHAM.

4. Resolved that the kind of securities to be guaranteed as aforesaid and the forms thereof, and the form and terms of the deed or deeds securing them, and the times and manner of the issue of securities and the disposition of the moneys to be raised thereon, by sale, pledge, or otherwise, pending the expenditure of such moneys for the purpose of the line of railway so aided, and the forms and manner of guarantee, shall be such as the Governor in Council approves of, and such terms, provisions and conditions may be included in such deed or deeds of trust as the Governor in Council deems expedient or necessary.

5. Resolved, that the said guarantee shall be signed by the Minister of Finance or such officer as is designated by the Governor in Council to sign it ; and upon being so signed the government shall become liable as guarantor for the payment of the principal and interest of the securities so guaranteed according to the tenor thereof, and the said payments shall form a charge upon the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

6. Resolved, that the rates and tolls charged by the company upon any of its lines shall not in any case be higher than the rates or tolls fixed in the contract to be made between the government of Canada and the company.

7. Resolved, that any moneys paid by the government of Canada under any guarantee herein provided for, shall be held to be paid in discharge of the liability of the government and not in discharge of the liability of the company under the securities so guaranteed, or under any deed of trust securing them, and the moneys so paid shall be held to be still secured by the said securities and deed of trust, and the government shall be subrogated in and to all the rights of the holders of such securities, the interest upon or the principal of which has been paid by the government, and the government shall, with respect to all moneys so paid, be in all respects in the position of security holders with respect to whose securities default has been made in payment to the extent of the moneys paid by the government.

8. Resolved, that the guarantee of securities, as herein provided, for the said line of railway shall not be given until the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company and the Canadian Northern Railway Company have amalgamated into one company under the name of the Canadian Northern Railway Company, nor until the amalgamated company, as successors by such amalgamation, has become, as maker of the securities, liable for the payment of the principal and interest of the securities so to be guaranteed with respect to such line of railway.

9. Resolved, that the decision of the Governor in Council as to the length of the mileage of the said line of railway so to be aided, shall, for the purpose hereof, be final.

10. Resolved, that the books of the company shall at all times be open for inspection for and on behalf of the government by any person named in that behalf by the Governor in Council or the Minister of Finance.

He said : His Excellency the Governor General having been apprised of the subject matter of this resolution commends it

to the favourable consideration of this House.

Mr. FOSTER. Will there be any memorandum for distribution to the members giving particulars of these various cases or are we to proceed to-morrow with no information except the meagre information that can possibly be given by the minister?

Mr. GRAHAM. I will have a memorandum prepared; I have a map with all the lines in both resolutions and forms of application and particulars. I shall have this information laid on the table this afternoon.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved that the House do to-morrow go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolutions:

1. Resolved, That the government of Canada may aid and assist the construction of the lines of railway, set out below, of the Canadian Northern Railway Company, hereinafter called 'the company,' by guaranteeing the principal and interest of the bonds, debentures, debenture stock or other securities, hereinafter called 'securities,' of the said company, to the extent of thirteen thousand dollars per mile of the said lines of railway so aided, respectively, interest on the said securities to be at the rate of three and one-half per cent per annum, payable half-yearly, and the principal to be payable in fifty years.

2. Resolved, That the said securities so guaranteed shall be secured by one or more deeds of trust, by way of mortgage or charge, to a trustee or trustees, approved of by the Governor in Council, and such deed or deeds of trust shall respectively grant a first mortgage or charge upon the line or lines of railway included therein, and the rights of way, station grounds and other real estate and interests therein, buildings and other structures and improvements, rolling stock and equipment, plant, machinery, tools, supplies, materials and other personal properties, present and future, acquired for the purposes of the said lines so aided, and in connection with operating, repairing and maintaining them, and the tolls, incomes, and revenues of the company arising and to rise from the said lines and the rights, privileges, franchises and powers of the company now or hereafter held with respect to and in connection with the said lines, and the operation, maintenance and repair thereof.

3. Resolved, That the said deed or deeds of trust shall also create a mortgage or charge, next after the charges existing thereon, upon all the lines and branch lines of railway of the company now in operation and upon all the property and franchises connected therewith, and upon all the tolls, incomes and revenues derived therefrom by the company, and also next after any bonds, debentures, debenture stock or other securities heretofore issued or hereafter to be issued by the company to raise the moneys required from time to time to meet the expenditures heretofore made or hereafter to be made for and in connection with the company's yard and freight terminals in Winnipeg, and the expenditures under the agreement respecting Winnipeg terminals, set out in chapter 52 of the Statutes of Canada of 1907, made between the company, the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, and His Majesty the King, and after the deeds of trust, mortgages, pledges and charges heretofore given or hereafter to be given to secure them: provided always that, with respect to lines or parts thereof now constructed and in operation, for the mileage of which no bonds, debentures, debenture stock or other securities have yet been issued, the company may issue first mortgage securities at a rate not exceeding fifteen thousand dollars per mile, and may secure them by deed or deeds of trust by way of first mortgage or charge, having priority over the mortgage or charge to be created by the deed or deeds of trust hereinbefore mentioned.

4. Resolved, That the kind of securities to be guaranteed as herein provided and the forms thereof, and the form and terms of the deed or deeds of trust securing them, and the times and manner of the issue of securities and the disposition of the moneys to be raised thereon, by sale, pledge or otherwise, pending the expenditure of such moneys for the purposes of the lines of railway respectively so aided, and the forms and manner of guarantee shall be such as the Governor in Council approves of, and such terms, provisions and conditions may be included in such deed or deeds of trust as the Governor in Council deems expedient or necessary.

5. Resolved, That the said guarantee shall be signed by the Minister of Finance or such officer as is designated by the Governor in Council to sign it, and upon being so signed the government shall become liable as guarantor for the payment of the principal and interest of the securities so guaranteed according to the tenor thereof, and the said payment shall form a charge upon the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

6. Resolved, That the rates and tolls charged by the company upon any of its lines shall not in any case be higher than the rates or tolls fixed in the contract to be made between the government of Canada and the company.

7. Resolved, That any money paid by the government of Canada, under any guarantee herein provided for shall be held to be paid in discharge of the liability of the government and not in discharge of the liability of the company under the securities guaranteed or under any deed of trust securing them, and the moneys so paid shall be held to be still secured by the said securities and deed of trust and the government shall be subrogated in and to all the rights of the holders of such securities the interest upon or the principal of which has been paid by the government, and the government shall with respect to all moneys so paid be in all respects in the position of security holders with respect to whose securities default has been made in payment to the extent of the moneys paid by the government.

8. Resolved, That the decision of the Governor in Council as to the length of the mileage of any of the said lines of railway shall, for the purposes thereof be final.

9. Resolved, That the books of the company shall at all times be open to inspection for and on behalf of the government by any person

named in that behalf by the Governor in Council or the Minister of Finance.

10. Resolved, That the lines of railway above referred to are the following:—

1. A line of railway from or from near Regina, in the province of Saskatchewan, to the westerly boundary of Manitoba, there connecting with the company's line to Brandon, not exceeding one hundred and fifty-two miles.

2. A line of railway from or from near Saskatoon, in the province of Saskatchewan, thence running in a southerly and western direction towards Calgary, not exceeding one hundred and seventy-five miles.

3. A line of railway from or from near Prince Albert, in the province of Saskatchewan, by way of North Battleford and Battleford Junction, to or near to Battleford, excluding, however, the mileage between North Battleford and Battleford Junction, the distance, exclusive of the last-mentioned mileage not exceeding one hundred and thirty-two miles.

4. A line of railway from the Thunder Hill line to the company's railway at or near the westerly boundary of the province of Manitoba, running in a generally western direction towards Rosthern, a distance not exceeding one hundred miles.

5. An extension of the Rossburn line from the western boundary of the province of Manitoba, in a northwesterly direction, a distance not exceeding fifty miles.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General having been apprised of the subject matter of this resolution commends it to the favourable consideration of this House.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved that the House do to-morrow go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to provide as follows:

1. The Governor in Council may grant a subsidy of $3,200 per mile towards the construction of each of the undermentioned lines of railway (not exceeding in any case the number of miles hereinafter respectively stated) which shall not cost more on the average than $15,000 per mile for the mileage subsidized, and towards the construction of each of the said lines of railway, not exceeding the mileage hereinafter stated, which shall cost more on the average than $15,000 per mile for the mileage subsidized, a further subsidy beyond the sum of $3,200 per mile of fifty per cent on so much of the average cost of the mileage subsidized as is in excess of $15,000 per mile such subsidy not exceeding in the whole the sum of $6,400 per mile:

Revotes.

1. To the Kettle River Valley Railway Company, for a line of railway from a point at or near Grand Forks to a point fifty miles up the north fork, and east or west fork of the north fork, of Kettle river, in lieu of the subsidy granted by chapter 43 of 1906, section 1, item 39; not exceeding 50 miles.

2. For a line of railway from Owen Sound, in the province of Ontario to Meaford, in lieu of the subsidy granted by chapter 43 of 1906, section 1, item 18; not exceeding 30 miles.

3. For a line of railway from Sharbot lake or Bathurst station, in the province of Ontario, or between these points, via Lanark village, to Carleton Place, in lieu of the subsidy granted by chapter 43 of 1906, section 1, item 7; not exceeding 41 miles.

4. To the Nipigon Railway Company, for the following lines of railway:

(a) from a point at or near Nipigon station on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway to Nipigon lake; not exceeding 30 miles;

(b) from a point on Nipigon bay to lake Superior to a point on the west of lake Helen on the line of the Nipigon Railway; not exceeding 3½ miles;

(c) from a point on the line of the Nipigon Railway at or near the crossing of the Fraser river to a point on lake Jesse, by way of Cameron's Falls; not exceeding 1½ miles;

(d) from a point on the north shore of lake Nipigon northerly; not exceeding 45 miles; the said subsidies to the said lines being granted in lieu of the subsidies granted by chapter 43 of 1906, section 1, item 10; not exceeding in all 80 miles.

5. To the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company (or to the Canada Central Railway Company with the consent of the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company, and subject to the approval of the Governor in Council), for the following lines of railway:

(a) from a point on the said line of railway, between Little Current and Sudbury westerly towards the Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway; not exceeding 100 miles;

(b) from Little Current thence crossing the Canadian Pacific Railway, at or near Stanley, and thence to Sudbury; not exceeding 64 miles;

(c) from a point at or near Sudbury, northerly; not exceeding 30 miles;

the said subsidies being granted in lieu of the subsidies granted by chapter 43 of 1906, section 1, item 1; not exceeding in all 194 miles.

6. To the Ontario, Northern and Timagami Railway Company, for a line of railway from a point at or near Sturgeon Falls, in a northwesterly direction, to a point on the westerly shore of Lake Timagami, in the district of Nipissing, in lieu of the subsidy granted by chapter 43 of 1906, section 1, item 28; not exceeding 50 miles.

7. For a line of railway from a point at or near Baptiste, easterly to a point at or near Renfrew, in lieu of the subsidy granted by chapter 34 of 1906, section 1, item 24; not exceeding 75 miles.

8. To the Bracebridge and Trading Lake Railway Company, for a railway from Bracebridge, in Muskoka, to a point at or near Baysville, Ontario, in lieu of the subsidy granted by chapter 34 of 1904, section 2, item 1, for 15 miles; not exceeding 16 miles.

9. For a line of railway from Roberval westward toward James bay, in lieu of the subsidy granted by chapter 43 of 1906, section 1, item 12; not exceeding 100 miles.

10. To the Matane and Gaspé Railway Company, for a line of railway from a point at or near Ste. Flavie, on the Intercolonial Railway, to Matane, in lieu of the subsidy granted

by chapter 43 of 1906, section 1, item 44, for 30 miles; not exceeding 38 miles.

11. To the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company, for a line of railway from a point at or near Arundel to a point in the municipality of the united townships of Preston and Hartwell, not exceeding 30 miles; and for a line of railway connecting its Montfort and Gatineau line with the main line at St. Jerome, not exceeding 15:2 miles; in lieu of the subsidies granted to the Great Northern Railway of Canada by chapter 43 of 1906, section 1, item 36; not exceeding in all 45:2 miles.

12. To the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company, for a line of railway from, or near, Garneau junction to or towards the Quebec bridge, in lieu of the subsidy granted to the Great Northern Railway of Canada by chapter 43 of 1906, section 1, item 37, for 70 miles; not exceeding 83 miles.

13. To the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway Company, for a line of railway from a point at or near Causapscal, on the Intercolonial Railway, to Edmundston, in lieu of the subsidy granted by chapter 43 of 1906, section 1, item 9, for a line between the points above mentioned; not exceeding 160 miles.

14. For a line of railway from Yamaska to a point in the county of Lotbinière, in lieu of the subsidy granted by chapter 57 of 1903, section 2, item 12, not exceeding 70 miles; and for a line of railway from Mount Johnson to St. Gregoire station in lieu of the subsidy granted to the United Counties Railway Company by chapter 7 of 1899, section 2, item 16, for 1 mile, not exceeding 1½ miles; and not exceeding in all 71½ miles.

15. To the International Railway Company of New Brunswick, for a line of railway from the western end of the twenty miles of its railway, as already constructed from Campbellton, to a point on the St. John river between Grand Falls and Edmundston, in lieu of the subsidies granted by chapter 57 of 1903, section 2, items 14 and 59, respectively; not exceeding 90 miles.

16. For a line of railway from Brazil Lake, on the Dominion Atlantic railway, to Kemptville, Nova Scotia, in lieu of the subsidy granted by chapter 8 of 1900, section 2, item 30; not exceeding 11 miles.

17. To the Inverness Railway and Coal Company, for a line of railway from Cheticamp to a point on the line already built between Broad Cove and Point Tupper, in lieu of the subsidy granted by chapter 57 of 1903, section 2, item 24, for 37 miles; not exceeding 37 miles.

18. To the Margaree Coal and Railway Company, for a line of railway from a point at or near Orangedale, on the Intercolonial railway, thence via the side of Lake Ainslie and Ste. Rosa, to Chimney Corner Cove, not exceeding 46 miles; and from a point on the Intercolonial railway between Orangedale and Point Tupper to Caribou Cove on Inhabitant's Bay or river, not exceeding 4 miles; in lieu of the subsidy granted by chapter 40 of 1907, section 1, item 21, for 38 miles; not exceeding in all 50 miles.

19. To the Lotbinière and Megantic Railway company, for a line of railway to extend its railway southerly from a point at or near Lyster, in Megantic county, to or towards a point at or near Lime Ridge, in the township of Dudswell, not exceeding 50 miles, and for a line of railway from a point on its line in the township of Inverness, to a point at or near the bridge over the St. Lawrence at or near Quebec, not exceeding 30 miles; in lieu of the subsidies granted by chapter 43 of 1906, section 1, items 3 and 20, respectively; not exceeding in all 80 miles.

20. To the Cape Breton Railway Company, Limited, for a line of railway from Port Hawkesbury or Point Tupper, on the Strait of Canso, Nova Scotia, to St. Peter's, in lieu of the subsidy granted by chapter 7 of 1899, section 2, item 6, for 30 miles; not exceeding 31 miles.

21. For a line of railway from a point on the Intercolonial railway at or near Dartsmouth, in the county of Halifax, to a point at or near Deans Settlement, in the county of Halifax, in lieu in part of the subsidy granted by chapter 43 of 1906, section 1, item 5; not exceeding 80 miles.

22. For a line of railway from a point at or near Deans Settlement, in the county of Halifax, to a point at or near Melrose, in the county of Guysborough, in lieu in part of the subsidy granted by chapter 43 of 1906, section 1, item 5; not exceeding 52 miles.

23. For a line of railway from a point at or near New Glasgow, in the county of Pictou, to a point at or near Melrose, in the county of Guysborough, and from the said point at or near Melrose to Guysborough, in the county of Guysborough, with branch line to Country Harbour, in the county of Guysborough, in lieu in part of the subsidy granted by chapter 43 of 1906, section 1, item 5; not exceeding in all 116 miles.

24. To the Ha Ha Bay Railway Company, for a line of railway from Jonquieres village to Baie des Ha Ha, via Laterrieres village, in lieu of the subsidy granted by chapter 43 of 1906, section 1, item 33, for 20 miles; not exceeding 24 miles.

25. To the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway company, for a line of railway from Chaudière junction to a point at or near the International railway, in lieu of the subsidies granted by chapter 7 of 1901, section 2, item 2, for 45 miles, and by chapter 40 of 1907, section 1, item 25, for 18 miles; not exceeding 80 miles.

26. For a line of railway from at or near Ste. Agathe des Monts station towards the township of Howard, in the county of Argenteuil, passing near lake St. Joseph and St. Mary in a southerly direction, in lieu of the subsidies granted by chapter 43 of 1906, section 1, item 38; not exceeding in all 15 miles.

New subsidies.

27. For a line of railway from Tusket Wedge to a point on the Halifax Southwestern Railway, at or near Riverdale station; not exceeding 8 miles.

28. To the Halifax and Southwestern Railway Company, for a line of railway from Lunenburg to Bridgewater, via upper La Have; not exceeding 12 miles.

29. To the Erie, London and Tilsonburg Railway Company, for a line of railway from Port Burwell to London; not exceeding 35 miles.

30. For a line of railway from a point at or near Centreville to Aylesford, or Kingston or Middleton, on the line of the Dominion Atlantic Railway; not exceeding 35 miles.

31. For a line of railway from a point on the Canadian Pacific Railway at or near Plaster rock to Riley brook; not exceeding 28 miles.

32. To the North Shore Railway Company, Limited (formerly the Beersville Coal and Railway Company), for a line of railway extending its present line from Beersville to Brown's landing, not exceeding 7 miles; and for a branch line of railway from its main line to Mount Carlyle, not exceeding 2½ miles; not exceeding in all 9½ miles.

33. To the York and Carleton Railway Company, for a line of railway from its present terminus to a point on the National Transcontinental Railway; not exceeding 9 miles.

34. To the Vancouver and Lulu Island Railway Company, for a line of railway from Eburn, on its main line, to New Westminster; not exceeding 9·65 miles.

35. To the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company, for a line of railway from a point near French creek to the village of Sandwich, not exceeding 41 miles; and for a line of railway from the village of Sandwich to Campbell river, not exceeding 38 miles; not exceeding in all 79 miles.

36. For a line of railway from Macleod, via Cardston, towards a point on the International boundary west of range 21; not exceeding 45 miles.

37. For a line of railway from a point at or near Cowley, in Alberta, to a point on Highwood river; not exceeding 50 miles.

38. For a line of railway from a point at or near the town of Red Deer to a point on the North Saskatchewan river at or near Rocky Mountain House; not exceeding 70 miles.

39. To the Canadian Pacific Railway company, for a line of railway from Winnipeg beach northeasterly to Gimli, not exceeding 9½ miles, and for a line from Gimli to Riverton, not exceeding 25 miles ; not exceeding in all 34½ miles.

40. To the Canadian Pacific Railway company, for a line of railway from Moosejaw, in a northwesterly direction ; not exceeding 123 miles.

41. To the Eastern Township Railway company, for a line of railway from the Intercolonial railway at St Léonard's junction to Dudswell ; not exceeding 36 miles.

42. To the Quebec, Montreal and Southern Railway company, for a line of railway from Noyan junction to the international boundary, not exceeding 8 miles, and for a line of railway from St. Lambert to St. Constant, not exceeding 15 miles ; not exceeding in all 23 miles.

43. To the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway company, for the following lines of railway :—

(a) from Valcartier station to St. Catherine ; not exceeding 3·8 miles.

(b) from Valcartier station towards Gosford ; not exceeding 5½ miles.

(c) from the end of the 35th mile of the branch to LaTuque, on the river St. Maurice, to LaTuque Falls ; not exceeding 5 miles.

(d) from LaTuque Falls to the mouth of the River Croche ; not exceeding 5 miles.

(e) from point on LaTuque branch to the steamboat landing near LaTuque; not exceeding 1·6 miles; not exceeding in all 20·9 miles.

44. To the Saguenay and James Bay Railway company for a line of railway from Herbertville to St. Joseph d'Alma ; not exceeding 10 miles.

45. To the St. Maurice Valley Railway company, for a line of railway from Three Rivers to St. Maurice ; not exceeding 28 miles.

46. For a line of railway from a point on the main line of the Great Northern Railway at or near St. Jerome to Charlemagne (Bout de L'Isle); not exceeding 22 miles.

47. To the North Eastern Railway company, for a line of railway from a point east of Lake Temiskaming, at or near Ville-Marie, easterly ; not exceeding 25 miles.

48. To the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway company, for a line of railway from Montreal to Hawkesbury ; not exceeding 65 miles.

49. For a line of railway from Montreal to a point on the National Transcontinental Railway; not exceeding 200 miles.

50. To the Quebec Central Railway company for an extension of its line of railway from St. George to or towards St. Justine; not exceeding 30 miles.

51. To the Maritime Railway company, for a line of railway from Chignecto to a point on the Northumberland Straits, not exceeding 25 miles, and from Joggins Mines to a point on the Bay of Fundy, not exceeding 1 mile ; not exceeding in all 26 miles.

52. For a line of railway from St. Peters, in the county of Richmond, by the south shore of Bras d'Or Lake, to Sydney; not exceeding 60 miles.

53. To the Nipissing Central Railway Company, for a line of railway from a point on the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway, at or near the town of New Liskeard, to a point in the township of Guigues, in the province of Quebec; not exceeding 13 miles.

54. To the Vancouver Island and Eastern Railway Company, for a line of railway from a point on the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway, near Campbell river, towards Fort George, on the line of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway; not exceeding 100 miles.

55. To the Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Railway Company, for a line of railway from Vancouver towards St. George, on the line of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway; not exceeding 100 miles.

56. For a line of railway around Death Rapid, British Columbia ; not exceeding 4 miles.

57. To the Pacific Northern and Omineca Railway Company, for a line of railway from Kitimaat to the Telkwa river, not exceeding 110 miles.

58. For a line of railway from Nicola to a point at or near Penticton ; not exceeding 100 miles.

59. For a line of railway from Carmi to Penticton; not exceeding 50 miles.

60. To the St. Mary and Western Ontario Railway Company, for a line of railway from Woodstock to Exeter; not exceeding 45 miles.

61. To the Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway Company, for a line of railway from Michipicoten Harbour towards the National Transcontinental Railway; not exceeding 50 miles.

62. To the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, for branch lines of railway from the line of the National Transcontinental

Railway to Port Arthur and Fort William; not exceeding 220 miles.

63. To the Lac Soul, Rat Portage and Keewatin Railway Company, for a line of railway from a point at or near Kenora to the line of the National Transcontinental Railway; not exceeding 18 miles.

64. To the Burk's Falls and French river Railway Company, for a line of railway from Burk's Falls to French river; not exceeding 85 miles.

65. To the Thessalon and Northern Railway Company, for a line of railway from Thessalon, northerly; not exceeding 4 miles.

66. To the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company, for a line of railway from Sudbury junction to Hutton Mines; not exceeding 30 miles.

67. To the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company, for a line of railway from Cowichan bay to Cowichan lake; not exceeding 24 miles.

68. To the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company, for a line of railway from Hawkesbury to Ottawa; not exceeding 60 miles.

69. For the following lines of railway:

(a) from Westfield to St. John, not exceeding 14 miles.

(b) from Gagetown to Fredericton, not exceeding 40 miles.

(c) from a point between Centreville and Woodstock to Grand Falls, not exceeding 55 miles.

70. For a line of railway from Papineauville, on the Canadian Pacific Railway, towards Nomininque; not exceeding 30 miles.

71. To the L'Avenir and Melbourne Railway Company, for a line of railway from Melbourne to Drummondville; not exceeding 28 miles.

72. To the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company, for a line of railway from Chicoutimi south or southeast; not exceeding 5 miles.

2. The Governor in Council may grant the subsidies hereinafter mentioned towards the construction and completion of the bridges also hereinafter mentioned, that is to say:

1. Towards the construction and completion of a railway bridge and approaches over the Nicolet river at Nicolet, in lieu of the subsidy granted by chapter 40 of 1907, section 2, $15,000.

2. To the Canadian Pacific Railway Company (lessees of the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company), towards the construction and completion of a bridge over the Saskatchewan river connecting Strathcona and Edmonton, 15 per cent upon the amount expended thereon; not exceeding $100,000.

3. To the Quebec, Montreal and Southern Railway Company, towards the construction and completion of the following railway bridges:

(a) bridge across the Gentilly river, $15,000.

(b) bridge across the Becancour river, $30,000.

(c) bridge across the Richelieu river, $30,000.

4. To the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway Company, towards the construction and completion of the 26 railway bridges on its line of railway from Paspebiac to Gaspé, payable upon the completion of the said line of railway between the said points, $250,000.

5. To the Interprovincial Railway Bridge Company of New Brunswick, towards the construction and completion of a railway bridge over the Restigouche river from Campbellton to Mission Point, $160,000.

6. To the Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Railway Company, towards the construction and completion of a railway bridge across Burrard Inlet, $200,000.

3. Unless the context otherwise requires, the expression 'cost' means the actual, necessary and reasonable cost, and shall include the amount expended upon any bridge, up to and not exceeding $25,000, forming part of the line of railway subsidized not otherwise receiving any bonus, but shall not include the cost of equipping the railway nor the cost of terminals nor the cost of right of way of the railway in any city or incorporated town; and such actual, necessary and reasonable cost shall be determined by the Governor in Council, upon the recommendation of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and upon the report of the chief engineer of the Department of Railways and Canals, certifying that he has made or caused to be made an inspection of the line of railway for which payment of subsidy is asked, and careful inquiry into the cost thereof, and that in his opinion the amount upon which the subsidy is claimed is reasonable, and does not exceed the true, actual and proper cost of the construction of such railway.

4. The subsidies hereby authorized towards the construction of any railway or bridge shall be payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, and may, unless otherwise expressly provided herein, at the option of the Governor in Council, on the report of the Minister of Railways and Canals, be paid as follows:

(a) Upon the completion of the work subsidized; or

(b) By instalments, on the completion of each ten-mile section of the railway, in the proportion which the cost of such completed section bears to that of the whole work undertaken; or

(c) Upon the progress estimates on the certificate of the chief engineer of the Department of Railways and Canals that in his opinion, having regard to the whole work undertaken and the aid granted, the progress made justifies the payment of a sum not less than thirty thousand dollars; or

(d) With respect to (b) and (c), part one way, part the other.

5. The subsidies hereinbefore authorized to be granted to companies named shall, if granted by the Governor in Council, be granted to such companies respectively; the other subsidies may be granted to such companies as established to the satisfaction of the Governor in Council their ability to construct and complete the said railways and bridges respectively; all the lines and the bridge for the construction of which subsidies are granted, unless they are already commenced, shall be commenced within two years from the first day of August, 1908, and completed within a reasonable time, not to exceed four years from the said first day of August, to be fixed by the Governor in Council, and shall also be constructed according to descriptions, conditions and specifications approved by the Governor

in Council on the report of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and specified in each case in a contract between the company and the said minister, which contract the minister, with the approval of the Governor in Council, is hereby empowered to make. The location also of such subsidized lines and bridges shall be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council.

6. The granting of such subsidies and the receipt thereof by the respective companies shall be subject to the condition that the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada may at all times provide and secure to other companies such running powers, traffic arrangements and other rights as will afford to all railways connecting with the railways and bridges so subsidized reasonable and proper facilities in exercising such running power, fair and reasonable traffic arrangements with connecting companies, and equal mileage rates between all such connecting railways; and the said board shall have absolute control, at all times, over the rates and tolls to be levied and taken by any of the companies, or upon any of the railways and bridges hereby subsidized; Provided always that any decision of the said board made under this section may be at any time varied, changed or rescinded by the Governor in Council, as he deems just and proper.

7. Every company receiving a subsidy under this Act, its successors and assigns, and any person or company controlling or operating the railway or portion of railway subsidized hereinunder, shall each year furnish to the government of Canada transportation for men, supplies, materials and mails over the portion of the lines in respect of which it has received such subsidy and, whenever required, shall furnish mail cars properly equipped for such mail service; and such transportation and service shall be performed at such rates as are agreed upon between the minister of the department of the government for which such service is being performed and the company performing it, and, in case of disagreement, then at such rates as are approved by the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada; and in or towards payment for such charges the government of Canada shall be credited by the company with a sum equal to three per cent per annum on the amount of the subsidy received by the company hereunder.

8. As respects all railways and bridges for which subsidies are hereby granted, the company at any time owning or operating any of the railways or bridges shall when required, produce and exhibit to the Minister of Railways and Canals, or any person appointed by him, all books, accounts and vouchers showing the cost of constructing the railway or bridge, the cost of operating it, and the earnings thereof.

9. The Governor in Council may make it a condition of the grant of the subsidies herein provided that the company shall lay the railway with new steel rails and fastenings made in Canada and shall purchase all materials and supplies required for the construction of the railway and bridges and the rolling stock for the first equipment of the railway, from Canadian producers, if such rails, fastenings, materials, supplies and equipment are procurable in Canada of suitable quality and upon terms as favourable as elsewhere, of which the Minister of Railways and Canals shall be the judge.

10. Whenever a contract has been duly entered into with a company for the construction of any line of railway hereby subsidized, the Minister of Railways and Canals, at the request of the company, and upon the report of the chief engineer of the Department of Railways and Canals, and his certificate that he has made careful examination of the surveys, plans and profile of the whole line so contracted for, and has duly considered the physical characteristics of the country to be traversed and the means of transport available for construction, naming the reasonable and probable cost of such construction, may, with the authorization of the Governor in Council, enter into a supplementary agreement, fixing definitely the maximum amount of the subsidy to be paid, based upon the said certificate of the chief engineer and providing that the company shall be entitled to be paid as the minimum, the ordinary subsidy of $3,200 per mile, together with sixty per cent of the difference between the amount so fixed and the said $3,200 per mile, if any; and the balance, forty per cent, shall be paid only on completion of the whole work subsidized, and in so far as the actual cost, as finally determined by the Governor in Council upon the recommendation of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and upon the report and certificate of the said chief engineer entitles the company thereto: Provided always—

(a) that the cost, as certified, is not less on the average than $18,000 per mile for the whole mileage subsidized;

(b) that no payment shall be made except upon a certificate of the chief engineer that the work done is up to the standard specified in the company's contract;

(c) that in no case shall the subsidy exceed the sum of $6,400 per mile.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General having been apprised of the subject matter of this resolution commends it to the favourable consideration of this House.

Motion agreed to.

QUEBEC BRIDGE.

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved that the House do to-morrow go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to authorize the government of Canada, pursuant to the agreement between it and the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company, dated the 19th day of October, 1903, and set out in the schedule to chapter 54 of the statutes of 1903, to exercise the right to take over the whole of the undertaking, assets, property, and franchises of the Quebec Railway and Bridge Company, upon the terms and conditions set forth in the said agreement and the said Act, and that the moneys required to pay therefor be appropriated for that purpose out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General having been apprised of the subject matter of this resolution commends it to the favourable consideration of this House.

Motion agreed to.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

On the orders of the day being called:

Mr. BERGERON. When may we expect the French version of the Civil Service Report which has been at the Printing Bureau I think for a month now? I would be glad to have it before the close of the session.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I shall have to inquire in what position it is and will tell my hon. friend to-morrow.

Mr. FOSTER. I would again call the attention of the Prime Minister to a question I put yesterday with reference to a return from the Justice Department.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I shall again call it to the attention of the minister.

THE BRITISH CATTLE EMBARGO.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Before the orders of the day are called I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he has noticed an article in the Montreal 'Gazette' referring to a large mass meeting held in London at which a strong resolution was passed urging His Majesty's government to remove the cattle embargo, and whether he intends to take any action in the matter.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). I have not noticed the article referred to, though I have noticed some reference in the public press to such a meeting.

THE PARDONING POWER.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). I would like to answer a question asked yesterday by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) in regard to a return in reference to the exercise of the pardoning power. I explained when the matter was last mentioned in the House that the preparation of that return necessarily involved months of time. I may say that a man has been specially engaged for the work, which is of such a character that it is not everybody who can do it, and he has been working at it continuously now for some months, and expects to be finished in the course of the next two or three months.

CANADA-GERMANY TRADE RELATIONS.

Mr. LALOR. I have received a letter from Germany stating that there is a rumour there that Canada and Germany are about to enter on closer trade relations. I would like to ask about that.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Occasionally conversations on so important a question naturally take place, but no official action has been taken, and I think I can say to my hon. friend that there is nothing contemplated at this moment which would justify that statement.

THE WOOLLEN INDUSTRY.

Mr. LALOR. In view of the fact that a number of deputations have lately waited on the government to urge increased duties for the woollen and knitted goods industries, I would like to ask if the government contemplate makng any change in the tariff in that direction.

Mr. FIELDING. The Prime Minister answered that question two days ago.

SUPPLY: INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I wish again to call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to a return of whch I have already spoken twice. Last evening the hon. gentleman told me that the return had been prepared and had been lost. I am informed by the hon. member for Queens, P.E.I., who asked me to bring the matter to the attenon of the minister, that he received exactly the same reply several days ago. The extraordinary delay and the replies of that kind repeated at such long intervals, lead us to believe that we are being humbugged in this matter.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). It will be brought down today.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I trust that the hon. gentleman will see that it is, because if it is not brought down to-day the date of prorogation will be very seriously interfered with.

Mr. BRODEUR. There is no need of the hon. gentleman taking that stand, because there has been no intention on my part to be discourteous towards him—quite the reverse. The return was sent to me some time ago and was lost, but it will be brought down to-day.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not think I should be troubled with the necessity of bringing matters of this kind to the attenon of the minister. I only brought this to his attention because members on this side of the House have come to me over and over again and said that they could get no satisfaction in regard to this return, and I was obliged to take the matter up myself. I should not be required to do that. Attention should have been given to it in the first instance. It has been pending for more than six months.

THE FRENCH TREATY.

Mr. BERGERON. I would like to have a definite answer from the government in regard to the French treaty—whether the Senate of France has accepted it, and, if not, where we stand in regard to the treaty between France and Canada which existed before this one was negotiated. If this treaty is not ratified by France, shall we have no treaty or the one we had before?

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman is perhaps aware from the public press that the treaty, though approved by the French Chamber of Deputies, has not been approved by the Senate. I am advised that the French Senate has adjourned and will not meet again for some weeks. We still anticipate that the treaty will be ratified, though we are not in a position to make any statement in regard to that. We are aware that the French government are making every effort to secure the French Senate's approval of the treaty, and we hope that in the end that approval will be given. In the meantime the old treaty remains in force. Until the formal approval of the new treaty by the French Chambers and the parliament of Canada takes place the matter stands precisely as before—as if nothing had been done.

Mr. FOSTER. I would understand, then, that no steps will be taken looking towards the establishment of the commercial steam line between France and Canada until this matter has been finally settled.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not think any contract has been made yet.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister knows that no contract has been made yet. That was not what I suggested. What I suggested was that until it is seen whether or not the French Chambers will ratify the treaty, I suppose that no steps will be taken to establish that line. It was understood that that was to be consequent on the treaty.

Mr. BRODEUR. Of course, we shall have the service as it has been in previous years.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not asking the minister either in reference to the line as it has been. I am asking with reference to the vote which puts into the power of the government a certain amount of money for a service contingent on the new treaty going into effect, and what I asked the minister was if he proposed to put that into operation whether the new treaty is confirmed or not.

Mr. BRODEUR. There was a service established in previous years, as my hon. friend knows, between France and Canada. That was to expire in the month of May last; but this year the same service is supplied as in previous years under the vote taken some time ago. But for that there would have been no service. I will bring before the Minister of Trade and Commerce the question of my hon. friend. I have never discussed the question very fully with the Minister of Trade and Commerce, but I do not think it is his intention to make a contract for a certain number of years if the treaty is not ratified.

Mr. BERGERON. Has the arrangement with the old company been renewed?

Mr. BRODEUR. For this year, at the same rate, $5,500 per trip.

ACCIDENT TO THE CORNWALL CANAL.

Mr. R. A. PRINGLE (Stormont). I would like to ask the Minister of Railways and Canals if any arrangement has been made by which the large manufacturing establishments at Cornwall will get a greater amount of water for power than they are now getting. I understand that since the unfortunate break in the canal they have been cut down to a very small amount, which puts them at a great disadvantage. I recognize that the navigation is the first point to be considered, but I understand that without any great additional expense the channel could be widened in such a way that the cotton mills and the other mills could have a larger amount of water than they are now getting. I may say that the loss of power means to one industry alone an additional expenditure of some $15,000 a month. I saw that a deputation waited on the Minister of Railways and Canals the day before yesterday in reference to this matter, and I want to know if any arrangement has been made by which the mills can get more water.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). As my hon. friend says, the restoration of navigation is the supreme object. That is being done as quickly as possible. We cannot allow anything to be done that is at all liable to place us at the risk of another accident of that kind. There is a large dam of a horseshoe shape. One of the difficulties found is if the current is allowed to be made fairly swift steamers coming down are liable to strike that dam, and it might be carried away and we would be in trouble again.

Mr. PRINGLE. The currents will go away from the dam towards the mill.

Mr. GRAHAM. Coming from the west is the difficulty. I discussed with the engineer last night the whole situation. He informed me that the curve in the canal was too sharp. I went over a rough sketch, and we decided it would be wise in the interests of navigation, apart from any consideration of the mills altogether, to widen out in one or two places so as to make the turn for vessels a little easier and ensure the safety of the cribwork as

well as improving navigation. He has also put in a crib west of the dam, so that vessels will strike the crib first and avoid the dam. It would be in the interests of navigation to widen out the channel in one or two spots, and that would also give the mills more water.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Has the hon. gentleman inquired into the accuracy of the statement made that about a year ago the department was notified of the liability of a break at this point in the Cornwall canal? It is understood that Captain Donnelly had made that statement.

Mr. GRAHAM. The department are not able to find any such communication. The bank all along certain parts of the canal is a difficult bank to protect, and certain opinions have been expressed verbally, but I never heard any suggestion that there was danger of a break at this particular point.

THANKSGIVING DAY.

Mr. KEMP. A large number of our citizens think it desirable to have Thanksgiving Day on Monday instead of Thursday. Many people would like to visit their friends or relatives at a distance, and on that account would prefer Monday to Thursday. I have in mind particularly the commercial travellers. They are much in favour of the change, because that will enable them to pass the holiday with their families.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We have received representations on this subject from several organizations, especially the commercial travellers. They have been informed officially that this year Thanksgiving Day will be on Monday instead of Thursday.

SLAUGHTER OF HOGS.

Mr. R. BLAIN (Peel). I wish to direct the attention of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) to a matter in connection with his department. During the St. Louis exhibition, held in 1904, two gentlemen from Western Ontario, in connection with their own private business, exhibited hogs at that exhibition. On their return to Canada these hogs were placed in quarantine at Point Edward. While there they were slaughtered under instructions of the department. In the Auditor General's Report of 1906 I find, at page D—10, that Mr. J. E. Brethour, Burford, Ont. received compensation for his eighteen hogs, amounting to $1,533, and that Messrs. Douglas & Sons, Mitchell, Ont. were paid $932 for twelve hogs slaughtered on account of disease. I have before me, in the return brought down, the prices paid. On November 4, 1904, they were slaughtered, and the compensation allowed Mr. Brethour was as follows:

1 boar two years old..	$180
1 boar yearling..	160
1 boar yearling..	80
1 boar under one year..	65
1 boar under one year..	80
1 boar under seven months..	35
1 brood sow..	80
4 yearly sows..	400
3 sows, eight months..	255
2 hogs, eight months..	32
1 hog, eight months (died)..	16
1 sow (died)..	150
	$1,533

This amount was paid to Mr. Brethour by the department on the 5th of April 1905. The department ordered a veterinary surgeon to go to Point Edward and examine the hogs when in quarantine. In a letter to Dr. Rutherford, Director Veterinary General, Ottawa, addressed to him by Mr. Perdue, I find the following:

Chatham, November 24, 1904.

It is a question hard to decide whether the hogs contracted the disease while at St. Louis or at Point Edward. Dr. Brown is of the opinion that these hogs became infected while at St. Louis, as one was coughing when it arrived at Point Edward, and was the first to succumb to the disease. The second hog that died I examined and found one of his lungs almost entirely hepatized.

Mr. Brethour applied for compensation and on December 24, 1904, the Minister of Agriculture wrote him as follows:

Dear Mr. Brethour,—I have yours of December 24 with reference to the hogs slaughtered at the Prince Edward quarantine. I note what you say with regard to the exposure of your hogs and will carefully consider the whole matter with Dr. Rutherford. On the first blush, however, I cannot see any possibility of paying compensation.

Yours very truly,
SYDNEY FISHER.

Although I have the correspondence before me, I shall refrain from putting on 'Hansard' any further extracts from it, as our time is very limited. I now find a list of the hogs owned by Messrs. Douglas & Son. These were the prices paid by the minister for compensation to this firm:

Lady Amherst..	$175
Letty..	125
Blain's last..	160
Maplehurst Queen..	125
Full sister to above..	125
Maplecliff Pointer..	15
Maplehearst Leader..	90
Thoroughbred boar..	45
Thoroughbred boar under 6 months.	30
Thoroughbred boar under 6 months.	30
Store hog..	6
Store hog..	6
	$932

These gentlemen made application to the department for compensation. I have read a letter written by the minister that on

examination of the matter, 'at first blush' he could not find that any compensation was due or could be paid by the department to Mr. Brethour. But in the correspondence I notice a letter from the hon. gentleman who represents South Perth (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) in which one of these gentlemen live. It is as follows:

St. Marys, Ont., December 13, 1904.

Hon. Sydny Fisher,
Minister of Agriculture, Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—Mr. Dunbar has asked me to forward you the inclosed letter from him in reference to a very unfortunate loss of valuable stock that has come to the Messrs. Douglas, who were Canadian exhibitors at the St. Louis fair.

I am not aware of your departmental regulations in regard to the destruction of such diseased animals, and in regard to recouping owners for loss.

The public value of the enterprise the owners had been engaged in, and the special features in connection with the contracting of the disease, would seem to call for the most favourable consideration of the case that you can fairly give.

Yours sincerely,
GILBERT H. McINTYRE.

Messrs. Douglas & Son had their case in the hands of a lawyer, Mr. Dunbar, of Mitchell. He gets in touch with the sitting member of the county who thus writes to the minister on behalf of these gentlemen. And, after some little correspondence—and an alteration in the Act, I may say—compensation at these enormous prices is paid by the minister. I have statements before me from other veterinaries who examined these hogs, and in view of these it seems surprising that compensation should be awarded. On November 3, 1904, a letter was written to Mr. M. B. Perdue, V.S., by Dr. Rutherford in the course of which he says, 'It is very important that the diagnosis should be placed beyond question as the animals are valuable and under the regulations it will be impossible to pay compensation. The director general telegraphed to Arthur Brown, V.S., Sarnia, as follows:

Ottawa, November 3, 1904.

Arthur Brown, V.S.

Keep Douglas hogs strictly isolated. Will send consulting veterinary before ordering slaughter as compensation impossible.

J. G. RUTHERFORD.

I shall not go at length into this case, but I would like to point out what the regulations say as to payment of compensation:

4. Hogs affected with hog cholera or swine plague, or which have been in contact with or close proximity to hogs affected with either of the said diseases should on an order signed by a duly appointed inspector of the Department of Agriculture be forthwith slaughtered and the carcasses disposed of as in such order prescribed.

5. The Minister of Agriculture is hereby authorized to order compensation to be paid to the owners of such hogs at the rate set forth in subsection 2 of section 12 of the Animal Contagious Diseases Act, 1903, as amended by chapter 6 of the Statutes of 1904.

The amended statute provides as follows:

4. In all cases, the value of the animal should be determined by the minister or by some person appointed by him, but should not exceed, in the case of grade animals, one hundred and fifty dollars for each horse, sixty dollars for each head of cattle, and fifteen dollars for each pig or sheep; and in the case of pure-bred animals, three hundred dollars for each horse, one hundred and fifty dollars for each head of cattle, and fifty dollars for each pig or sheep.

So you will see that if compensation was allowed at all under the Act, $50 is the highest price that could be paid by the minister for any hog. In this case the hon. gentleman has paid Messrs Douglas & Son $175 and Mr. Brethour as high as $180.

At this stage of the session, time is so precious that I will not dwell upon the case. I have mentioned the fact to show how some of the money is going. In view of such payments the people will not be surprised that the public expenditure is increasing every year. The Minister of Agriculture is something of a czar in his department; whatever he says must go; if he says the price to be paid is $180 it is paid, even though the regulations and the law say that $50 is the highest price that may be paid. I suppose the minister will answer that these gentlemen were contributing to the public good and adding to the reputation of Canada in respect of swine breeding. Well, these gentlemen are private dealers in western Ontario. The department did not ask them to exhibit their hogs at the St. Louis exhibition as a government exhibit; they sent them of their own free will. The correspondence here points out that hog cholera was to be found at the St. Louis exhibition and one of these lots of hogs was close to swine affected with that disease. Judging from the correspondence I am led to believe that the hogs contracted the disease not at Point Edward in quarantine, but in the St. Louis exhibition. The minister, when the matter was first brought to his attention, said that 'at first blush' compensation could not be given. I do not know how many blushes it took before he felt free to pay these enormous prices. Then, if these gentlemen had a right to compensation, they did not require a lawyer to present their case to the department, nor did they have to ask the influence of the gentleman who represents the county. Why should that hon. gentleman be requested to interfere? Taking it altogether, it seems to me there was party politics in this matter and pay, because of this these gentlemen must be paid their price. I do not know what their politics are—nor do I care; that is not the question before us. But I think the farmers of this country will think that such prices

as $175 are to be regarded as pretty excessive to be paid by the government for compensation for hogs that were sent for exhibition as a private business enterprise. I await an explanation from the Minister of Agriculture of the excessive prices that he has ordered to be paid these gentlemen contrary to his own Act.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). I regret that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) did not give me a little earlier notice of his intention to bring this subject forward. I merely got a slip of paper a few minutes ago that he was going to deal with the subject

Mr. BLAIN. I rather apologize for the short notice.

Mr. FISHER. The consequence is that I cannot answer the details of the case. I regret that, because I am sure there is a sufficient explanation to be given in regard to it. I have some memory of the case, but, not having had the opportunity to refresh my memory by reference to the files of the department, I cannot be sure of the details. The case was a very peculiar one, and that is why, when I first looked into it, I did not know whether there was any possibility of compensation or not. As a matter of fact, Mr. Brethour and Douglas & Sons are well known hog breeders in the western part of Ontario. They were urged, not only by my department, but by the Department of Agriculture of the province of Ontario, to exhibit at the St. Louis exhibition. Efforts were made to get the stock breeders of Canada to do so, and assistance was given to them in taking their stock to St. Louis for the purpose of making a creditable showing of this country in the competition of live stock there. The result was that Canada did make a very creditable showing. My hon. friend said it was a matter of private business. I take exception to that. I think these men were public spirited citizens, and they were urged to take their stock to St. Louis.

Mr. BLAIN. Did the department solicit these gentlemen to exhibit their hogs at St. Louis as a public enterprise ?

Mr. FISHER. Speaking from memory, I have no doubt that they did, though there may be nothing in the correspondence to that effect. At the same time, it is a well known fact that the Live Stock Commissioner of my department at that time went amongst the breeders of Canada and urged their taking part in the St. Louis exhibition, and the department went so far as to offer to pay extra prizes so as to encourage them to do so, and in order to get a creditable exhibit of Canadian live stock at that great exhibition.

Mr. BLAIN. The department did not pay the expenses of taking these hogs to the St. Louis exhibition. Does he say they did ?

Mr. FISHER. I am under the impression that we paid the expenses besides.

Mr. BLAIN. There is not a word about it in the correspondence.

Mr. FISHER. Well, I am speaking from memory. If my hon. friend had given me an opportunity of looking into the matter I would have been better supplied with the facts than I am now. But I do say emphatically that the department did make arrangements by which we added the live stock breeders of Canada in sending their stock to St. Louis ; just to what extent and in what manner I would have to refer to the files of the department to say. My hon. friend is looking up the files, there may be nothing about it there.

Mr. BLAIN. There is a letter addressed to the minister by Mr. Dunbar, the lawyer having charge of this case, who says :

> Had the exhibit been strictly a government exhibit, so that the government would have had charge of the transportation of the animals, I have no doubt that Messrs. Douglas & Sons would be compensated in full.

Mr. FISHER. That is true. But it was not a government exhibit, the government had not charge of the animals ; at the same time the government did assist pecuniarily these gentlemen to send their stock to St. Louis. What my hon. friend says does not in any way militate against my statement. The fact that it does not appear in that file is easily explained. The matter of sending stock to St. Louis was managed by a special officer attached to the St. Louis exhibition staff, and had no concern whatever with the veterinary branch of my department who had to deal with the question of paying compensation for this stock. I fancy that anything concerning that would not appear on those files. I am speaking from memory, but at the same time I am pretty sure that I am correct. However, the hon. gentleman says that these gentlemen were engaged in a private enterprise. They were to the extent that it was their stock they were handling, but I state again that they sent it to St. Louis on the request of the Department of Agriculture of the Dominion, and also the Department of Agriculture of the province of Ontario, who were desirous of seeing Canada well represented at the St. Louis exhibition. Now, so far as concerns the compensation paid, I have not the details, I have not the figures here. I take the figures my hon. friend gave, but I cannot discuss them because I have not got them before me. I can well believe that if more was paid than would have been paid under the ordinary operation of the Contagious Diseases of Animals Act, it was because of the exceptional circum-

stances and the exceptional character of the stock. This stock for which compensation was paid was the stock that practically swept the boards at St. Louis and took the prizes at that great international exhibition.

Mr. BLAIN. Who received the prize money?

Mr. FISHER. The men who owned the stock got the prize money, of course, who else would get it? They sent their stock there, and did a credit to Canada which was of incalculable advantage to the whole stock industry of this country. I do not dispute the figures the hon. gentleman gave me, he need not hold them up, I daresay they are exact. All I say is that I have not been able to verify them. However I accept his statement that those figures are correct, and that the money was paid. But it must have been paid in consequence of the exceptional circumstances and the exceptional character of the stock.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I understood the hon. minister to say that the Ontario government paid part of the compensation to these gentlemen who took the hogs over to St. Louis.

Mr. FISHER. I said nothing of the kind. I said that the Ontario government encouraged these men to send their stock to St. Louis for the purpose of making a creditable representation of Ontario stock, but I did not say that the Ontario government paid any compensation. I do not know whether they did or not, but I do not believe they did, because full compensation appears to have been paid by my department, and I know Mr. Brethour and Douglas & Son well enough to know that they would not ask any other government for compensation after getting it from this government. They are not that kind of men. My hon. friend has spoken about political influence. I believe that the hon. member for the riding of Perth wrote me a letter simply drawing attention to the fact that one of his constituents, or some people whom he knew, had suffered in this way. But there was nothing improper in that letter, nothing of a political nature. It was the kind of a letter that any member of this House ought to write in the interest of his constituents, and if he had not done so at the request of his constituents, he would have been wanting in his duty to the people whom he represents in this House. But so far as politics are concerned, I do not know the politics of Douglas & Sons. I do happen to know the politics of Mr. Brethour, a gentleman of whom I have the highest opinion as a man and as a breeder of hogs, and he is a well known Conservative. He has been asked to be the Conservative candidate in his constituency, in a certain election some years ago. Mr. Brethour was the one who took up this correspondence and dealt with it before Mr. Douglas ever came near us. It was Mr. Brethour who made the first request to the department, it was Mr. Brethour who made the representations to me. It is true that Dougal & Sons were with him, it is true they suffered with him and they got compensation with him. It was Mr. Brethour who came to see me about the matter before the hon. member for Perth ever made any representations to me at all.

Mr. BLAIN. Why was it necessary to place the case in the hands of a lawyer to get compensation if it was so freely given by my hon. friend's department?

Mr. FISHER. I do not know why it was necessary. It was not necessary to put the case in the hands of a lawyer. It would have been considered in exactly the same way if no lawyer had interfered with it. I do not know why Douglas & Sons put it into the hands of a lawyer, and I do not care. Mr. Brethour did not put it into the hands of a lawyer, but came personally to see me about the matter. At my first interview with Mr. Brethour I said: This is an unusual thing, and I will have to look into it carefully to see the exact circumstances of the case before I can pay you any compensation at all. I did look into the circumstances of the case, but as I said, I am speaking from memory and cannot give all the details. Finally it was decided, that, as these gentlemen had suffered a very large pecuniary loss due to the death of their animals by hog cholera, they should be allowed compensation, that compensation was based on the report of one of our own veterinaries and I authorized and agreed to the payment. As for politics entering into it there was nothing of the kind as far as Mr. Brethour is concerned. I do not know anything about the politics of Douglas & Sons as I do not know them personally. I do not know that I had anything to do with them personally, but as Mr. Brethour is a gentleman whom I know as being one of the leading producers of high class hogs, if not the leading producer, and whom I had met over and over again at exhibitions and at live stock conventions, naturally he came personally to me to discuss this heavy loss of his and to ask for compensation. Compensation was ordered to be paid in the ordinary way of business and to suggest that there were any politics in the matter is absolutely out of the question.

Mr. H. S. CLEMENTS (West Kent). I have had the return in my possession for some time, I have gone through it thoroughly and I have drawn my own conclusions from it. The minister is usually of a very kindly disposition and I want to give him credit for

that. But, he seems to have got very wrathy over this return, and it is for that reason that I want to say a word or two. He cannot justify the payment of this compensation in that way. I would be very glad to invite the minister to visit my own district where we have many breeders of high class animals, who have as good a reputation as Mr. Brethour and these other gentlemen spoken of, and yet I can show by this return that these breeders were allowed $6 and $7 each for their high class hogs when they were ordered to be killed by Mr. Perdu. It is simply outrageous that the compensation allowed in this case should have been paid because any gentleman who knows anything about farming never heard of a hog being worth $233.

Mr. McCOLL. Does the hon. gentleman know the price that Mr. Platt of Hamilton gets at public auction for his high class cattle ?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I do not know anything about Mr. Platt of Hamilton.

Mr. McCOLL. These are high class hogs.

Mr. CLEMENTS. You cannot see a solitary thing in any of the correspondence relative to taking these animals to St. Louis.

Mr. FISHER. If my hon. friend is fair he will acknowledge that the correspondence with regard to taking these animals over to St. Louis would not appear in this return because it is in another branch of my department. The statement he is making is a direct insinuation that what I state is not correct.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the hon. gentleman lay that corresepondence on the table of the House ?

Mr. FISHER. I can if the hon. gentleman will give me time.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. Brown, your own veterinary surgeon and inspector at Point Edward, as shown by this return, distinctly states that these gentlemen are not entitled to compensation. That seems to me to be the most direct evidence that this compensation should not have been paid. As far as Mr. Brethour is concerned the taking of these hogs over to St. Louis was a personal matter with himself. He was a breeder seeking a larger market for his stock and I give him credit for having the personal enterprise to go to the St. Louis exhibition. From the evidence of Mr. Brown there is no question that the disease was contracted at St. Louis. It is because of the irregularities of this government that so much loss has been caused to the farmers of western Ontario and so much compensation has been asked for as these irregularities have permitted a large quantity of American pork to come into this country. I censure in the strongest terms possible the action of the Department of Agriculture in authorizing any such payments as these to these gentleman, and I invite the Minister of Agriculture to come to my district at any time and discuss this question.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). What authority had the minister to order the payment as compensation of such a large amount ? We had a case similar to this before the House last session, and in that case the minister refused to order compensation either large or small. The minister is controlled by statutory law the same as any one else. He may think that he is not but he is. The law says that where compensation is given the value of the animal shall be determined but that the conmpensation shall not exceed, in the case of grade animals, a certain amount and, in the case of pure bred animals, $50 for each pig. It would be interesting to know what justification the minister has for the open violation of the law by which he must be controlled the same as any one else in making the compensation larger than the statute provides. Last year I drew to his attention a case in which an animal had been slaughtered because of tuberculosis and in that case there was an absolute refusal to give any compensation though the party could not afford to bear the loss. The animal had been killed in the interest of the health of the community. If these gentlemen were induced to take their hogs to St. Louis for the purpose of representing the country I would naturally expect that they would be dealt with liberally as the circumstances would justify and the provision of the law permit. I would like to hear the minister's reason.

Mr. PATERSON. He has already spoken.

Mr. FOSTER. He has exhausted his reason.

Mr. G. H. McINTYRE (South Perth). I was not in the House at the time that my hon. friend from Peel introduced this matter but I heard a reference to a letter that I had written to the department. I am not aware that the hon. member for Peel has criticised that letter in its form or spirit and I can see no good reason why it should be criticised because it appears to me to be a perfectly natural letter for a member of parliament to write to a minister on an appeal from any one in his riding. It is three and a half years since I wrote it, but, as I recollect it, it conveys exactly what it was intended to convey. I do not think it was intended to convey any political meaning or bias. I know of no political reason why I should aid the Messrs. Douglas whom I did not know at all and about whom at this stage I knew nothing. In this I simply did as every member of this House would do, and all I can say to the hon. member for Peel is that whenever his hogs may be sick

or die and I can do him any good I will only be too glad to do so.

Mr. BLAIN. I will send for you because you can be more influential than I could be.

Mr. G. H. McINTYRE. I have never endeavoured to antagonize the minister. I will extend the same offer to the hon. member for Kent; I will be glad to aid him in the same way.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister ought to give some reply.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. member (Mr. Sproule) is perhaps not aware that I have spoken already, that the Speaker is in the chair and that I am not authorized to speak again any more than any other hon. gentleman is.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the House will grant you that grace.

SALE OF INDIAN LANDS.

Mr. A. C. BOYCE (West Algoma). I propose to refer briefly to the sale of a large block of land in the townships of Fisher, Haviland and Tilley, in the district of Algoma, by the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, on or about April 24, 1900. Presumably this sale was made under the Indian land regulations. The regulation under which it is stated the sale was made reads as follows:

Section 6. The above regulations as to occupation and improvement shall not apply to any lands in respect of which the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, has received a report, sworn to by a competent, reliable and disinterested person appointed by the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs to examine such lands that the same are in whole or for the most part unfit for cultivation. In the case of such lands the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs may dispose of the same or of the timber or other valuables thereon or therein to the best possible advantage in the interest of the Indians without reference to occupation or improvement.

Under that section and by agreement entered into between the Superintendent Genral of Indian Affairs and the purchasers on or about April 24, 1900, but not carried out by grant of the Crown until September, 1906, the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs sold to three gentlemen who certainly were not unfriendly to the government and particularly to the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs at that time, the present member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), 29,301 acres of lands in those townships at the very moderate price of $9,017.50. The names of the purchasers are: W. F. Wilson, sometime of Berlin, sometime of Brandon, Manitoba; A. E. Philp, solicitor and barrister of Brandon, and D. Anson Ressor of Brandon, Manitoba. I wish to point out the conditions in regard to valuation. A valuator is to be appointed to report upon lands which are to be sold in this way and that valuator is to have the qualifications named in section 6, namely, he is to be competent, reliable and above all disinterested, and upon the report of such a man the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs may, in his discretion, sell the lands.

The first episode in this extraordinary transaction is a letter from A. H. Gale who hails from and describes himself as of Oxford, England. That letter reads:

Toronto, July 25, 1899.

Wm. Van Abbott, Esq.,
Agent Indian Affairs, Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario.

Sir,—I desire to purchase under section 6 of the land regulations the following Indian lands:

All sections in the townships of Ley, Haviland, Tilley, Fisher, Herrick and Palmer; also sections in Batchawana island. Also all sections in the west half of the townships of Tupper and Archibald, and all of the unoccupied lands in the townships of Kars, Fenwick, Pennefather and Dennis, and the west half of the township of Vankoughnet, all of the said lands being Indian lands and in the province of Ontario, at a price to be fixed by valuation of government valuator and upon such terms and regulations as your government may provide for the sale of the same.

I have the honour to be,
Your obedient servant,
A. H. GALE,
Oxford, England.

Please send reply, if any, to Brandon, Manitoba, care of W. F. Wilson.

It is to be noticed that this gentleman comes from Oxford, England, writes from Toronto and gives his address as Brandon in care of W. F. Wilson. That letter is received by the Indian agent and forwarded to the Department of the Interior where it is filed. Nothing more takes place until March 19, 1900, under which date this letter appears:

Brandon, March 19, 1900.

James A. Smart, Esq.,
Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, Ottawa.

Dear Mr. Smart,—I inclose application to purchase certain hardwood timber lands in the Batchawana bay district, Lake Superior, under section 6 of the regulations, and as myself and associates are very anxious——

Mark the words:

—are very anxious to establish a sawmill in that district, I would be very much obliged if you would take hold of the matter and put it through at your earliest possible convenience. I have been over the ground, and find there will be no difficulty in establishing, by the report and affidavits of men in the Goulais bay district, who are the nearest to this district, and who know the ground, that the lands we are after are unfit for settlement and that it would be most expedient as a matter of public policy to allow of our application being granted.

There is a family, called McCaulay, settled in the Goulais bay district who are the nearest settlers to the land wanted and who are wood rangers, and have acted in different capacities for the government, who are in a position to give an accurate report and valuation of the lands. The elder McCaulay acted for the government as foreman or inspector, during the construction of the Sault Ste. Marie canal, and one of the sons is an expert wood ranger, and has been employed as wood ranger and timber inspector both by the government and by private lumber companies, and the report of either of these men would we believe be reliable.

I further think that we could have a petition signed by every settler in the Goulais bay district asking that the government grant our request, and should you think it advisable will proceed to obtain it at once.

Kindly let us hear from you in this matter at your earliest convenience and oblige.

Yours truly,
W. F. WILSON.

That accompanies the application. I would emphasize these features in the transaction, first that this gentleman wants to purchase hardwood timber, that he is anxious, nay he is very anxious to establish a saw-mill in the district at the very earliest possible moment, that he has been over the ground and that it would be expedient, as a matter of public policy, to grant the application as soon as possible and that the settlers in the district are favourable to it and would petition for it if a petition was asked for.

I further refer to the extraordinary feature of that letter accompanying the application, namely, that the purchaser, the applicant for the land, nominates or suggests to the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs the person who is to value the land under section 6. The application is as follows :

Jas. A. Smart, Esq.,
Superintendent General of Indian Affairs,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Sir,—Myself and associates are anxious to establish a mill for the sawing and manufacturing of hardwood in the Batchawana bay district, Lake Superior, and from a personal examination of the district we find:

1. That there are absoluetly no settlers in the district and no lands have been taken up for settlement, or sold.

2. That the lands in the said district for the most part are unfit for settlement.

3. And that such lands as might upon examination prove fit for settlement are inaccessible for present markets.

4. That there is no pulpwood of any value on the lands proposed to be selected.

5. That the lands proposed to be purchased are now covered by timber license in the name of the St. Maurice Lumber Company expiring on April 30 next.

6. That the St. Maurice Lumber Company has been merged in the business of the International Paper Company of New York.

7. That neither the International Paper Company or the St. Maurice Lumber Company have ever built or operated a saw-mill upon the said limit and have no saw-mill in Canada manufacturing or for the purpose of manufacturing the timber upon the said lands.

8. That we find that the International Paper Company cut a quantity of birch logs on the island in Batchawana bay and had them towed to a mill in the United States, there to be converted into lumber.

9. That if myself and associates are granted the privilege of purchasing the lands or portions thereof hereinafter mentioned under section 6 of the regulations for the disposal of Indian lands we will establish a saw-mill at a point on Batchawana bay with a capacity of from three to five million feet per annum, and will further place a number of settlers upon such lands in the said district as shall be found fit upon examination for settlement under section 9 of said regulation (order in council) June 7, 1888.

10. That the establishment of a saw-mill and plant on Batchawana bay would prove a great boon to the settlers of Goulais bay and to those whom we might place on the lands in the said district and the carrying trade of the upper lakes.

11. That no hardwood timber has ever been cut on the said district.

12. That the majority of the said hardwood consists of maple and birch and the large part of the timber trees are very old and many have already commenced to decay and unless the same are cut within the next few years much merchantable timber will be lost.

13. That we would ask you to appoint a person to report upon the said lands hereinafter mentioned, in accordance with the provisions of section 6 with a view to our purchasing the same.

The following are the lands proposed to be purchased in whole or in part, in quantities, in accordance with section 1 of the regulations, or settlers placed thereon where the lands are suitable for settlement. The townships of Haviland and Fisher, and the most western sections of the township of Tilley.

W. F. WILSON.

There are some extraordinary features about that application. It is an application formal in its nature, of which the letter which I have read is not intended to form a part, and sets out the conditions on which the superintendent general is invited to sell these lands, the main features of which are the development of the district and the improvement of the conditions of the settlers in the neighbourhood. He sets out that the lumber companies that have been operating there have not been establishing any saw-mills, but that on the contrary they have had the logs towed to a mill in the United States, to be there converted into lumber, inferentially commenting very severely on that method, and suggesting that if he and his associates are granted these lands, they will adhere to the manufacturing conditions, establish a mill, and place a large number of settlers on the land. Then the application asks the government formally to appoint a valuator, and in the letter which accompanies that application the prospec-

tive purchaser asks that McAuley, either father or son, be appointed the independent valuator under the regulations. That application goes into the department on the 19th of March; it is acknowledged on the 27th of March; and while it is under consideration there is evidently communication between the applicant, the prospective purchaser, and this disinterested valuator who is to be appointed by the government. I refer to the following letter:

Goulais Bay, April 3, 1900.

W. F. Wilson,
Brandon, Manitoba.

Dear Sir,—I received your letter and in reply would say, the parties who hold the timber license have taken the present winter all the pulpwood off that portion of land that you were looking after around Batchawana bay.

In regard to the petition it seems to me unnecessary as it is outside of the settlement. However, if the petition is needed I am at your service.

Hoping you will succeed in the undertaking.

I remain yours truly,
A. McAULEY.

The application was under consideration by the superintendent general of Indian Affairs, and here is the purchaser in correspondence with the valuator to be appointed by the government, employing that valuator in conjunction with the obtaining of a petition, the valuator offering to get the petition to accompany and support the application of the purchaser, and expressing the hope that the purchaser will succeed in the undertaking. That letter by some means or other is in the possession of the Department of Indian Affairs. A report is made upon the matter on the 29th of March, 1900, signed by W. A. Orr. I will not weary the House by reciting the whole of that report, but I will extract portions of it:

Section 6 of the land regulations makes provision for having land reported unfit for settlement examined and authorizes the superintendent general to dispose of such land with the timber thereon to the best possible advantage in the interest of the Indians without reference to occupation and improvements.

He thinks Mr. Wilson's application is worthy of very favourable consideration, and he recommends that the lands be offered to Mr. Wilson and his associates on the following conditions:

1. The lands and timber thereon to be explored and valuated by a competent valuator under oath and payment therefor, other than pine and spruce, to be made in cash at the time of sale at the value placed thereon.

2. Sections and broken sections reported for the whole or most part fit for settlement to be subject to the following settlement duties—One settler to be placed upon each section or broken section, a house at least 18 x 24 feet to be erected thereon and occupied for three years, and five acres in every hundred, or in that proportion, to be cleared and cultivated.

3. Sections or broken sections reported unfit for or for the most part unfit for settlement, not to be subject to settlement duties.

4. The sale to be made subject to the existing timber license covering the lands as regards pine and spruce which timber may be cut and removed by licensees within three years from date of sale provided the license is yearly renewed.

5. Pine and spruce not removed by licensees within three years, to be paid for by purchaser of land at value placed thereon by valuator.

6. The purchasers to establish a saw-mill at a point on Batachawana bay with a capacity of from three to five million feet per annum, and to give Indians the preference in employment of labour, when found suitable for the work to be performed.

7. All minerals, precious and base, to be reserved from sale, as well as the right to work mines and remove the mineral.

8. Letters patent to be issued after the expiration of three years from date of sale, upon proof being furnished of the due fulfilment of all conditions.

I commend that last clause to the attention of the hon. Minister of the Interior. This report closes with the recommendation that Mr. McAuley might, as suggested by Mr. Wilson, the purchaser, be instructed to make the valuation. The superintendent general of Indian Affairs thought that he was fulfilling his obligation and the requirements of his solemn trust under section 6 of the regulations, by appointing, as a competent and reliable and above all disinterested person to report on those lands, the man who it was shown was in correspondence with the purchaser, and appointing him while he was employed by the purchaser and doing his work in conjunction with this very application, and who was recommended by the purchaser. Mr. McAuley's letter was before the department at that time, filed there before any offer was made by the department to Mr. Wilson to sell these lands. The land was offered to Mr. Wilson in the following letter:

Department of Indian Affairs,
Ottawa, April 18, 1900.

Sir,—In further reference to your letter of the 19th ultimo, inclosing an application to purchase certain lands in the Batchawana district, I am directed to inform you that the department is prepared to sell you the undisposed of lands in the townships of Haviland (except part on Batchewaugn Island), Fisher and the nine westerly sections of Tilley, on the following conditions:—

1. The lands and timber thereon to be explored and valued by a competent valuator under oath, and payment therefor other than pine and spruce, to be made in cash at the time of sale at the value placed thereon.

2. Sections and broken sections reported for the whole or most part fit for settlement to be subject to the following settlement duties: One settler to be placed on each section or broken section, a house at least 18 x 24 feet, to be erected thereon and occupied for three years, and five acres in every hundred, or in that proportion to be cleared and cultivated.

3. Sections or broken sections reported unfit or for the most part unfit for settlement not to be subject to settlement duties.

4. The sale to be made subject to the existing timber license covering the lands as regards pine and spruce, which timber may be cut and removed by licensees within three years from date of sale, provided the license is yearly renewed.

5. Pine and spruce not removed by licensees within three years to be paid for by the purchaser of land at value placed thereon by valuator.

6. The purchaser to establish a saw-mill at a point on Batchewana bay with a capacity of from three to five million feet per annum, and to give Indians a preference in the employment of labour when found suitable for the work to be performed.

7. All minerals, precious and base, to be reserved from sale as well as the right to work mines and remove the mineral.

8. Letters patent to be issued after the expiration of three years from date of sale, upon proof being furnished of the fulfilment of all conditions.

9. The purchaser to pay proportionate amount of cost of valuation for the land found to be unfit for settlement.

Will you be good enough to advise the department whether or not you and your associates are willing to purchase under the conditions above named.

I may say as regards condition nine, that the practice of the department has been to require a deposit to cover the cost of valuation of land under section 6 of the regulations.

Your obedient servant,
J. D. McLEAN,
Secretary.

Here is the answer:

Brandon, Manitoba, April 24, 1900.

J. D. McLean, Esq.,
Secretary Department of Indian Affairs,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—I have your communication of 18th instant and would say that myself and associates are prepared to complete on the terms outlined therein.

We take it, however, that the valuator appointed will have as his basis of valuation the present price of Dominion and Ontario government of like kind in the same district.

Would like to have valuator make his examination at an early date. Would like to be advised about that date as we would like to have a man go over the land with him.

I am your obedient servant,
W. F. WILSON.

Just as if the purchaser had not got sufficient of his own way when he secured the appointment of a man interested in seeing that he succeeded in his application, he must also have knowledge of the time when the valuator would go over these lands in order that he might have another of his friends to accompany the valuator and keep the latter within the line of instructions given by the purchaser.

The next in order is the question of valuation. It is important to see what this valuation consisted of. Well, the result of the valuation was this:

	Acres.	
Township of—		
Haviland..	10,701	$3,681 70
Fisher..	13,358	4,397 05
Tilley..	5,242	1,909 00
Total..	29,301	$9,987 75

Let me refer to the report upon this valuation by Mr. Orr of the department, dated 17th November, 1900. The terms of the sale were completed by the acceptance of the 24th April, 1900. The pretended valuation went on, and there is a memo. given by Mr. W. A. Orr to the department under date the 17th November upon the whole matter, from which I extract the following:

Mr. Agent Van Abbott, in his letter of the 31st ultimo, reports that he had a conversation with Mr. Thomas Bishop, foreman in the International Lumber Company, the timber licensees, regarding the quantities of timber on the land in question, and the estimate given by Mr. Bishop is very largely in excess of that reported by Mr. McAuley, as shown by statement attached hereto, but as Mr. Bishop's estimate is not under oath I do not think it should be taken as against Mr. McAuley's sworn statement.

He asks that Mr. Wilson be now advised that the department will sell the land on these terms. Here is a man, Mr. Thomas Bishop, foreman of the International Lumber Company, a man of great experience, a man who has worked on these very limits for several years—and the department was told, before that report, by a letter from the Indian agent, dated 31st October, 1900, in which he says that Mr. Bishop has worked on these limits for several years. Bishop's estimate of the value of the timber was far in excess of this so-called disinterested valuation. The department made the sale to Wilson for the lower amount, upon the paltry, flimsy pretext that because Mr. Bishop's statement was not on oath and Mr. McAulay's was, they would prefer Mr. McAulay's valuation. It never seemed to occur to these officials of the Indian Department that in order to make this purchaser pay a fair value they might have sent out, at a little expense, and got an affidavit from Mr. Bishop. That never occurred to the department, or if it did occur they paid no heed. They did not want to get any affidavit, because they wanted to favour the purchasers who were trying to get the land at the most nominal value and then get rid of all the conditions on which they had agreed to purchase it.

Another strange feature about the valuation is that unfortunately all Mr. McAulay's books and notes in connection with this marvellous valuation suddenly became lost. That is reported to the department by the Indian agent on the 27th October, 1905. All the notes and memo. upon which this interested valuator, nominated by the purchaser, made this wonderful valuation,

were lost, destroyed by fire or in some other way unexplained, whether from accident or motive of expediency, the House can best judge.

The department had the lowest possible valuation placed upon that land. There is no man of any experience in that country that I have seen who has not said that it is a shame and a disgrace for the government that that land was sold, even under those conditions with regard to the development of the neighbouring country, conditions by which the farmers and the settlers would get an advantage in the opening of that country. Even under those conditions, I have heard it said by many competent to give an opinion that it was a shame and disgrace that so little was got for that splendid acreage. In the township of Tilley——

Mr. JOHNSTON. Louder.

Mr. BOYCE. Considering the source from which the interruption comes I will not regard it. I will say that I am trying to be as brief as possible and if the hon. member will not interrupt me except when it is really desirable, I will be obliged to him. In the township of Tilley, section 7, containing 646 acres, was estimated by the valuator at $425, with all the timber on it. The department sold it at $388. Section 8, containing 637 acres, was valued at $267; the department sold it at $262.50. Section 9 was valued at $247.50 and was sold by the department at $209.50. Section 18, containing 317 acres was valued at $111 and sold at $91. Section 4, containing 647 acres, was valued at $285 and sold at $190. Section 5, containing 644 acres, valued at $212.50 was sold at $175. Section 6, stated by the valuator to contain 565 acres, was valued at $206, but the department sold that section containing 644 acres at $169; so that upon that section there were 79 more acres and yet it was sold at $37 less than the value put upon it by the valuators. The same thing runs through a good many of the lands which I have cursorily touched upon. Let me call the attention of the minister to one particularly significant circumstance. In the same township the s.w.¼ of the n.w.½ of section 17 and the w½ of the s.w.¼ of section 17, containing 40 acres, realized about $4 an acre to this department. But when the valuator for the purchases by Mr. Wilson and his very acceptable associates valued a portion of the same section, all he could see of the value was 34 cents an acre. A great deal of time elapsed in correspondence with the department. Mr. Wilson was not as brisk as he might have been at the first in completing the purchase at the valuation, and we find that the department had to ask several times for him to exercise some haste in closing up the matter. It will be noted that on the 20th of April, 1900, Mr. Wilson writes to the department and asks to hasten the application as he desires to attend to the erection of the mill. This is before the application is accepted. A part of the amount, the sum of $500 on account of purchase is paid on the 5th of May, 1900. After the valuation is made, Mr. Wilson seems to be thinking the matter over very seriously and the department is reminding him about it. On the 24th of June, 1901, Mr. Orr, of the department, reported that the land had been sold to Mr. Wilson and had been withdrawn from sale with a view to allowing Mr. Wilson to bring the whole question of his application before the minister, and it was understood from him when he was in Ottawa in the preceding February that the purchaser proposed bringing it to the attention of the minister. On the 25th of June, 1901, the department wrote to Mr. Wilson that unless action was taken to comply with the terms of sale the department would have to take into consideration the placing of the lands again in the hands of local agents. On the 29th of June, 1901, Mr. Wilson writes to the department that he is advising with his associates and will write later. On the 19th of August, 1901, a memo. is made by Mr. Orr in regard to an application from Mr. Wilson to be relieved of a portion of these lands, reported to be unfit for settlement. This is accepted, the memo of 19th August reading in this way:

> Approved on the grounds that the land is fit for settlement and adjoining settled portions of the township. It is understood that this matter will be disposed of in the course of a couple of months.

Taking into consideration that the transaction was not closed until some time in the year 1906, five years afterwards, this memo seems extraordinary.

At one o'clock, House took recess.

House resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. BOYCE. When you left the chair at one o'clock, I was proceeding to show that after the valuation had been made, the department was urging the purchasers to complete the sale in terms of the application by payment of the purchase money immediately after valuation. In a number of letters which I will not read at length, the purchasers were urged by the department to close. On December 6, 1901, a memorandum was sent to the department by Mr. Orr saying the matter had stood for a considerable time, and should be closed at an early date. On December 7, 1901, the department wrote to Mr. Wilson, the purchaser, that it would hold the application in abeyance two months. That is from December 7, 1901, to February 7, 1902. Immediately after that, an application was made for the same land, or a portion of the same land, by another purchaser who proposed to establish a hardwood industry in that district,

but he was told the land was not open for sale. Then the same delay goes on down to February 13, 1902, when the department again urged the purchaser to close the transaction; again on June 20, 1902, when the department urged that the transaction be closed. On June 24, 1902, the purchaser wrote that he was ill, but he would be able shortly to lay the matter before his associates at Brandon and have it closed. On January 12, 1903, the department again wrote to Wilson urging that the sale be closed up, and received the reply that he had been again away from home for a couple of weeks, and that when he returned he would take the matter up with his Brandon associates and have it closed at the earliest possible moment. I mention these dates for a reason. Something was going on during the time that the purchaser appeared to be doing nothing, and while the department was urging him to close by fulfilling the conditions. Now we come down to January, 1903. Up to that time the purchaser had been paying money in instalments on account of the land, and on May 29, 1903, he had so far completed this purchase that he only owed the department, exclusive of interest, about $500. On May 29, 1903, there comes a letter from Mr. Wilson, the purchaser, to the department which explains what has been going on in the meantime, and his reluctance to close.

Berlin, Ontario, May 29, 1903.

J. D. McLean,
Secretary Indian Affairs.

Dear Sir,—In reference to your letter to me of April 18, 1900——

That is the original offer of sale.

—would beg to submit that owing to the said lands in Haviland, Fisher and Tilley townships being very lightly timbered and the lands so rough and mountainous, it is practically impossible to get enough timber within reasonable hauling distance at any point on the said lands to warrant the erection of a permanent saw-mill, and would respectfully submit that clause 6 with reference to the erection of a saw-mill capable of cutting three to five million feet of timber per year, be withdrawn. The labour in lumbering, especially in a rough country like that, and in hardwood which cannot be floated down the streams, consists chiefly in getting out logs to the shore. A very safe proportion of the outlay would be 75 to 90 per cent for cutting and hauling the logs to the shore, and the balance for labour in the saw-mill cutting them into lumber. The only way I see it possible to take out timber without loss is either to put in a small portable mill that can be moved from place to place on the shore, or make the logs into rafts and tow them to a place like the Soo to be sawn into lumber.

Trusting that you will see your way clear to abrogate clause 6 so I will be able to work the land without loss.

Yours truly,
W. F. WILSON.

Now, Sir, what a farce is that letter. Note the first part of it, 'owing to the lands being lightly timbered and so rough and mountainous.' Refer back to his original proposition to the department to purchase those lands where he says that he has been over the lands and examined them, and he is very anxious indeed to establish a mill for the cutting of hardwood. It is his own proposition to establish a saw-mill on those lands capable of cutting 3,000,000 to 5,000,000 feet of lumber a year. Then it will be observed that he still suggests that he desires to work those lands, but that he desires to work them without loss. The correspondence shows that at the time he wrote this letter he had absolutely no idea whatever of working the lands, and in my judgment, from a careful perusal of the correspondence, I do not believe he ever had any idea of working those lands or of complying with the conditions imposed by the department; and I believe from the same examination that the department, that the officers of the department, that the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs at that time, now the hon. member for Brandon, knew that the purchaser had no intention whatever of complying with these conditions, and that he only made them in order to give face to his application. That was dealt with by the department in this way. On June 20, 1903, Mr. Orr again made a memorandum to the department upon the letter just read, in which he suggests that if the permanent saw-mill clause is to be abrogated, that the suggestion of the purchaser be accepted, and that the following clause be added:

The purchaser to place and operate a portable saw-mill of large size on the lands purchased and to give Indians a preference in the employment of labour, when found suitable for the work to be performed.

Paring down the most important condition on which the land was sold. The condition suggested by the purchaser himself was communicated to him by Mr. Frank Pedley on the 22nd day of June, 1903, and in the same letter he is asked to pay the balance of the purchase money. I propose that we shall look behind the scenes and see what this purchaser did. He was under an obligation to plant an industry on this land which would be good for the district, good for the workman and good for the farmer, and I propose to show how anxious he was later on to remove these conditions and get the land freed from them. He says in his application that there was an American firm in there, that they were exporting logs and he asserted that if he and his associates had the property they would establish a sawmill and comply with the manufacturing conditions, so that the settlers as well as the Indians would have the benefit of a hardwood manufacturing industry on this land. What was he doing in the meantime? I refer to a letter, dated September 17, 1903, which reads as follows:

Chicago, September 17, 1903.

To the hon.
Minister of Crown Lands,
Toronto, Canada.

Dear Sir,—A gentleman by the name of Wilson living in Berlin, Ontario, wishes to sell us 26,000 acres of timber lands as per the inclosed map, lands being shown inside the red lines. The owner represents that the logs from this timber can be exported into the United States without export duties or timber dues of any kind from the Canadian government. I desire confirmation of that statement from your department and will be very much obliged if you will inclose same and forward to me by return mail in inclosed envelope and at the same time inclose the blue print which I hand you herewith. I desire your answer at the earliest moment possible and would be pleased with your prompt attention.

Yours very truly,
W. S. JOHNSON.

During the time that this purchaser was trying to get the mill clause abrogated it is shown by this letter that he was offering to sell the land to American firms and representing to them that the logs could be exported from Canada to the United States free of duty to the Canadian government, representing that he could avoid all manufacturing conditions and that he could avoid the very conditions upon which alone he could hope to get a patent of this land. That shows that the purchaser knew what the department was doing before the department had made any ruling whatever about this mill. Before he had accepted or rejected the alternative proposition of the department as to the erection of a portable mill in lieu of a permanent mill this gentleman knew what he could do with the department, he knew that he held some one in the department, perhaps at the top of the department, by the nose and he had confidence enough to go upon the American market and offer this tract of 20,000 acres free from all conditions, undertaking to say that there would be no export duty on logs to the Canadian government. That letter was written to the Minister of Crown Lands, Toronto, and forwarded to the Department of the Interior and, by the Department of the Interior, to the Indian Lands Department. It will be noted that the letter is dated on the 17th September. On the 19th September, just two days after the date of that letter, the purchaser replies to the letter to which I have referred, the letter of June 22, which is as follows :

Berlin, Ontario, September 19, 1903.

J. D. McLean, Esq.,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Sir,—Referring to letter of June 22, signed by the deputy superintendent general of Indian Affairs offering a substitution for clause 6 of the original agreement of sale for lands in Haviland, Fisher and Tilley, would say I am very much disappointed in the terms of the same. I have delayed commenting on it till I could see Mr. A. E. Philp, of Brandon, who tells me you assured him that by proper representation of the case you would abrogate clause 6. If he has misunderstood you and it is impossible to do away with clause 6 it simply means that we have thrown away our money. I inclose two letters that speak for themselves. Cedar is the timber of most value at the present time and what we based our hopes on mostly. Kindly advise me if there is not some way of abrogating clause 6 so as to give us a chance to work the lands in such a way as not to make a loss.

Yours truly,
W. F. WILSON.

On the same day a letter was written by the purchaser to the department in which he asks just exactly what the Chicago man to whom the land had been offered asks. He asks if the department would kindly inform him if there is any export duty on logs, timber or tan bark, or any other regulation prohibiting the export of timber from Indian lands to the United States. A reply to Mr. Johnson's letter is sent by Mr. Pedley :

Ottawa, September 22, 1903.

Dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 17th instant, which was transmitted to this department by the assistant commissioner of Crown lands, relative to certain lots in the townships of Fisher, Haviland and Tilley which, you state, Mr. Wilson, of Berlin, Ontario, is desirous of selling to you and requesting information as to whether the timber can be exported to the United States free of duty.

In reply I have to state that Mr. Wilson has not completed the sale made to him, and, therefore, the patent for these lands has not been issued.

I inclose for your information a copy of the order in council of April 19, 1901, imposing 'the manufacturing conditions,' which will show the kinds of timber subject to the condition that it shall be manufactured in Canada, also the blue print which you asked to have returned.

Your obedient servant,
FRANK PEDLEY,
Deputy Superintendent General Indian Affairs.

W. S. Johnson, Esq.,
138 Washington street,
Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.

Let us see for a moment what that means. What is there included in these words, the 'kinds of timber subject to the conditions'? Here is the Department of Indian Affairs with its superintendent general, its deputy superintendent general, and all the officers of the department presumably watching the interests and carrying out the duties of their respective positions ; they have a contract entered into which requires the manufacture of this timber into lumber in Canada, that the purchaser shall establish a mill for that purpose of a certain capacity, that he shall employ the Indians where possible and that he shall plant settlers on the land. Notice is given to the department that the pur-

chaser is not complying with these conditions, that he is trying to abrogate them and that while the abrogation of the clause is under consideration by the department you have the department notified that this man is offering for sale in the United States the very same land free from all conditions which would prevent the export of logs to the United States. Would you say, Mr. Speaker, that that was a provident transaction entered into by a watchful, vigilant and honest Superintendent General of Indian Affairs? I think not. I think if the Minister of Interior of that time who occupied the position of Superintendent General of Indian Affairs had been honestly desirous of properly performing the duties of his department, if he had been desirous of maintaining the position of this government as trustee of the Indians, if he had been desirous of carefully guarding the interests of the district in which these lands were located, of the settlers and of those who were to get the benefits from the fulfilment of these conditions, from the establishment of that mill, he, when he got that letter, first, asking for the abrogation of the mill clause, and, secondly, followed by the letter from the Chicago man when the land was offered to him free from any conditions, would have said: Mr. Purchaser, you cannot have this land except upon the conditions stated in the application.

Would he not, had he desired honestly to adhere to the contract, itself, have notified the Chicago man at the same time that he told him the purchaser had not received his patent, that the patent could only issue and that the agreement was on condition that the mill should be erected and the logs cut into lumber in Canada and that the conditions of the agreement on which alone the land could be patented were such as to prohibit the export of timber from those limits in the log? But what of the regulations themselves? Here is an order in council dated April 9, 1901—a very significant date in connection with this transaction. The transaction was entered into in the latter part of 1900, and all this time the purchasers were being pressed to pay their money, the valuation had been made and the department was anxious to have it completed. It is shown by later correspondence that the land was offered for sale to American firms, that it was being held purely for speculative purposes, and we find on April 19, 1901, His Excellency in Council assenting to an order fixing manufacturing conditions on timber cut on Indian reserves and Indian lands in Ontario. These regulations are signed by His High Mightiness, Clifford Sifton, Superintendent General of Indian Affairs. I shall not read the conditions. They refer first to pine and second to spruce or other soft wood trees or timber. Whenever other wood than pine is mentioned, the regulations are careful to mention soft wood trees or timber not being pine. The regulations are careful not to mention but to except anything in the nature of hard wood, and hard wood is the very timber which was on this land and an industry for the manufacture of which it was a condition precedent to this application these purchasers should establish upon this land. The deputy was notified by Mr. Wilson that he would consent to nothing, that he would consent only to the employment of Indians at the current rate of wages if it was found they were suitable. The result of it was that the clause containing the manufacturing conditions and provision for the establishment of a mill was abrogated and struck out of the contract.

On November 5, 1903, Wilson says:

> I presume now that the saw-mill clause is arranged that there will be no objection to issuing the patent for the lands.

In the same letter he says:

> The matter of issuing patent for the lands was discussed between Mr. McLean and Mr. Philip some time since and Mr. McLean was favourable to it.

He gets a reply from McLean, who evidently is desirous of fulfilling his duty as acting deputy Superintendent of Indian Affairs. The letter is dated November 27, 1903:

> Sir,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 25th instant, regarding the issue of patent for lands applied for you in the Batchawana bay district and in reply would call your attention to the last paragraph of letter addressed to you on the 2nd instant, from which you will see that there is still a balance of purchase money due and unpaid of $415.80. Upon payment of the above sum a sale will be duly made in accordance with the conditions specified in letter addressed to you on the 18th April, 1900, varied only as regards clause 6 and under which arrangement letters patent can only issue after expiration of three years from date of sale, upon due fulfilment of all conditions.
>
> (Sgd.) J. D. McLEAN.

Section 6 of the regulations having been abrogated, the next step is to pare down the conditions with regard to existing timber licenses. The purchaser then sets himself assiduously to work to get rid of the conditions and finally succeeds in getting rid of the conditions which make his purchase subject to any timber license.

Then the purchaser and his friends seem to have become anxious, as on March 11, 1905, A. E. Philp, one of the associates of the purchaser and one of the guarantees of this land by patent from the Crown, was in Ottawa. Here is a letter from him:

> Brandon, Manitoba, March 11, 1905.
>
> Frank Pedley, Esq.,
> Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, Ottawa.
>
> Dear Sir,—With further regard to our conversation regarding this matter would point

out that I was correct in stating that the clause relating to a saw-mill had been entirely eliminated. I wrote Mr. Wilson regarding this and he had forwarded a copy of your letter to him of 6th November, 1903, which I inclose and which you will see disposes of that question.

Now regarding the lessees, I trust you will be able to advise me that the solicitor general holds that your notice to quit was sufficient and that patent will issue.

The purchaser has been anxious up to this time that the patent should be delayed, but now Wilson is very hostile over the delay in closing.

He insists that when he paid, he paid his money to the department some three years or more ago, he paid it in full of the amount due on Haviland township, and that the patent in any event should issue for that portion.

Yours truly,

A. E. PHILP.

What that gentleman wants now is a patent from the Crown, if it is for only a portion of this land, anything for a patent. The political situation at this time seems to be significant. I find that on March 1, 1905, the Hon. Clifford Sifton, then occupying the position of Minister of the Interior, and Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, found it necessary to resign from that high office in emphasizing those high and lofty principles of public morality and public rectitude which it is said have always dominated his career. He resigned his portfolio and at once these purchasers became frenzied with anxiety to get their patents and to get the lands at once out of the hands of the Crown. So soon as this mighty king who had dominated the Department of the Interior during the preceding years was about to abdicate his throne, these gentlemen were evidently afraid that there might rise up in the department another king 'which knew not Joseph.' Well, Sir, they did not get their patent just then, and they were somewhat disappointed at not getting it. There was some little question as to the delay which was occasioned by the purchaser whittling away at these conditions. However, the matter was referred to the Department of Justice, not upon the question of interest, but upon the question of the timber limit. On the 14th of April, 1905, Mr. Philp was again in Ottawa, and it is a far cry from Brandon to Ottawa. In March and April he was down twice to get the patent for these lands and to hurry it up, and on the 14th of April the department writes to the Deputy Minister of Justice stating:

Mr. Philp, of Brandon, called at the department to-day and was very anxious to have an early reply as to the decision of the Department of Justice in that matter.

Well, the Department of Justice gave a decision with regard to the timber limit, and at the same time drew the attention of the Indian Department to the fact that this sale had been made on the 24th of April, 1900, and that interest must be paid on the purchase money. The result of that was that Mr. Orr makes another memorandum on the 28th of April, in which he says:

The other conditions of sale having been complied with——

Although they had not been complied with at the time.

—the purchasers would appear entitled to receive letters patent for the land, reserving minerals, upon payment or remission of above interest and of the value of pine and spruce.

And a memorandum is sent to the purchaser saying that he owed to the department $1,167.32, balance of interest on purchase money—that during the time he was delaying he should pay interest on his purchase money. It appeared to be a considerable delay that the department was subjected to; but Wilson, at the same time, objects, and the result is that my hon. friend, the present Minister of the Interior, possibly with not a very careful examination of the file, possibly upon some one else's recommendation, possibly upon the statement of some one else whose word he was obliged to rely upon, as he had so recently come into the department, advises that this interest be remitted altogether. On the 12th of February, 1906, there is a recommendation by the Hon. Frank Oliver, as Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, which is very interesting in view of the facts. I do not associate the name of the hon. gentleman in any invidious manner with this recommendation, because I feel that he was trusting to the representations of those who had been administering the department before him, and this was one of those numerous legacies which were left to him to carry out. This recommendation is as follows:

Department of Indian Affairs,
Ottawa, February 12, 1906.

His Excellency the Governor General in Council.

The undersigned begs to report, in connection with a sale of the land on the Batchawana Indian reserve to Mr. W. F. Wilson and associates, of Berlin, Ontario——

He has made a mistake—it should be Brandon, Manitoba.

—which was carried out on November 21, 1900, that, although the land was purchased by Mr. Wilson and his associates for the purpose of securing the timber thereon, no timber has been removed by them owing to a misunderstanding as regards their rights to operate; and consequently the purchasers have not had the possession nor use of their property.

The final instalment of purchase price was paid on April 12, 1904, and, in view of the circumstances above mentioned, and of the

fact that the purchasers paid a fair price for the land, it is considered that the charging of interest on the unpaid principal to the above date would be excessive.

The undersigned would therefore recommend that, under the provisions of section 141 of the Indian Act, as added thereto by section 8 of chapter 35, Victoria 58-59, authority be given for the remission of interest in connection with the sale referred to.

FRANK OLIVER,
Superintendent General of Indian Affairs.

And accordingly the interest was remitted. Mr. Philp writes on the 24th of August from Brandon to the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs informing him that 'Mr. Wilson has sold the property, and has asked me to instruct you to issue the patent direct to him.' He wants the patent issued to William F. Wilson, of Berlin, manufacturer; D. Anson Reesor, of Brandon, merchant; and Albert E. Philp, of the same place, barrister-at-law. That, after some delay, is carried out, and the patent of these lands is issued to these three gentlemen.

Now, I want for a moment to set before the House a statement of exactly how the matter worked out, so far as the purchase money is concerned, having regard to the changes which were made from time to time by the purchaser with the very easily obtained consent of the department. The valuation reported to the department by this highly disinterested valuator, nominated by the purchaser and appointed by the department, was $9,987.75; the interest, which was worked out by the Department of Justice as owing by the purchaser, amounted to $1,167.32; the valuation of the pine and spruce not removed by the licensee, and payable by the purchaser under section 5 of the agreement, amounted to $704, making the amount payable under the agreement $11,859.07; whereas the department only received from the purchaser $9,017.50, so that the department lost $2,841.57, six years' delay, and an abrogation of every one of the conditions upon which the purchase was entered into; a patent was issued clear and free to the purchasers without asking proof of any one single condition. I lay it to the charge of the hon. Minister of the Interior who sits in this House to-day that he permitted that patent to issue during the period of his administration of office, whether upon some one's recommendation or not, without seeing to it that the conditions had been performed, and that the letter of the contract upon which the patent should issue had been performed. The matter did excite some little comment and criticism. It excited criticism from a member of this House sitting behind the Minister of the Interior, and a gentleman who has done, or been interested in, lumbering in Algoma. I find this letter on file:

House of Commons,
Ottawa, May 30, 1905.

Frank Pedley, Esq.,
Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—I have your favour of the 19th together with the full information asked for, and which I assure you is sufficient in every way. I have also been informed that a large tract of Indian land was recently sold for the sum of thirty cents per acre. Is it possible that such a transaction was put through? If so, would you mind giving the names of the purchasers and the quantity of land purchased? No further particulars will be required.

Thanking you for the same, I am,

Yours sincerely,
D. A. GORDON.

What answer did Mr. Gordon get to that?

Department of Indian Affairs,
June 2, 1905.

Dear Sir,—In reply to your communication of the 30th ultimo, I beg to say that in 1900 a tract of land in the townships of Fisher, Haviland and Tilley, containing about 29,300 acres, was sold to W. F. Wilson and his associates at a price based on a sworn examination and valuation of each section, which price averaged about thirty-four cents per acre, the sale being made on specified conditions, pine, spruce and all minerals being reserved from the sale.

Yours very truly,
FRANK PEDLEY,
Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs.

The minister must know that the deputy superintendent mis-stated the facts in this letter, because the essential condition of that sale having been abrogated, the deputy superintendent general concealed that from a member of this House who desired the information. He informed this member that the sale was made on specified conditions when he knew that these conditions were entirely abrogated.

I have shown conclusively by the correspondence that three years before the patent is issued, these men were trying to get rid of the conditions and sell the same land in the United States free of conditions. The department was aware of that and assisted them in getting rid of the conditions and the spirit and letter of its own order in council of April, 1901, knowing that their removal would result in a sale being made. Before the patent is used a sale had been made. Let me give the figures to show the profits realized by these purchasers from the Crown on the sale they made to these Americans.

Township of Fisher—	
Purchase price to the department	$ 3,681 70
Price of re-sale by the purchasers to the American firm before the patent was issued	37,346 06
Net profit to purchasers	$ 33,664 30

Township of Haviland—	
Purchase price to department. ..	$ 4,397 05
Purchase price paid by Americans to the purchasers from the Crown, before the patent was issued or concurrently therewith.	49,000 00
Net profit to purchasers..	$ 44,602 95
Township of Tilley—	
Purchase price to department. ..	$ 1,909 00
Paid by Americans on the re-sale before the patent issued or contemporaneously therewith.. ..	15,481 00
Net profit..	$ 13,572 00
Total purchase price..	$ 9,017 50
Total re-sale price..	101,830 00
Net profit..	$ 91,812 50

And not a stick removed or a tree cut—not a dollar spent on those limits; not one condition upon which that contract was entered into performed by these gentlemen.

Referring again to section 6 of the regulations, my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior will see that I am right when I say that section 6 contemplates the sale being made with the concurrence of the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, absolutely in his discretion, upon such terms and conditions as he may see fit to impose. But the sale can only be made on the report of a reliable and disinterested person, and then it must be disposed of with the timber and other advantages to the best possible advantage of the Indians. If that land was worth $101,830, to be paid in hard cash by the Americans after examination, report and valuation, it was certainly worth that amount when valued by the disinterested gentleman appointed at the instance of these purchasers in 1899-1900. That money was stolen from the Indians. It belongs to the Indian Trust Fund. The purchasers have no right to it and it ought to be restored. There ought to be restitution of that amount or some restitution, having regard to the value of this territory which was alienated in this extraordinary manner.

I was proceeding to show to the Minister of the Interior what the section contemplated as to application—this whole transaction by the Indian regulations, was to be separated entirely from sale of land by a local agent. A local agent, of course, would have no jurisdiction whatever over a transaction of this kind, it had to be made by the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs who had to proceed in the manner specified by the regulations. Then, we see the application put in the name of A. H. Gale, who hailed from Oxford, England, and wrote from Toronto and gave his address as Brandon, Manitoba. We see that letter tucked away in the local Indian agency in Sault Ste. Marie. Why was it put in in this clandestine, peculiar and sinister manner? Gale knew the law, for, in his letter, he mentions the section of the regulations under which the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, and he alone, could deal with this transaction. Was there any motive in it? Was it done at any one's suggestion or request? Was it done at Mr. Wilson's request or at that of any one higher in authority or closer to the department than Mr. Wilson? If it was, then surely the members of this House, the members of the government and the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) himself cannot afford to neglect it. If this sale originated in fraud and if this fraud was allowed by the officers of the department, resulting in the net profit to these parties of $90,000, surely that is a circumstance that no hon. member of this House, mindful of his oath of office and realizing his representative responsibilities, can afford to disregard. Let us see if there be any explanation of why this application was put in in this peculiar manner, tucked away in this local agent's office and not brought to the attention of the superintendent general direct and filed in his department. The application of Mr. Gale was not proceeded with. You will see from the correspondence I have placed on record that the application was made by Mr. Gale and he gives his address 'care W. F. Wilson.' The patent and the subsequent correspondence and all the negotiations were with W. F. Wilson, A. E. Philp and D. Anson Reesor, of Brandon. And the patent issued without regard to Gale so far as one can judge from the correspondence, and without regard to his application which lay in the office of the agent in Sault Ste. Marie. And W. F. Wilson, A. E. Philp and D. Anson Reesor profited to the amount of $90,000 by the re-sale. What is the association between Mr. Gale and these lucky purchasers? I will now put in the link. Here is a letter that I have extracted from the files, and hon. members can conclude for themselves as to whether this may be the link or not:

Brandon, Manitoba, April 20, 1900.

J. A. Smart, Esq.,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—Re my application for timber land in Batchawana bay.

In my previous letter inclosing a letter from Mr. McAuley, I mentioned that the petition referred to in McAuley's letter meant a statement that the lands referred to were in most part unfit for settlement.

I find, however, by looking over my correspondence that he refers to a petition which he can get signed by all the settlers in the district asking the government that we be allowed to purchase the land. We can also furnish a statement sworn to by all the settlers in the district that the land in most part is unfit for settlement.

I wish you would give this matter your earnest attention as no time is to be lost in preparing for the season's operation as I will necessarily lose considerable time preparing

to get away from my business here to attend to the erection of a sawmill, &c.

You will notice an application was put in by A. H. Gale dated July 25, 1899, covering all the lands in the district. This, however, will not interfere with my application as Mr. Gale is with me in the matter and we can work under either application. Mr. Sifton wished the application put in Mr. Gale's name at the time.

Please bear in mind that the license of the St. Maurice Lumber Company expires on the 30th of this month and will doubtless be called on to consider a renewal of same even though all pulpwood has been removed, and I trust you will consider its bearing on my application before doing so.

Yours truly,

W. F. WILSON.

'Mr. Sifton wished the application put in in Mr. Gale's name at the time.' Mr. Sifton—the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, the high trustee for the Indians, who, under section 6, had great discretion as to whether he would sell or not sell Indian lands, and who alone had the judging of applications of that character and the imposition of terms and conditions which would obtain the best possible advantage in the interests of the Indians—he, it appears, is a party to the sinister, clandestine application, not sent to himself, not presented to his department, but filed away in the local office in Sault Ste. Marie. For what purpose this was done goodness only knows, except this, that the application of Gale covered all the unsold Indian lands in that part of the district and the subsequent application of Wilson—who, by his own statement, had gone over the land and examined it—and who had the opportunity for nine months to select and narrow down his application to what he wanted. Where is the significance? Leave that letter as it is, carrying with it what information it does; admit for the moment that W. F. Wilson was not justified in saying that the hon. Superintendent General of Indian Affairs had directed that application and had wished it to be in the name of a man who had nothing whatever to do with the transaction—admit all this, and what do we find? Did the department recognize it? The statement went to the Deputy Minister of the Interior, Mr. J. A. Smart, who was very close to the then Minister of the Interior, Hon. Mr. Sifton, if one can judge from evidence that has been adduced before commissions of this parliament. That letter went to him. Did he show it to Mr. Sifton? Was it acted upon? Yes, it was acted upon in the Department of the Interior, it was forwarded to the Indian Department and whatever rights Gale had in that application were, upon the statement contained in that letter, by the wish of this high monarch, Hon. Clifford Sifton, transferred to, vested in and patented to Messrs. Wilson, Philp and Reesor to reap the profits. Is that significant enough for my hon. friend? If not, let me place some more significant facts before him. Who is Mr. A. E. Philp? He is a barrister-at-law, of Brandon, Manitoba. I need not tell this House what association he had with the then Minister of the Interior and Superintendent General of Indian Affairs. He was his partner, his law partner, connected with him in business transactions, very loyal to him, a hard worker in his election, a close political friend and a close adherent to the right hon. gentlemen, and a man who was down here just at the time when Mr. Sifton was resigning his office, clamouring to get a patent, frenziedly anxious that the will of the people should be carried out with regard to the domain of the Indians, and that the conditions of the sale should be performed. There, Mr. Speaker, is the transaction in a nutshell. Let us see how it is worked out in a summary:

1. A blanket application (Gale's), while preliminary selection made by purchaser: and valuator chosen by him and arranged with.

2. A restricted area applied for by Wilson after inspection, and a valuator nominated by applicant and appointed by the minister.

3. The department's proposition to sell subject to manufacturing and other conditions is made to and accepted by the applicant.

4. The purchaser's nominee is appointed by the government to value the land, and his valuation is sent to the department.

5. Indian agent concurrently informs the department that this is a low valuation, and that the valuation of an experienced lumberman in the district, who has had intimate knowledge of these lands, is far in excess of the valuation received.

6. Department rejects high valuation and accepts the lower one, and then reduces even the lower valuation.

7. After lapse of three years all manufacturing conditions of sale are removed so as to permit of the timber being exported to United States in the log.

8. Before abrogating these conditions department is made aware that the lands are being offered to purchasers in the United States.

9. Order in council of 1901 is passed, in which export of hardwood in the log is not prohibited or restricted.

10. Purchase is allowed to drift along from 1900 to 1906, during which time all conditions of sale disappear, and the land is being offered in United States markets.

11. Minister of Justice rules that interest amounting to $1,167.32 should be paid on the purchase money owing to delay in closing deal on recommendation of Minister of the Interior. This is remitted by order in council.

12. Before patent issues to purchasers

they have arranged and completed a sale to United States firms of all the lands at a net profit to them of $91,813.50.

13. Patent issues to purchasers without any conditions.

14. Applicants and purchasers are (a) all political friends of Mr. Sifton, Minister of the Interior, who sold the land ; (b) one of them (A. E. Philp) his former law partner ; (c) and the others, D. A. Reesor and W. F. Wilson, active political workers and friends.

15. Mr. Sifton, then Minister of the Interior, directs or wishes original application for the lands to be put in Mr. Gale's name at the office at Sault Ste. Marie at the time.

16. By this transaction—

(a) The Indians are robbed of the true value of the land, the accrued interest thereon, and of the benefit of the manufacturing conditions, which would have provided them with labour.

(b) The settlers in adjoining lots lose value of improvement, roads and settlement, as well as the sawmill and work in the same.

(c) The district of Algoma loses an industry to which it was entitled, and its labouring men lose the work and its merchants the sale of material which would have resulted from its maintenance.

(d) The close political friends of the minister gain $91,813.50 without cutting a tree or doing any work of improvement or development.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I notified the Minister of the Interior that I should speak about this matter, and I also drew it to the personal attention of the ex-Minister of the Interior, the man whose name I have mentioned, and who is irresistibly connected with this correspondence. He knew this matter was coming up, but he has not seen fit to houour the House with his presence. Why does he not think it of sufficient importance that he should be here to listen to a transaction of this nature? Perhaps this is a transaction beneath the dignity of so important a gentleman, perhaps that, on the occasions when he does visit this House, matters of more paramount importance attract him. It is only on such occasions that this gentleman, who came into this House like the rest of us, not endowed with too much of this world's goods, but now a very rich man, deigns to visit us ; it is only on very rare occasions that an equipage that almost puts into the shade the carriage of His Excellency the Governor General, rolls up to the door of this House and that hon. gentleman condescends to honour us with his presence. It is of that gentleman that I desire to say a few words, and in his absence I will say them to the right hon. gentleman instead. I have drawn to the attention of the right hon. gentleman the quotation—it is on 'Hansard'—which I will read again to refresh his memory. I quote from the London 'Economist' of the 9th of November last, in which these words are used :

> The worst his opponents can allege is that he has been remiss in not ordering an inquiry into the Interior Department and not dismissing those about him who make a vulgar display of riches acquired no one knows how, unless by official malversation on a grand scale.

I wonder whether the right hon. gentleman, after perusing these indisputable facts, after looking at the sinister way in which the then Minister of the Interior, whom he placed so high on the pedestal, and held up before this country as the Napoleon of the West, this minister who steps down from the office of Minister of the Interior in order to emphasize a great principle ; this minister who, if rumour speaks true, is shortly to be taken again to the political bosom of my right hon. friend—I wonder if the right hon. gentleman can read this evidence of record in the department and then say that there should be no inquiry into the transactions of the Department of the Interior, that nobody has been robbed, that no sinister dealing has taken place in that transaction whereby the public interests have suffered, and that officials high up in the department, even the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs himself, has profited, or his close personal friends have profited through his help, or through the originating mind of the hon. gentleman himself in initiating this great transaction, out of which so much money was made at the expense of the public domain?

Well, Sir, the right hon. gentleman made some professions as far back as 1893, and those professions were backed up by a gentleman, then a very modest young man, who came from the province of Manitoba and who addressed the Liberal convention, saying he was pleased to be there as representative of the youngest province of the Dominion, a young man himself in official life, as he stated. This hon. gentleman, at that great Liberal convention of 1893, was the seconder of this motion.

> We cannot but view with alarm the large increase of the public debt and of the controllable annual expenditure of the Dominion and the consequent undue taxation of the people under the governments that have been continuously in power since 1878, and we demand the strictest economy in the administration of the government of the country.

The hon. gentleman said on that occasion :

> Now, Mr. Chairman, I am called upon to second a resolution affirming again the Liberal principle of economy. I do not propose to lecture men who are my seniors in wisdom, as well as in years, upon the necessity of economy in connection with the administration of public affairs, but I wish to call attention to this fact, that, as Liberals, we have the

right to say that we are the exponents of economy. Our opponents do not even pretend to be economical. Their principle is to get all the money they can from the people and distribute it amongst their friends.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that, comparing this extract from that speech of the hon. gentleman with the facts as they appear from the records in this matter, it is very clear that he has somewhat changed the principle which he there enunciated. He stated that it was the principle of his opponents to get all the money they could from the people and distribute it amongst their friends. The hon. gentleman has shown that he has followed that principle by getting all the money he could from the people and distributing it amongst his friends, if not himself. These were the principles which were affirmed by the right hon. gentleman. Time after time grave matters of mal-administration in the Department of Indian Affairs have been brought to the attention of the right hon. gentleman. In each case he has defended, or excused, or, if he has not defended or excused, and if he has been silent, he has been the first to rise in his place to vote down investigation, or the punishment of the offenders or that an inquiry should be held into the transaction referred to. Wherever there was a case of corruption the right hon. gentleman has defended or excused it. Where the public has been robbed he has voted down resolutions condemning the robbery. Where the public service was degraded he has denied an investigation and if public servants have been shown to have stolen from the people he has voted down inquiry, investigation, punishment or condemnation. The right hon. gentleman has lent his moral support to transactions as scandalous as this. He has upheld Siftonian deals, he has voted for them, he has approved them and if he does that and if he affirms before this House and the country that he does so approve of them, that he will not lend a hand to punish the offenders or even to inquire whether the accusations and information be correct, than I say that he is standing before this country at this hour, when he is about to ask for the re-endorsation of the people, as one who has not elevated public morality, as one who has not done that which he professed and promised to do, which he vowed that he would do and which he pledged himself to do in his great platform and in his great speech of 1903, which induced the people of Canada to entrust to him the reins of power. The right hon. gentleman is very fond sometimes in this House of making quotations from the sayings and speeches of the Hon. Geo. Brown. He will perhaps remember this quotation from that statesman's speech which is pertinent to the position in which he finds himself to-day:

If, sir, a public man avows certain principles, agitates those principles and seeks to overthrow a government to establish those principles, and when he attains power, laughs at his professions and casts his principles to the winds, he is aiming a blow at public morality.

I ask the right hon. gentleman to take those words to heart in conjunction with the very serious matter which I now commend to his attention and leave with him. There is not a fact that I have stated but which is referred to in the documents in his department. I am not responsible for any of them. Every one of these facts is set forth in the documents extracted from the Department of the Interior. How many more there may be that we have not seen I do not know, but I do know that there has been knitted together a case which the right hon. leader of the government cannot excuse and cannot justify. One by one these facts have been knitted together and they disclose a transaction which is absolutely indefensible. I have embodied in the resolution which I now propose to offer to the House these facts as they appear and which I will commend to the right hon. leader of the House. Mr. Speaker, I beg to move:

That all the words of the said motion after the word 'that' be struck out, and the following substituted in lieu thereof:

The government as trustees for the Indians is bound to sell Indian lands or timber, or other valuables thereon, for the best price obtainable, and to the best possible advantage of the Indians.

That the sale by the government of lands in the townships of Haviland, Tilley and Fisher, in the district of Algoma, with the timber thereon, containing 29,301 acres for $9,017.50 without competition to political friends who were thus enabled to reap profits amounting to $91,813.50,on re-sale of the said lands and timber made by them, before patent issued was not a sale for the best price obtainable, nor to the best possible interest of the Indians, but constituted a grave breach of trust by the government and deserves the condemnation of this House.

I have only to say in conclusion that we have recently had a most emphatic illustration of the wantonness of this sale in which there was no competition and no public advertisement. We had a sale by public auction on the 24th June of Indian timber limits which produced the magnificent sum of $871,000 which went into the Indian funds where it ought to belong in exchange for the timber. In this case, by private sale, $91,000 went into the pockets of the friends and an erstwhile partner among them of the former Superintendent General of Indian Affairs who made the sale.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Mr. Speaker, I think it is proper, in discussing the question now before the House, to call attention to what must be very prominent in the minds of all hon. members. We have before us on the Order

Paper at the end of an eight months' session——

Mr. TAYLOR. For which the government are responsible.

Mr. OLIVER. Ten Bills of serious importance for the consideration of the House. We have Supplementary Estimates on the table for consideration amounting to something like $10,000,000, railway subsidies of possibly $10,000,000.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. OLIVER—and we have also a proposition to guarantee certain aid to railways to the amount of something like $10,000,000. There is sufficient important business to claim the best attention of the House for the remaining period of the session, whatever it may be. To occupy the time of this deliberative body for two hours and a half in shrieking into 'Hansard' the elements of a future campaign address is neither more nor less than an outrage upon parliamentary propriety and the patience of the House. The hon. member knows that in making such a statement at such a time he must have peculiar freedom because no person could take the time or the trouble nor would the House submit to the time or trouble necessary to contradict or disprove the absurdities he has placed before us. My hon. friend, however, has shown himself wiser than the gentleman whose parable he has taken up, whose mantle he seems to think has fallen on his shoulders, the hon. member for St. Antoine Division (Mr. Ames), the slander-monger in chief of our hon. friends opposite.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that expression should be withdrawn.

Mr. OLIVER. I withdraw it, I was so convinced of the truth of it——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman knows that it must be unreservedly withdrawn.

Mr. OLIVER. I have withdrawn it unreservedly.

Mr. FOSTER. There is too much of the woolly west in that.

Mr. OLIVER. The member for St. Antoine Division (Mr. Ames), if I am not allowed to use the word slander in connection with statements he made before the House, was unwise, he was not satisfied with making them here when there was not a fair opportunity of disproving them. He was so successful in his efforts on the floor of the House that he undertook to carry them further where they could be investigated with an opportunity of determining their truth or falsity, with the result that he has retreated from the House to make his peregrinations in the remote parts of Canada with his limelight, his camera, and his microscope. His usefulness in the House appears to have departed—and he has departed with it. The hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Boyce) is wiser in his generation, he is careful to delay his slander——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member has heard a moment ago that that statement should not be used.

Mr. OLIVER. I withdraw the term, I shall use the expression 'unfounded and untruthful allegations.' He has chosen a time when the condition of business for the session does not admit under any circumstances dealing with this question either on the floor of the House or in the committee where it should be dealt with. If the one hundredth part of the noise that my hon. friend has made to-day were warranted by the facts and if he did desire to arrive at a knowledge of the facts, he has had eight months of this session, he has had from day to day the sittings of the Public Accounts Committee before which he could have brought his charges, to have proved, if possible, everything he has alleged here. I submit with due deference that allegation is not evidence, particularly at a time when such statements—and they would be grave statements if they came from a grave source—can not be dealt with as their gravity entitles them to be dealt with. My hon. friend must take it as he gives it. Having chosen to put forward these statements at a time when they cannot be proved or disproved he must accept the opinion that they are of but little weight and could not have been proved if he had brought them forward at a time when investigation would be possible.

Mr. FOSTER. He dare not investigate them.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend is perfectly safe, there is no danger of investigation between now and the close of the session. My hon. friend has been here nearly eight months, he has been an active and energetic member of the House. The alleged facts he has placed before us are within a stone's throw of where he has lived for ten or fifteen years, but he chooses an opportunity, three days before the end of the session, to bring forward the statement he has made, and which I shall not call slanderous again.

I am somewhat at a loss to know just what my hon. friend's charge is. The allegation would seem to be that certain gentlemen lived in a place called Brandon. If that is a crime, then these certain men, Messrs. Wilson, Philp and Reesor, are residents of Brandon and must be condemned. Is it a crime that this land was sold? The land is of no use to the Indians unless it is sold, it is the price that the Indians want and not the land.

Mr. FOSTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. OLIVER. And so the land has to be sold somehow, somewhere,to some one, at some time. Thus, if I understand the matter correctly, it has been the practice of the department for twenty or thirty years, during part of which time my hon. friend was a member of the government, to make sales of Indian lands under certain circumstances. According to that practice a certain sale was made. Is that a crime? Is that the offence charged against the Superintendent of Indian Affairs of that day or whoever was responsible? If that is the crime, then we must admit they are guilty. Is it a crime that the land was sold at 30 cents an acre? The timber of value, that is, the pine timber upon it, had already been removed under a license which had covered this same area.

Mr. BOYCE. My hon. friend will pardon me. The land was sold subject to the provisions of a timber lease then in existence, and that was subsequently cancelled, so that the purchasers got the benefit of the cancellation.

Mr. OLIVER. I repeat that the land was sold subject to the timber license, and the licensees had exhausted their rights, and their rights were cancelled because they had no more rights to exercise, and the purchasers of the land paid extra for the balance of the pine timber that remained upon the tract, and the valuation of the timber was $66. So that the timber of value, the pine timber, had been cleared off before the sale was made. The minerals in the land were also reserved. So that what the purchasers got was the hardwood growing upon the land and the surface rights, for which they paid 30 cents an acre some eight years ago. Now, I am credibly informed that in all this vast area of New Ontario any person may at the present time go anywhere and buy any piece of land for 50 cents an acre, including the mineral rights and the timber rights except the pine timber, and that after performing certain limited settlement duties, and after a period of three years, he gets a patent for the land, including the pine timber. If it is a question of price, it seems to me that the Indians got a better price for their land that was sold eight years ago than the government of the province of Ontario is getting for the land that it is selling to-day. Under these circumstances the charge that there was something wrong in the sale at that price does not seem to be substantiated.

I am unable to follow all the charges which my hon. friend made. There was a charge that a man lived in Brandon; there was a charge that the land was sold; there was a charge that it was sold at a low price; there was a charge that it was afterwards sold at a higher price. It had been sold at a higher price, and it had been sold before the patent from the Crown had been issued. What is the charge in that statement of fact? When a sale is made, if the purchaser fulfils the conditions, the conveyance has to be given, although the property may increase in value. Now, my hon. friend is of the legal profession, and I do not think he will suggest that the Indian Department, having sold lands at a certain price, and the price having been paid, the department had any right to refuse the conveyance of these lands, no matter whether the right to them had changed hands or not. If he holds that view, it is a decidedly new doctrine to me, and in administering the Indian lands and the Dominion lands, I shall have to take new advice in order to be able to conform to the rule my hon. friend has laid down.

But a charge is that the land was sold at a higher price than it was purchased for. Now, I do not suppose that anybody buys anything as a commercial transaction without expecting to sell it at a higher price. That is what he buys it for; and does my hon. friend suggest that a sale having been made, if the value of the property increases, the sale must be cancelled? My hon. friend is not surely so absurd as to hold such an argument when it is stated in plain words. And yet, if there is anything in his charge, that is the position which he insists that the Department of Indian Affairs shall take. Well, let us try this question out by a parallel case. There is a member of this House who sits on the opposite side, a man of high repute, personal and financial, a man whose personal honour or whose business honour I think nobody in the House will question; I speak of the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler). This hon. gentleman was a member of a company which had the ownership of certain lands which had been granted to the Regina, Qu'Appelle and Long Lake Railway Company. So far as the matter has come to my knowledge, this hon. gentleman was the chief agent of his associates both in acquiring these lands and in disposing of them. At a certain time, I think in the year 1902, this company—I believe, acting through the agency of the same hon. gentleman—disposed of a quarter of a million of acres of the lands at I think $1.63 an acre. To-day that land is worth $5 or $10 or $15 or possibly some of it $20 an acre. Does my hon. friend suggest that the sale that was made in good faith at the highest going price and through the agency of the hon. member for West Toronto at that time, was a dishonest sale and should be cancelled because that land is worth more to-day than it was then? He would not suggest such a thing; he would say that anybody who would suggest it was not speaking with due responsibility.

And yet he stands up here and for two hours and a half he has shrieked into 'Hansard' denunciations of a certain transaction because the value of the land went up and was sold at a higher figure in a subsequent year. I submit that the position he takes is an absurd one. To say that

because property has been sold at a certain figure at a certain time and afterwards sold at a much higher figure, the transaction is not honest, is to draw a conclusion utterly unwarranted. The hon. gentleman drew a comparison between the sale of land in these townships at Batchawana Bay and the sale which recently took place of the timber in the Dokis reserve. He pointed out that, in the first instance, the minister sold the land at thirty cents, and that, in the second instance, a comparatively small area of Indian lands was sold at $871,000. Sir, the comparison is far worse than that. In the case of the $871,000 sale, there was not a foot of land transferred at all. All that was sold was the right to cut the timber for ten years. It is quite possible that the tract to which the hon. gentleman alludes in the first place might have carried timber, but that timber had been cleared away, and to make a comparison between bare land, or more probably rock, and the timber on the Dokis reserve shows the absurdity of my hon. friend's argument from the beginning to the end, and it bears out the view that he would never have made the statement he did, had there been an opportunity to investigate the matter to a conclusion. I do not know that any more need be said. The transaction was in the ordinary line of business. It was just the same as those which had taken place in the department during the past twenty or twenty-five years. It differed from them in no particular except in this that some of these people lived at Brandon and that some of them wrote letters and some of them did not. My hon. friend (Mr. Boyce) has followed the example set him by the hon. member for St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) and has imported into his statement of the case insinuations and suggestions entirely unworthy of being put before a deliberative body. The Indian lands are unquestionably a sacred trust. It is the duty of the government to administer them with the view of obtaining for the Indians their utmost value. These lands are looked upon by the public as a sacred trust, and the hon. gentleman is seeking to take advantage of that sentiment in making this most unfair attack especially at this period of the session. If he could prove that there was anything wrong done, he would have made a point, but he was careful to bring his accusation at a time when there could not be produced any proof.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Can the minister give any good reason why the land was not put up at public auction ?

Mr. OLIVER. This land was offered for sale in accordance with the practice of the department which had prevailed for twenty-five or thirty years or more. What was good enough in preceding years was still considered good enough when this sale was made. And because in the process of time conditions change and it becomes necessary to adopt new methods, that is no proof that the former administration was improper or dishonest. But my hon. friend jumped to the conclusion that because there has been a change of administration due to the changed conditions, there must have been something wrong with the previous administration. Nothing could be more unfair.

Mr. HAGGART. A few words in reply to the extraordinary defence of the Minister of the Interior. What is the charge ? The charge made by my hon. friend from Algoma (Mr. Boyce) is that the Department of the Interior, against the advice of the Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, sold property belonging to the Indians, held by us in trust, for a sum altogether inadequate to its value. The hon. gentleman has tried to defend this by citing the policy of the government in the past. Well, if there is one sacred trust which the people of this country should fulfil to the utmost letter, it is that of the Indians. If there is one thing this or any government should be most careful to see to, it is that our wards, the Indians, should receive the highest value for the small moiety of property left to them in this country. There can be no doubt as to the accuracy of the statement made by my hon. friend from Algoma. There can be no doubt that certain parties, clearly connected with the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) got possession of these lands, belonging to the Indians, for a ridiculously low price, and the minister tries to justify this by saying that his predecessor, the ex-minister, (Mr. Sifton) only followed the precedent set him by previous administrations.

The justification pleaded by the minister is that he was following the usual course in the disposition of these Indian lands. I deny that. I give a most distinct and emphatic denial to the statement that it was the policy of the last government to dispose of these lands contrary to the very advice of the deputy superintendent general of Indian Affairs—who, in this case, it appears, declared in his report that the price for these lands was totally inadequate but was overridden by the Minister of the Interior of that day. And in this way these lands were disposed of, these lands which were held as a sacred trust by the government. I say it is a disgrace to the officers of the government and to the Minister of the Interior that such a thing should happen. Where is the authority for the Minister of the Interior to say that this was the mode by which these lands were disposed of in the past ? The policy of the late government was to ask for tenders for these lands. Nothing was more sacred in the eyes of that government than the trust they exercised in these Indian lands, and they did

all in their power to see to it that the Indians got the very last farthing for all the lands that were disposed of. And not only were they careful to act according to the opinion of the chief officers administering the department, but they insisted that the Indians themselves should be a party to the surrender. I do not see anything of that kind here; certainly it was not stated by my hon. friend (Mr. Boyce) nor was it shown by any of the documents he read that the consent of the Indians had been obtained for the sale of this property. But the bald fact stands out that parties closely connected with the Minister of the Interior of that day got control of these Indian lands, and, even before they had got the conveyance of them, they had turned them over at a profit of $90,000. And this government is trustee for these poor creatures who are not able to look after themselves, who at one time owned all the land of this country of which now but a pittance remains to them. And this is the way the Minister of the Interior of this government exercised the sacred trust reposed in him —defrauding these poor people of whom we are the trustees of the sum of $90,000. I say it is simply a disgrace to the management of the department that anything of the kind should occur. I say that my hon. friend from West Algoma (Mr. Boyce) did right to draw the attention of the House to the vulgar ostentation of wealth of these parties from one end of the country to the other, wealth obtained by means such as this. The people of Canada will soon have an opportunity to express their opinion of such transactions, and I hope and believe that the standard of morals among our people is such that the electors will punish such crimes as these, committed by those who have thus unworthily exercised the power of government.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I desire to say just a few words in response to the peculiar observations of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver). That hon. gentleman saw fit to apply some strong language to my hon. friend from St. Antoine, Montreal (Mr. Ames). There was good reason for his doing so. For if the minister has had certain workings of his department, which he would have preferred to conceal, exposed before this House and this country—

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know if my hon. friend is in order in saying that I desired to conceal the workings of my department?

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that that language is not in order.

Mr. OLIVER. I wish to say distinctly that I do not wish to conceal any part of the working of my department that is rightly the property of the public.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. So far as you find my remark to be out of order, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw it. But I desire to say that it is this same hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) who stood up in his place here and declared that he would not bring down certain original documents which in the end he was forced to bring down. He stood in his place here and read a memorandum from his deputy, reading it as his own, which stated that these original documents should not be placed before parliament. Relying on a majority at his back in this House—

Mr. OLIVER. I desire to correct the hon. gentleman's statement as to that memorandum, I did not read it as my own statement, but as the advice received from my deputy. And, if I remember well, it did not say that these documents would not be brought down—very far from it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) declared that they should not be brought down until a special vote had been passed for that purpose in this House; he declared that he proposed to abide by that memorandum and by the advice so received. But the hon. gentleman did not abide by that advice, because, in the end, the original documents were produced and laid on the table of this House without any special vote of the House being demanded.

Mr. OLIVER. I desire to correct the hon. gentleman——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I want to be correct.

Mr. OLIVER. I am sure of it. I objected, and stated to the House my objection, to bringing down private documents to this House, which documents, on motions calling for them being carried, and on the documents being brought down in response to those motions, became part of the records of the House and were removed from being part of the records of the department. And I instanced the case of what had occurred during the session before, when, in response to a motion by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), certain original documents had been brought down which became part of the records of the House and ceased to be part of the records of the department though they were needed in carrying on the business of the department. And the motions of hon. gentlemen opposite requiring the production of original documents were amended so that these documents did not become part of the records of the House but were laid upon the table for inspection and returned to the department.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) laid great stress upon the circumstance that certain documents

had not been returned. But he knew, and every one knew, that all he had to do was to stand on his feet for thirty seconds and move for an order to return these documents to the department,——

Mr. OLIVER. Precisely.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN—but the hon. gentleman did not think it worth while to do so.

Mr. OLIVER. I did not think it my duty. The House had seen fit to make these documents part of its records. The House controls its own actions; and, if it saw fit to do this, certainly it was not for me to take control when control had been taken from me by the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I suppose the hon. gentleman is not so absolutely ignorant of the rules of this House as not to know that documents can be brought down only on motion by a member of the House. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver), as custodian of these papers, requires them back, it is his duty to move to that effect.

But this is only an incident. I was referring to the fact that the hon. gentleman had good reason, even in the absence of the hon. member for St. Antoine, to use strong expressions with regard to the course which that hon. gentleman has taken in this House. And the hon. minister (Mr. Oliver) has not heard the last of it. For, if I am not mistaken, he will hear something from that hon. gentleman in the west; and if he desires to meet my hon. friend from St. Antoine on any platform in the west, a proper amount of time will be given him to make his explanation of the administration of his department. The hon. minister referred to the postponement of this motion, but he did not see fit to say that it had been postponed at his own instance. On at least three different occasions to my knowledge, the matter has been postponed either by the action of the government, or at its request. His allusion to the circumstance that this matter has not been brought up——

Mr. OLIVER. I am not aware—

Mr. R. L. BORDEN—was unworthy of the hon. gentleman and one in which, it seems to me, he ought not to have indulged.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not aware of having been the cause of the postponement of this motion, and I would like to know when the motion was first proposed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The day before yesterday there was an arrangement made for it, that was departed from, and another arrangement was made yesterday and that was again, at the suggestion of the government, altered and a previous arrangement to that, when it was said the hon. gentleman could not be present on account of a cabinet meeting, was the third to which I have reference. I do not know how many others there were. Under the circumstances, it did not seem to be a happy taunt from the hon. gentleman to speak of postponements. Why should it be postponed? There is no reason for it. My hon. friend, at the earliest opportunity, was ready to bring it on as soon as he had prepared the case and was able to speak upon it; and when he was ready to bring it on, there were the delays to which I have alluded. The minister refers to the lack of evidence. The evidence relied on by my hon. friend from Algoma is to be found in the records of the hon. gentleman's own department, brought down and laid upon the table of the House. What better evidence does he want than that?

Mr. OLIVER. Such part of the record as my hon. friend chooses to pick out and present.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does the hon. gentleman say that there is any other portion of the record which qualifies that which has been alluded to by my hon. friend from Algoma?

Mr. OLIVER. The best way to answer that is to bring it before a committee of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. We do not usually bring these records before a committee of the House unless there is some fact to be investigated, and inasmuch as the facts were plain and open upon this record, and inasmuch as that portion of the record mentioned by my hon. friend from Algoma is not qualified, so far as I understand, by any other portion of the record, the observation of the Minister of Interior is absolutely beside the mark, and shows his utter incapacity to make any defence whatever to the statements of my hon. friend.

The minister says the statements are grave. He is right, and there has been no answer, except the complaint of lack of time. The minister has had notice of this motion four or five days.

Mr. OLIVER. I never had any notice of this particular motion. I had notice that my hon. friend proposed to bring up a motion in regard to Indian lands, but I had no notice that they were the Indian lands he has alluded to.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I accept any correction of that kind.

Mr. OLIVER. That is not what I was objecting to at all. I objected to his bringing this question forward at a time when the press of the business of the session is such that it cannot be attended to fully, either on the floor of the House or in a committee of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is no necessity for any committee of the House, there is a necessity for investigating the records of the department which have been laid upon the table. If he has any complaint that all the facts have not been brought out, I will undertake to stay here an additional day, and to give him all the time from the present until next Monday, or next Tuesday, or next Wednesday, to go thoroughly through these records and show whether any of the facts stated by my hon. friend from Algoma can be controverted by the records, or in any other way, by the Minister of the Interior.

What is the gravamen of the charge of my hon. friend from Algoma? I accept the comparison of the Minister of the Interior to the case of a private trustee. What would be thought of a private trustee, and where would he find himself, if, taking the trust property, he sold it upon the statement of a valuator selected by the purchasers, sold it under certain conditions, every one of which was afterwards abrogated, and finally handed it over for a sum of $9,000, although, before the deed was given by the trustee, the purchasers sold it to another person for $101,000? Where would any private trustee find himself under these conditions? In the first place, at the very earliest opportunity, any court of the land would hold this action up to the severest condemnation and would order immediate restitution, with interest. That would be the first proceeding. The next proceeding probably would be, if certain circumstances might fairly be taken into account, that such a trustee would probably be called upon to answer in the criminal courts upon a charge of malfeasance in his office of trustee. Why, the circumstances are almost unbelievable. If any hon. gentleman in this House had arisen and made the statement, without being able to base it upon the records of the Department of the Interior that this particular series of transactions had taken place in that department one would have said that the man was drawing upon his imagination. And yet every line and every word he mentioned can be substantiated, and has been substantiated by my hon. friend from Algoma, by a direct reference to the records of the Department of the Interior. There is small wonder that the Minister of the Interior takes up his half hour in making complaints as to the period at which this matter was brought to the attention of the House, and endeavouring to cast slurs and aspersions upon an hon. member who is not here to defend himself, and who needs no defence against any attacks that can be made upon him by the Minister of the Interior.

The Hon. gentleman had the temerity to refer to private transactions, and amongst others, to the transactions of my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Osler) in connection with the sale of certain lands which were afterwards acquired by the gentleman who had formed themselves into that wonderful corporation known as the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company. If I am not mistaken, when those lands were sold—I have for this the word of the member for West Toronto, as well as the records of the department itself—when these lands were sold it was not known that the area within which they might be selected had been enormously increased by an order in council of this government, and that added very materially to the value of these lands. I do not doubt if the member from West Toronto had known at the time, as he has assured me he did not know, that that area had been so extended, the price he would have asked for those lands would have been very much greater. Further than that, what is the idea of the hon. gentleman in comparing a sale of agricultural lands in the west of Canada to the sale of these lands? He knows that the value of those lands, sold, as he says, by a company in which my hon. friend from West Toronto is interested, has been since increased by settlement, and the development of that country by the influx of settlers. No such conditions prevailed in the district we are now discussing, so far as I am aware, at all events, they did not prevail up to the time of the resale by the purchasers. Will the Minister of the Interior tell me this? What was it that increased the value of those lands from $9,000, the price received by these fortunate grantees from certain gentlemen from the United States, what was it that occurred to increase the value? Can any one doubt that if these lands had been put up at public auction, and if these gentlemen had had an opportunity to bid for them, the results would have been very different?

Another instance that is most startling in connection with the matter, is this: There was more than one report made to the government as to the value of these lands. There was a report made by Mr. McAuley, the gentleman nominated by the very men who were purchasing from the government. That is said to have been a sworn valuation. There was another report brought to the attention of the head of the department by a man who had means of knowledge as to the value of the property. We do not know what that man's estimate was; it does not appear as far as I am aware, but it does appear in the records of the department and by the report of the deputy head of the department that the report of that independent man placed the value of this land very much above the amount stated in the report of the valuator selected by the purchaser. Imagine a private trustee acting with respect to a property which was not his own, acting under a trust, having before him two reports, one a report made by persons to whom the

land was to be sold and the other the report of an independent person,imagine him having it brought definitely and distinctly to his attention that the report of the independent person was very much larger in its estimate of the value than the report of the man who had been selected by the purchaser, imagine that trustee, in face of these circumstances, putting aside all further inquiry or investigation into the value of this land, disregarding the report of the independent valuator and taking the $9,000 report of the man who had been selected by the purchaser—imagine that in the case of a private trustee and come to a conclusion, if you please, as to what would be the result of an investigation by the courts into the conduct of any trustee such as that which has been described. The circumstances in the case being as they are I am bound to say that in my estimation, after listening with the utmost possible attention to the speech of my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, I have heard not a single word uttered by him in defence or justification of the case which has been made out so clearly.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (East Assiniboia). Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to say anything on this subject had it not been for some outside remarks that the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) has brought in and to which I wish to refer for a moment. The leader of the opposition has said that the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) made the statement that he was not aware, that, when the company of which he was the principal member sold some railway lands to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company, this government, by order in council, largely increased the area of the lands and therefore made them more valuable.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not say that it was when the sale was made, but I said that when the hon. member for West Toronto negotiated that sale, as the Minister of the Interior has told us, he was absolutely in ignorance of the fact that the area had been extended.

Mr. TURRIFF. That statement of the hon. member for West Toronto is an absolutely false statement in every shape, form and manner.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Shame; order.

Mr. TURRIFF. I have made the same statement in the House before and the statement I make is absolutely true.

Mr. BENNETT. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I cannot very well rule on that point. A statement is made by one hon. member as to what another hon. gentleman has said and the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) states, apparently from personal knowledge, that the statement is untrue or false. I cannot very well rule that that is out of order.

Mr. TURRIFF. I will say it is absolutely untrue if that will suit hon. gentlemen any better. I will say further that before the hon. member for West Toronto made the sale to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company the Minister of the Interior of that day, on two different occasions a year apart wrote to the solicitor of the hon. member for West Toronto, the man who was handling the case that they had against the government, asking the government to give them cash in lieu of land, sending him a map and stating that there had been set apart 10,000,000 acres of land in addition to what they already had had set apart in 1887.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I ask the hon. gentleman who the solicitor is to whom he refers?

Mr. TURRIFF. I refer to Mr. Creelman who is at the present time the solicitor of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, who, at that time, was solicitor for Osler, Hammond and Nanton, and who had brought action against the government to force the government to pay them cash in lieu of land on the ground that the land was absolutely unfit for settlement. In order to give them a better opportunity of locating their land, the government in 1900 and 1901, set apart four different blocks in addition to what had already been set apart, out of which they might select the 800,000 acres which were coming to them.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Who had brought action?

Mr. TURRIFF. The Regina, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway Company.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have not the records before me, but I have investigated the question very carefully. I have looked over every scrap of paper I could find in two very large returns. I looked up the case after it had been stated in the House that notice had been given, and I can find no such notice had been given, and I can find no notice given to any solicitor which would give the information which the hon. gentleman has stated. I examined the returns with great care because that statement had been made and I could find no notice such as the hon. gentleman has spoken of.

Mr. TURRIFF. If the hon. gentleman will get a copy of the bill of rights that was presented by Osler, Hammond and Nanton on behalf of the railway he will find copies of these letters of the Minister of the Interior to their own solicitor and copies of their letters from their own solicitor back to the Minister of the Interior giving the reasons why they would not take the land in these four new blocks, and saying that they had sent their inspectors over that

land. Not only did the hon. member for West Toronto know that the land had been set apart, but they sent their inspectors over the land, their inspectors examined most of this new area of 10,000,000 acres and they reported back to the government that in the additional area they were not able to find enough land which would come up to the requirements of their contract, that is to say, which was fairly fit for settlement. The Minister of the Interior notified them that if they could not find enough land within these four blocks and within the original blocks set apart by order in council they could then go outside of these blocks into any land which had not been selected by other railway companies and take what they could get.

Mr. TAYLOR. What has this to do with robbing the Indians?

Mr. TURRIFF. It was the hon. leader of the opposition who brought this matter up. I am only replying to a statement made by your hon. leader to show that he has been misled by the hon. member for West Toronto and I am just putting the facts of the case before the House. It has nothing to do with the Indians, it has nothing to do with the matter that is under discussion, but it was not I who brought it up; it was the hon. leader of the opposition.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend does not desire to mislead the House, I am sure.

Mr. TURRIFF. No.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not introduce it; the Minister of the Interior introduced it.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think it would be wise not to pursue this subject any further but to confine the discussion to the subject before the chair.

Mr. TURRIFF. I will close in one minute. I want to say in conclusion that the statement that has been made in this House before and which the hon. leader of the opposition has made now, on the authority of the hon. member for West Toronto, is absolutely without foundation, that there is not a word of truth in it, that when Osler, Hammond and Nanton sold the land to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company there was an increase in the area and that if the hon. leader of the opposition wishes to go into the matter further all he needs to do is to get the bill of rights presented by Osler, Hammond and Nanton or send over to the Department of the Interior and get copies of the correspondence with respect to the matter.

Mr. HENDERSON. I assume that as this matter of the sale of land by the trustees of the Regina, Long Lake & Saskatchewan Railway Company has been brought under review you will, Mr. Speaker, make no objection to hearing the statement which I propose to offer with reference to it?

Mr. SPEAKER. I think it is not relevant to the matter under discussion. It was brought in by way of illustration, as I understand, in the first place, by the Minister of the Interior and was used in the same way by the hon. leader of the opposition. I think the discussion of it is not relevant.

Mr. HENDERSON. As the statement was made by the Minister of the Interior in reference to my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Osler), which I regard as a very unfair statement, I thought that I, would be entitled to a small modicum of the time for the purpose of placing the matter in its true light before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. On a question of privilege that might be done, but it would seem as if it would lead to a great deal of trouble and confusion if it were done on a specific motion in amendment such as this. I think the preferable course would be for the hon. member to take the matter up on some future occasion.

Mr. HENDERSON. I shall take another opportunity then of placing the matter in its true light.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Boyce).

YEAS :

Messieurs

Alcorn,
Armstrong,
Avery,
Barker,
Barr,
Beattie,
Bennett,
Bergeron,
Blain,
Borden (Carleton),
Boyce,
Brabazon,
Broder,
Chisholm (Huron),
Christie,
Clements,
Crocket,
Daniel,
Elson,
Foster,
Fowler,
Henderson,
Herron,
Hughes (Victoria),
Kemp,
Lake,
Lalor,
Lancaster,
Lefurgey,
Lennox,
Lewis,
MacLaren,
McCarthy (Calgary),
Marshall,
Martin (Queens, P.E.I.),
Morin,
Northrup,
Owen,
Paquet,
Perley,
Reid (Grenville),
Roche (Marquette),
Schaffner,
Sproule,
Stanfield,
Staples,
Taylor,
Walsh (Huntingdon),
White,
Wilson (Lennox & Addington),
Wright (Muskoka)—51.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Aylesworth,
Beauparlant,
Beland,
Lemieux,
Logan,
Loggie,

Black,
Borden (Sir Frederick),
Brodeur,
Brown,
Caldwell,
Calvert,
Carney,
Caron,
Carrier,
Carvell,
Cash,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Clarke,
Conmee,
Crawford,
Cyr,
Delisle,
Demers,
Desjardins,
Devlin,
Dubeau,
Dugas,
Dyment,
Emmerson,
Ethier,
Fielding,
Finlay,
Finlayson,
Fisher,
Fortier,
Galliher,
Gauvreau,
Gervais,
Girard,
Graham,
Greenway,
Harty,
Hughes (Kings, P.E.I.),
Hunt,
Jackson (Selkirk),
Johnston,
Kennedy,
Knowles,
Lanctot (Richelieu),
Lapointe,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Lavergne,
Lovell,
Macdonald,
Maclean (Lunenburg),
Macpherson,
McCarthy (Simcoe),
McColl,
McCool,
McIntyre (Perth),
McIntyre (Strathcona),
McKenzie,
McLean (Huron),
McLean (York, C.),
McLennan,
Marcile (Bagot),
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Martin (Wellington),
Michaud,
Miller,
Oliver,
Pardee,
Paterson,
Parent,
Pickup,
Power,
Pugsley,
Ratz,
Reid (Restigouche),
Rivet,
Roche (Halifax),
Ross (Cape Breton),
Ross (Rimouski),
Ross (Yale-Cariboo),
Rousseau,
Savoie,
Schell (Glengarry),
Schell (Oxford),
Sinclair,
Smith (Oxford),
Stewart,
Talbot,
Telford,
Tobin,
Tolmie,
Turcotte,
Turgeon,
Turriff,
Walsh (Montreal, St. Anne),
Watson.—101.

Amendment negatived.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT.

Mr. S. J, JACKSON (Selkirk). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the chair, I wish to rise to a question of veracity between the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) and myself which arose yesterday. That hon. gentleman made the statement that the polling subdivisions in Manitoba were made by the judges, and I denied the statement. The hon. gentleman was appealing to the Prime Minister and he said :

I would remind him also that the present provincial polling subdivisions have been created by the judges—not by the Lieutenant Governor in Council nor by the returning officers, but by the judges. There can be no party advantage in arranging polling subdivisions; my objection is based upon the confusion likely to arise in having different polling subdivisions for the Dominion from those established for the province.

Mr. HENDERSON.

In answer to that I said :

I may state, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. W. J. Roche) is not aware of it, that at present the judges do not arrange the polling subdivisions, but the government arrange the registration districts and the polling divisions.

The hon. member for Marquette said in reply :

As usual, the hon. gentleman is speaking without full knowledge when he says that the judges do not fix the polling subdivisions.

I would just like to point out to the hon. gentleman that in the Manitoba 'Gazette' of April 28, 1906, there is a proclamation issued by the Lieutenant Governor, which reads as follows :

Whereas, pursuant to the provisions of the Manitoba Election Act, it is necessary to add to and revise the lists of electors in and for the several electoral divisions of the province of Manitoba, and it is necessary for the said purpose to issue a proclamation containing the information hereinafter set forth.

Now, therefore, we have thought fit and do hereby, pursuant to the powers and authority contained in the Manitoba Election Act, proclaim the following:

1. That it has been determined to add to and revise the lists of electors for the several electoral divisions of the province, except those of Brandon City, Winnipeg Centre, Winnipeg North and Winnipeg South.

2. That the names and post office addresses of the persons appointed to act as registration clerks in the respective polling divisions of the several electoral divisions are as follows:

It goes on and gives the polling subdivisions for every electoral district in the province of Manitoba. Then it winds up by saying :

In testimony whereof we have caused these our letters to be made patent and the great seal of our said province of Manitoba to be hereunto affixed.

On the following page of the 'Gazette' you will find another proclamation :

Whereas it has been determined to add to and revise the list of electors in and for the several electoral divisions in the province of Manitoba, pursuant to the provisions of the Manitoba Election Act, and it is necessary for the said purpose to constitute the several judges of the county courts in the said province a board of registration;

Now, therefore, we have thought fit and do hereby, pursuant to the powers and authority contained in the Manitoba Election Act, consitute the several judges of the county courts holding office in the province of Manitoba a board of registration for all and singular the premises.

I think it is not necessary for me to say anything further on this matter, except to ask the hon. member for Marquette how the judges can obtain such knowledge of the various electoral districts as to enable them to lay out the polling subdivisions. As a practical politician, he knows that the mem-

bers always lay out the polling subdivisions. The judges would have to travel through every electoral district to get the necessary local knowledge to do the work. That is the political end of the business, and it is done by order of Lieutenant Governor in Council on the advice of the local member or the man who has been the candidate in the preceding election.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Nothing that the hon. gentleman has said has disproved in the slightest degree the statement I made. He asks what local knowledge the judges of the province of Manitoba have that they can lay out the polling subdivisions; and yet we approved yesterday of a section of an Act conferring that power on the judges.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. They will have to come to me for advice in regard to my district.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). This is the reason the hon. gentleman has been bringing his influence to bear on the Prime Minister, in order that the judges might go to the member for Selkirk and get advice. Now the cat is out of the bag. This is the influence behind the Throne. So that after all the judges are not going to lay out the polling subdivisions.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. We will have to give them advice. You will have to give them advice too.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). No, my advice will not be asked for. The hon. gentleman has read from the Manitoba 'Gazette' a proclamation defining the polling subdivisions, and he states that orders in council are issued fixing the dates and places for the holding of the courts of revision. As a matter of fact the judges name the dates and places for the courts of revision and define the polling subdivisions. I have original letters from every judge of Manitoba showing that they fix the dates and places for the holding of courts of revision, as I stated yesterday. There is the order in council approving of every one of these recommendations and that was given out to the public by means of a proclamation, so that the judges in practice appoint the places and the very same practice and procedure is adopted in connection with the polling subdivision. The judges name the polling subdivisions and the Lieutenant Governor in council issues a proclamation making them known to the public.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. Where did that emanate from?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). If the hon. gentleman wants to read the information, I have it right in my possession now.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. What is the use of looking to a judge against the statute?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I did not wish to place on 'Hansard' those letters at this late stage, but, as the hon. gentleman seems in doubt, I shall do so. Here is a letter from Mr. Justice Myers:

Winnipeg, April 7, 1908.

James Hooper, Esq.,

Deputy Provincial Secretary, Winnipeg.

Dear Sir,—Replying to your letter of the 4th instant, I beg to say that the following times and places will suit me for holding the court of revision on the list of electors, namely:—

Lakeside at Macdonald, on Monday, June 8, from 11 o'clock, a.m., to 4 o'clock, p.m.; Gladstone at Gladstone, on Tuesday, June 9, from 1 o'clock, to 6 o'clock, p.m.; Beautiful Plains at Neepawa, on Wednesday, June 10, from 10 o'clock to 6 o'clock, p.m.

And so on, with each place in the riding. And these places named by Judge Myers were in every instance adopted and a proclamation issued to the public.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. Those are the courts of revision.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. This letter is signed 'Yours sincerely, R. H. Myers,' who used to be the leader of the Liberals in the local legislature before he was made a judge. I have got letters from the other judges in other ridings naming the times and places for the holding of the courts.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Does the hon. gentleman argue that because the judges have named the places for registration they have also named the polling subdivisions?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I can give the very same evidence with regard to the polling subdivisions. They named the polling subdivisions as well. I also wish to inform the hon. gentleman that I have it on the authority of the King's Printer of Manitoba that the judges were not only asked to name the different places for the holding of courts of revision, but to delimit the boundaries of the polling subdivisions, and they did so, and that was approved by order in council and issued to the public in the form of a proclamation.

DEEP WATERWAYS COMMISSION.

Mr. ANDREW BRODER (Dundas). Before you leave the chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring up for a few moments the matter of the damming of the St. Lawrence down at the Long Sault. I have in my hand a petition to the International Waterways Commission from parties representing the St. Lawrence Power Company, and it has reference to matters that ought to be brought before this House and country. The American company, called the Long Sault Development Company, and the St. Lawrence Company are identical in their interests. The one gets its powers from the Canadian and the other from the American authorities, but there can be no

doubt that they have a community of interests. The American Power House and Lock Company, known as the Long Sault Development Company, propose to construct a power house and lock between the foot of the Long Sault island and the main shore, as shown on plan No. 1. Permission has already been granted them by the New York State legislature, authorizing this construction so far as it lies in American territory. What particularly affects the Dominion of Canada is that they propose to dam the St. Lawrence main channel, as well as the south channel, so that virtually the whole river will be dammed at that point. In looking up the correspondence, I find that if they are allowed to do what they want, all the risk will be run by the Canadians and none at all by the Americans.

I wish to refer to another matter which ought to be brought to the attention of the House, and that is that the Waterways Commission, in their recommendations, seem to take a line which would permit or justify the Chicago canal. We know that is going to affect Lake Erie, because they are proposing, as a remedy for the damage that that work is likely to do to the navigation of Lake Erie, to dam the lake near the Niagara river. The several reports and data furnished by the commission point to the conclusion that for sanitary purposes the Chicago canal will necessarily be allowed. The Chicago people have put up the argument that it is altogether for drainage and sanitary purposes for the city of Chicago, but none the less it will affect navigation. If any of the reports can be relied on, it will lower the water, and I want to draw the attention of the government to this. In every instance in which this matter has been referred to any expert authority under the control of the government, the opinion is given that they have not sufficient data on which to base a judgment. Take all the reports and correspondence, and you will find that no one ventures to express an opinion as to what effect this will have on the navigation of the St. Lawrence. That is sufficient reason for our government to say at once that no such thing will be allowed.

Referring again to the proposed damming of the St. Lawrence, when you look up the record you will see that this question was dealt with away back in 1842 by the Ashburton treaty. The seventh clause of that treaty distinctly states:

> It is further agreed that the channel, in the river St. Lawrence on both sides of the Long Sault islands and of Barnhart island——

It refers to other rivers which I do not need to specify here.

> —should be equally free and open to the ships, vessels and boats of both parties.

Mr. BRODER.

Now, away back as far as 1842—I suppose in part, for the reason that this place is very near the point where the river ceases to be the dividing line between the two countries—this matter was particularly referred to. We should stand on the principle of that treaty, we should maintain the spirit of that treaty, and keep both these channels open to both countries for all time. In the treaty of 1871, while not the same language is used, virtually the same conclusion is reached. And, while I am dealing with the matter, I think it well to state very clearly that the people along the river are very much concerned as to what may be done by the government. We have the assurance, given, I think, last February, by the right hon. Prime Minister that nothing would be done by the government without all parties affected by such operations being consulted or notified. That is not the exact language, but that is the spirit of the promise given. This is a matter affecting the navigation of one of our greatest rivers, and it ought not to be dealt with in any serious way without the people's representatives in parliament being apprised of the conclusion that is come to. We know that if the people once get the privilege of damming that river, laying out millions of money as they propose to do according to their own statement, navigation will be but a secondary consideration with those who hold these great interests. I do not think the government should allow local commercial considerations to affect the navigation of a great river which has been made by solemn treaty, common to the two countries.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. BRODER. When the House rose at six o'clock I was arguing that local commercial interests should not interfere with the navigation of a river that was of general importance. Now in order to give the House some idea as to what the St. Lawrence Power Company, in connection with the Long Sault Development Company, are asking the government of this country to do, I wish to read the request that they make upon our government:

> (a) To construct a solid masonry dam from a point near the Canadian main shore, about opposite lock 20, extending to the international boundary line, there to join a dam to be constructed in connection with the works above described in American territory.
>
> (b) To construct a power house between the northeasterly end of this dam and the Canadian shore, together with a new lock about 2,600 feet west of present lock 20, and an earthen dike, having a top width of about 100 feet, between this power house and lock, also a similar earthen dike extending from this lock northwesterly and parallel to the present

canal, and connecting with the main shore at Milles Roches.

(c) To enlarge the present channel of Little river as above set forth, to a minimum width of about 800 feet, and to raise the level of the pond above the dams to an elevation five feet higher than the present level of the Cornwall canal above lock 20.

(d) After the stability of all of the above described works has been satisfactorily proved, to remove the two earthen dams at the easterly and westerly ends of Sheik Island and to enlarge the present channel on the north side of Sheik Island.

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

Now that is the proposition. That means to dam the St. Lawrence river at that point from the main shore over to meet similar works on the American side. I want to say this, that you cannot tell, in a work of that kind, what eventuality might arise. Something might occur that might change the whole aspect of that river so far as navigation is concerned, and if anything should occur to transfer the control of the navigation of that river now in our hands, to American control, in which the citizens of the United States were interested, then Canadian interests might suffer very materially. Now it may be quite a surprise to many in this country to learn that the people of Canada have not had the use of the New York state canals for thirty-seven years; for thirty-seven years Canadian marine interests and Canadian vessels have not been allowed to use the New York State canals. Now what does that mean in case anything should be done to transfer the control of the navigation of the St. Lawrence at that point from the Canadian government to the American government? As I say, you cannot tell what might happen. It is a peculiar circumstance, that while in the treaty of 1871 the United States government stipulated and agreed to urge upon the state of New York the wisdom of giving Canada the use of her canals, whether they carried out that obligation or not, the state of New York has not allowed Canadians to use their canals for the last thirty-seven years. If you go down into the Richelieu river you find that our pulp wood, our lumber and coal go down that river to Lake Champlain in American bottoms. These are things that ought to be considered, and I would like to consider them more at length if time allowed. I certainly think that this is a question deserving of careful consideration by the Canadian government; it is a question that should not be left to one or two men, but should be considered from the national standpoint of keeping that river for the use of Canadian navigation interests. That river is the channel through which imports from Europe are carried into the interior of this country, and it is the great navigable outlet to the sea in the summer time from the interior portion of Canada. It seems to me the government cannot be too careful in dealing with those interests, because no engineer seems to be able to say what effect the damming of the river at that point, as proposed by these companies, might have on the navigation of the river. We know that the slowing of the current by ice jams some miles below Morrisburg has raised the river ten or twelve feet at Morrisburg. When the ice jams occur some eight miles below, the ice gradually fills in until you can drive across it at Morrisburg. This is the first time that it has been known to have reached as far up as Morrisburg. But it has occurred several times some miles below Morrisburg, and raised the water in the river several feet. If the proposed dams were built, the slowing of the current might bring on this ice jam and cause very serious injury to the people along the shores of the St. Lawrence on either side. There is this point to consider, that if you leave the river in its natural condition, any damage that may occur from ice jams, or from any natural cause, the government of this country could not be held responsible. But if we allow dams to be built across that river then this government would be responsible for damages that might result. I have felt it my duty, as voicing the feelings of my constituents along the river in that section of the country, to draw the attention of the House and the government to this important matter, and I regret that the time at our disposition will not allow me to pursue the subject further.

Mr. R. A. PRINGLE (Stormont). I did not think that this matter would come up for discussion at the present time. I may say that I have long taken a very keen interest in the development of power on the St. Lawrence river at or near the town of Cornwall. The hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Broder) has expressed my sentiments when he says that the question of navigation is one of paramount importance, and if I considered for a moment that the accomplishment of this scheme would in any way injuriously affect the navigation of the St. Lawrence river, I would oppose it strenuously. But, Mr. Speaker, the matter is in that stage that I do not think this House is in a position intelligently to discuss it. The Canadian sections of the Deep Waterways Commission have given this matter a great deal of consideration, and in their report they express themselves as not yet having come to a conclusion, and they desire to get the very best expert engineering evidence before they finally report on the matter. I may say that the constituency which I have the honour to represent is vitally interested in this question.

We have had meetings of our town council and our board of trade and delegations have been sent to appear before the Deep Waterways Commission to urge upon them

that they give to this matter their most serious consideration. The Deep Waterways Commission have not acted hastily in this matter. They have held meetings at different times. They held a meeting in the city of Toronto and after they had had some representations against the scheme they, for the convenience of the people who might urge opposition to this scheme, adjourned their meeting to Montreal so as to give every one interested an opportunity of being heard. Not one engineer in this or any other country has put himself on record as saying that this scheme will injuriously affect navigation. On the other hand we have the reports of the most eminent American, Canadian and English engineers to the effect that this scheme would not only not injure navigation on the St. Lawrence, but would be of incalculable assistance to it. We saw what occurred here a few days ago. We have a canal, over 9 miles in length, some 6 or 7 miles of that canal are separated from the river by an earth embankment and a greater strain is being put upon the banks of this canal year by year by the increased size of the vessels. They are not increased in length because the locks will permit of a vessel of only a certain length passing through, but they have been increased in width and in carrying capacity. To-day we have vessels going through that canal carrying 80,000 and 90,000 bushels of grain and with the increased displacement of water there is greater pressure put upon these banks. In 1903 I put myself on record in this House in favour of a lock at the foot of Sheik's Island dam, into the St. Lawrence river. If that lock had been built, and engineers of that day said it was quite feasible, we would have had no delay to vessels passing through the Cornwall canal. There would have been no request for a vote of $150,000 to repair break as it is very probable there would have been no break as vessels could have come down Sheik's Island dam, passed through that lock into the St. Lawrence and gone on their way saving the time that it now takes to pass through five locks which is considerable, and saving danger to banks of canal from large vessels passing through canal. My remarks at that time are to be found in 'Hansard' of 1903, page 14137. I said :

I understand from those who are engaged in navigation that a saving of an hour or two could be made by having a lock immediately east of the Sheik's island dam, which would let vessels into the St. Lawrence river without going down through three locks to the eastern end of the canal; and it would also permit all vessels to come up and enter the canal just at the foot of the dam and go through the Cornwall canal in a very short space of time. Vessel owners have told me that it would be an immense saving if that lock were put in, not only a saving of expense, but a great saving of time in passing through the canal.

Mr. PRINGLE

It would not have been a very expensive lock. It would have paid for itself between 1904 and the present time. That is practically the scheme now. The scheme to-day is to have a lock, or two locks, where this dam will be built so that vessels coming through Sheik's Island dam may pass on into the St. Lawrence, saving time and expense. This is a matter of the utmost importance to the whole surrounding country but it should not in any way influence myself or any man in this House in favour of this scheme if it is not practicable and if it is likely in any way to interfere with navigation. What are the objections we find ? My hon. friend has said that no engineer has been able to say what effect it would have on navigation. I ask my hon. friend to read the reports of the engineers who have investigated this matter most thoroughly and who say that the scheme would not be objectionable from the point of view of navigation but that on the other hand it would assist navigation.

There are one or two objections made with regard to this scheme. One is that it will prevent certain tourist steamers passing through the Long Sault rapids. I say at once that it will. For four months there are certain tourist steamers which pass down the Long Sault rapids. They say it will destroy the scenic effect. What does one eminent engineer say in regard to that ? He says : 'Take the great dam on the Nile—I think it is called the Assouan dam ; that dam is bringing yearly increasing numbers of visitors to see its beauties. It is possibly the largest dam in the world.' When this dam is constructed on the St. Lawrence it will be the largest dam in the world and the beauty of the dam will be just as great as the beauty of the Long Sault rapids. But this is not the only rapid we have. There is a chain of rapids all down the St. Lawrence and many boats pass down through them to the city of Montreal. Now, it is said that it will back up the water on the property west of the Cornwall canal. What do the engineers say ? The engineers say that it will back up the water as far as Farran's Point canal and they say that in so far as Morrisburg is concerned the effect will be practically nothing, that it will be nil.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. How many miles will that be ?

Mr. PRINGLE. It will be 15 or 16 miles. There is a drop in the river from Morrisburg to where this dam would be erected of between 13 and 16 feet. We have between Morrisburg and the Long Sault a small rapid opposite Farran's Point and engineers say that it would practically do away with this rapid. It is a great inconvenience now to navigation and why ? Because steamers going west have to take to the Farran's Point canal instead of keeping to the river as they could not possibly

take their heavy loads up that raipd current. This would do away with that inconvenience. The moment they came within the influence of this dam they would have practically smooth water until they got to Morrisburg where they would take to the Morrisburg canal. I ask the House to pardon me ; I know we are pressed very much for time, but this is a matter that could not be discussed intelligently in fifteen or twenty minutes. I have not taken up the time of this House for some time and it is a very important matter. For myself I do not see the necessity of it being brought up at the present time because I am quite satisfied that the government would not consider entering into any arrangement for the construction of this dam until such time as they not only had a report from the Canadian section of the Waterways Commission, but until such time as they had brought the matter before this House where it could be very thoroughly discussed. My hon. friend has spoken of the channels. To-day all south of Barnhardt's island is the American channel which is practically the only navigable channel; 95 per cent of the water flows through that channel and only 5 per cent through what is an international channel, being the channel between Barnhardt's island and the Canadian shore. The effect of the construction of this dam will be to send 50 per cent of the water to the Canadian side and 50 per cent to the American side. It is well to talk of the beauties of the St. Lawrence : no one appreciates more than I do the grandeur of the Long Sault rapids, but I believe there will still be great beauty there after the construction of the dam and we will have hundreds of thousands of horse-power to be used by our people in manufacturing on the Canadian side. There will no doubt be a large development of power on the American side; they have it to-day. The Long Sault Power Company have their power at Messina. What has been the result ? The construction of one of the greatest works in the United States. The Pittsburg Reduction Company have put up an enormous establishment there. They came to us ; I went with them personally as I was anxious to see the work located on our side. They went over the St. Lawrence Power Company's scheme but found there was no possible way of getting more power than there is at the present without an enormous expense and they turned it down. They established their Canadian institution at Shawinigan Falls and built one of their American institutions right across from us. We wanted that industry and would have had it if we had the powers which we will have under this project. A great deal has been said by the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid) against the St. Lawrence Power Company. It has been one of the best developments in eastern Ontario.

Mr. J. D. REID. It has the largest rake-off of any company in Canada.

Mr. PRINGLE. I do not know aything about the rake-offs, and I am not discussing the contract that has been threshed out before. It has been an enormous benefit. Only a few years ago one of our woollen mills closed down and had to go out of business. We were able to have it reopened because of the electrical power and to-day it is employing three or four hundred men in a different class of industry and owing to the power we have had other factories located there.

We suffer in Cornwall from floods in winter, caused by the frazil that comes down, forms in the rapids and passes under the ice which has become solid, causing a shove. The result has been that portions of the town have been flooded, and mills have been closed for weeks. One of the largest of the cotton mills was flooded. These people are naturally interested in seeing this scheme go through, so long as it does not impair in any way the navigation of the St. Lawrence. They know from the engineers' reports that the result will be no floods in the winter. This water will be hemmed back, it will form almost level to the dam, will freeze solid there and there will be just a natural flow over the dam with no possibility of the injurious floods we have had in years past. On one occasion the government had to come to the rescue of people who had suffered from one of those heavy floods. It has been said that the American section of the International Waterways Commission have reported favourably on this. If they have it has been after giving the matter the greatest possible consideration. When the Canadian section of the International Waterways Commission said to Mr. Calvin, to the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company and others who were opposing this scheme : Nominate an engineer and we will appoint him and get him to look into the matter and see what his report will be, they did not take the responsibility of nominating an engineer because no engineer would stand for the statements made by some of those people that the erection of this dam would decrease the flow of water east of Cornwall. Some went so far as to say it would affect the flow of water at Montreal, but that statement was so ridiculous that they could not get any engineer to endorse it. The effect of this scheme would be that instead of only 5 per cent of the waters of the St. Lawrence going down on the Canadian side we would have 50 per cent. The effect would be to give us all the power that could be developed, practically unlimited power, whereas we are now absolutely limited. It is no wonder that some of the power companies are instrumental in putting up opposition to this scheme. This development would be one

of tremendous advantage to the whole eastern portion of Ontario and I am satisfied it would be of great advantage to the county of Dundas, which my hon. friend (Mr. Broder) represents. While the Minister of Railways has been expressing his opinion against this scheme it would be a tremendous advantage to his own constituency for this power would be taken to Brockville where it is needed, more than in any other town in Ontario. I have refrained from speaking on this before because I felt that we had not all the information before the House required for a full and intelligent discussion of the question, but when the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Broder) opposes it in the dying days of the session, I feel that in the interests of the eastern portions of Ontario, especially in the interest of the county of Stormont, if this scheme does not injuriously affect navigation, but on the contrary, aids and assists it, the government should give it careful consideration and should procure all possible information on the subject before any agreement is entered into or any permission given for the erection of this dam. Of course I foresee that the permission would have to be a joint permission of the United States and Canada, but nothing I think should be done until the whole matter comes before parliament.

Mr. J. D. REID (Grenville). I protest absolutely against the dam being built. It certainly would be unfair to have it built and destroy the navigation on the St. Lawrence. The hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Pringle) complains that I have been finding fault with the St. Lawrence Power Company. I have not been finding fault with them as a corporation, I have been criticising the agreement made by this government with the St. Lawrence Power Company for eighty-nine years, which I think is outrageous, while the price the government are paying this company is simply absurd. A scheme of this kind is such a great scheme, affecting the whole marine interests in this country, that I think no action should be taken by the government in regard to it until the whole matter is submitted to parliament. I only rose to ask if the Prime Minister can see his way to give us a promise that no action will be taken in the direction of granting a charter or the right to dam the River St. Lawrence until the matter is submitted to parliament and thoroughly discussed here. The right hon. gentleman did state a few months ago that nothing would be done until every one had an opportunity of being heard; but I think we should have that opportunity in parliament, and if the Prime Minister would give us that promise, I do not think there will be any reason for detaining the House any longer at this time, as the matter could come up next session.

Mr. GRAHAM. Being conversant with the territory covered by this discussion, there is a great temptation for me almost to attempt to make a speech; but I will resist the temptation. This is a matter that was brought before the department some months ago, and it was placed before members of the government—the premier, I think the Minister of Public Works, and myself. It is a matter of such great importance that it could not be dealt with quickly or without the gravest consideration. The government feeling that it affected particularly three departments—the Marine Department, the Public Works Department and the Railways and Canals Department—appointed a chief engineer of each of those departments, and these three form a committee, as it were, to look into the matter from the departmental standpoint. They have not yet submitted to their respective departments the result of their investigation; they have not yet had time to do so. But, to be very brief, the matter is of such great importance—and there are two sides to it—that before anything could be done it would require the best consideration of the best talent that could be brought to bear upon it. The government has no idea of taking any steps to commit the country to anything in connection with this scheme until parliament has a full opportunity to discuss it and approve or disapprove of it.

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

Steam service between Canada and Australia, $180,509.

Mr. FIELDING. This is not a new service, but it was not included in the main estimates owing to negotiations which were taking place in connection with the contract.

Mr. BERGERON. Does my hon. friend know the company that is doing the service?

Mr. FIELDING. It is the same company as before. I think it is called the Union Steamship Company. Sir James Mills is the manager of it.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it an English company?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, with headquarters in London.

Additional amount required for the Canada, Japan and China service, $48,666.66.

Mr. FIELDING. This arises from a readjustment of the service with the imperial government under which we are obliged to pay somewhat more than we formerly did.

To provide for the appointment of a post office inspector, an assistant inspector and three clerks at North Bay, Ontario, $5,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Will there be an office there for the staff?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Mr. DANIEL. Who is to occupy the position of additional post office inspector for New Brunswick?

Mr. LEMIEUX. That is a matter of promotion, and we have not yet decided, but will in a few days.

Mr. DANIEL. Has the hon. gentleman filled the place of the late Mr. Ryan?

Mr. LEMIEUX. We shall in a few days. Mr. Gross, the senior officer, and an old and faithful employee, will be given the appointment.

Mr. J. D. REID. I thought I saw that Mr. Hawken is going to be superannuated.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes; he was appointed before confederation, and has on many occasions applied for superannuation. He has done very faithful service, but of late the office has been rather in want of a younger man.

Mr. FOWLER. I have a letter from a constituent of mine who is a mail carrier and has not received justice at the hands of the department. I refer to Mr. Gibbons, who has a claim some three years old. He had a mail contract and he went to Clifton, some ten or fourteen miles further than his contract called for. He sent in a claim for something over $100 and the department offered him $28, which he indignantly refused.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I urged his claim on my hon. colleague's predecessor very strongly some time ago.

Mr. FOWLER. This matter has been before the department some time. I am afraid the Minister of Public Works could not have urged it with his usual vigour, or it would have been paid long ago.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I pleaded very strongly.

Mr. FOWLER. I am satisfied that if the facts were put before the Postmaster General he would recognize the justice of the claim. A department with a constantly increasing surplus does not want to get services for nothing.

Mr. LEMIEUX. If my hon. friend will send in this claim I shall give it every consideration.

Mr. STAPLES. What progress is the hon. minister making towards the establishment of a post office at St. Charles? The people are extremely anxious to have one, and write me frequently about it.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Some weeks ago I established a post office at the request of the people of the locality, selecting what I thought the best site, near the church. But I have received a complaint from some petitioners who say that this is not the proper site. There is a difference of opinion among the people on this point. I have written to the inspector, Mr. McLeod, at Winnipeg, asking him to make a choice of a site.

Mr. STAPLES. It will depend on the inspector?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, he will make the selection.

Mr. FOWLER. I have found the letter of which I was speaking. The writer says:

> They made me carry the daily for a month from Clifton, also the Long's cove bag for a time. And about three years ago the inspector had a bill made for me of $111.43.

The inspector is Mr. Colter, of St. John.

> I was not quite satisfied and wanted $124, and sent this bill to the Deputy Postmaster General, but have heard nothing of it since.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Perhaps this was sent at a time when the Deputy Postmaster General was away. He was absent on leave for four months. I will see that the papers are brought before me and that justice is done.

Mr. FOWLER. Does that mean that you will send the cheque in the morning?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Practically so, if the claim is a valid one.

Mr. WHITE. Has the department come to a decision respecting the establishment of a post office at Graham Station?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have asked the inspector to give me a fresh report, as there are conflicting statements with regard to that post office. I am sure that the distance justifies placing a post office at that point, but I will act on the report of the inspector.

Mr. CROCKET. Does not the department issue a monthly circular showing the new post offices established during the month and the changes made in existing offices?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Mr. CROCKET. Why is it not sent to members of this House? I am sure it is information that would be of use to them.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I will see that that is done.

Mr. LENNOX. At Barrie, there are two post offices, one in the old part of the town and one at Allandale, known as Allandale post office. I understand that letters transmitted from one post office to the other must bear a two-cent stamp. I called the Postmaster General's attention to this some time ago and, as I recollect it, he said the matter would be adjusted when the Bill went though. I have a letter which I have forwarded to the Postmaster General from a constituent of mine, not a political supporter I am sorry to say, who asked me to inquire into the matter. He says that the postmaster at Barrie informs him that he

has no instructions on the subject, and the two-cent rate is still charged.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The one-cent drop letter rate will come into effect as soon as the Bill is sanctioned.

Miscellaneous—amount required to pay losses sustained by Chinese residents of Vancouver in connection with the riots of Vancouver in September, 1907, and the legal expenses arising out of the inquiry into the same, $26,990.

Mr. BERGERON. Are we to expose ourselves to such damages every time there is a row between whites and the Chinese in Vancouver ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. It has been a good lesson, and I hope it will be the last.

Mr. DANIEL. How much are the legal expenses ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. About $1,000.

Mr. KEMP. Is not this a municipal matter ? If there were a riot in Ottawa or Montreal, would not the municipality have to pay the damage ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. There is a difference in this case. I do not wish to excuse the acts perpetrated in September last, but my hon. friend will understand that this is quite different from a riot taking place, say, in Ottawa, where there is only one nationality —that is, we are all Canadians. But this riot in Vancouver was engineered, I am sorry to say, not by our own people, but by foreigners——

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Galvanized Yankees.

Mr. LEMIEUX ——and directed against other foreigners. They have appealed to their respective governments for redress and payment of the losses that have been suffered. We thought, under the circumstances, the government should see that this amount was paid, I hope we shall not hear any more of such riots.

Mr. BERGERON. Are we paying for houses wrecked, glass broken and that kind of thing ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) will refer to the report I laid on the table some time ago, first as to the Chinese claims, then as to the Japanese claims, he will see that the whole matter was sifted to the bottom. Mr. King went to Vancouver and took evidence. He had an attorney there to represent the government, and there were legal representatives of the Chinese and Japanese governments. No fancy damages are to be paid or were paid.

Mr. BERGERON. No doubt about that; but if these people enjoy this sport and go in for another row, will the government of Canada have to pay for the pots cassés ?

Mr. LENNOX.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I think we must regard this case as exceptional.

Mr. FOWLER. Does not the head tax paid by the Chinese go to the Receiver General ?

Mr. FIELDING. Only half of it; the other half goes to the provincial government.

Mr. FOWLER. I was going to say that if the government receives the head tax it is only reasonable they should pay the damages.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. If this government is taxing Chinese who come in $500 a head, will he undertake to tax these galvanized Yankees, these anarchists who come in, $500 a head ?

Expenses of Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the losses and damages sustained by the Chinese population of the city of Vancouver on the occasion of riots during September, 1907 (payments on account of services rendered may be made to any member of the Civil Service notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act), $1,165.

Mr. DANIEL. Was that for salaries ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. To pay the expenses of the inquiry—shorthand writers, typewriters, and so on.

Expenses of Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the method by which oriental labourers have been induced to come to Canada (payments on account of services rendered may be made to any member of the civil service notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act), $3,311.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Has this commission succeeded in connecting Mr. W. T. R. Preston with the inducing of these oriental immigrants to come to Canada ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am glad to be in a position to assure my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) that Mr. Preston has nothing to do with the influx of orientals into Canada. Quite the contrary. I met Mr. Preston when in Japan, and I am in a position to say he is rendering very valuable service to this country on this question as well as in relation to commerce. He is a good and very efficient officer of the government.

To provide for expenses of Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the industrial disputes in connection with the cotton industry in the province of Quebec, $2,000.

Mr. BERGERON. What has the commission to do? Would my hon. friend tell us how it is going to work?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The commission has begun its sittings in Montreal to-day, as I see by the Montreal 'Star,' and several witneses have been summoned, and Mr. King is hearing evidence. My hon. friend will remember under what circumstances this commis-

sion was appointed. During the month of May, a strike occurred at several points in the province of Quebec, at Montmorency, at Valleyfield in the county represented by my hon. friend, at Magog and in Montreal. I was asked as Minister of Labour to intervene between the mill owners and their operatives. All I did was to promise the men that if they would return to work and accept the sataus quo I would appoint a commission. They said: We do not know what to do. One month we are told that our salaries are cut down by 10 per cent, and we do not know whether the financial position of the cotton industry is such as to justify a reduction in our salaries, therefore we ask the government to appoint a commission to investigate the circumstances. I did not make any promise, but I returned to Ottawa and submitted the case to the cabinet, and it was decided to appoint Mr. Mackenzie King, who has had large experience in these matters, to hold an investigation. He will confine his activities to the province of Quebec, and will ascertain whether it is true that the salaries have been necessarily reduced on account of over production, as it is claimed.

Mr. BERGERON. Several delegates from the cotton workers met the hon. gentleman in Montreal, I believe. What did they say to him, and what answer did he give them?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I do not exactly remember the answer I gave. But they represented to me that they had suffered two reductions in wages within the last five or six months, ten per cent one time, and ten per cent at another time, and they gave me the facts and figures. They showed that the average wages paid to men in Montreal was $10 or $11 per week, including men, women and children. I thought that was not a very high wage in these prosperous times. They said that there were some people working in those factories, even some mechanics, who were only receiving $5 a week. The delegates represented about 5,000 working people, and they said they would accept the conditions offered by the mills and return to work provided the government would appoint a commission to investigate the situation, and see whether it was true that the cotton market was glutted with goods, and that the owners were justified in reducing their wages in consequence.

Mr. BERGERON. What kind of an investigation is Mr. King holding? Some time ago I remember my hon. friend saying that Mr. King, or some other commissioner, would ask the company to show their books and to reveal the stocks they had on hand, and generally the financial condition of the company, and whether they were in a position to pay higher wages to their operatives. I told my hon. friend that I did not think the commissioner could force the company to show their books, and I am under the same impression still. I would ask my hon. friend to say how Mr. King can force any one of those companies to bring forward their books and show whether, from the condition of their business, they are able to pay the higher wages that they have so far refused to pay.

Mr. LEMIEUX. They will not be bound to pay higher wages, even if it is proven by their books that they have the means to do so, but the investigation will allow the public to judge who is right and who is wrong. The hon. gentleman questions Mr. King's power to examine the books. I think he is mistaken, because Mr. King is appointed under the Great Seal, he has a royal commission, and it gives him power to investigate the books of the company.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Does Mr. King's commission empower him to inquire into the relationship existing between the cotton industry here in Canada and that industry in other countries, and to consider whether the Canadian tariff is high enough to protect these industries? Perhaps the Minister of Finance could answer that question. Has Mr. King power to investigate the effect of the tariff upon Canadian industries?

Mr. FIELDING. No, I should say not.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That is the whole question.

Mr. FIELDING. That is a matter of opinion, some people think it is not.

Mr. BERGERON. I believe that there is something wrong in the present condition of the cotton industry. I am better acquainted with that than with the woollen industry, although I know that in my county the woollen industry is closing down this week, and will not resume unless there is a change in the tariff. But the cotton industry has been a subject for politicians to make capital out of. A man by the name of Paquette is playing a great game in Montreal to help the Liberal party. He has become one of the leaders of the workingmen, and has got them to believe that he is a very powerful man. But he made a mistake the last time because he thought the elections would take place in the fall. He was foiled in his attempt at that time; though he succeeded once before, when I was the victim. The workingmen were deceived, I was defeated and another man gained the seat. Now this is what I wish to bring to the attention of the House. On the last occasion only a few men went on strike, the mule spinners I believe they are called, who furnish work to the great body of the other workers in the mills, and when the mill spinners strike there is nothing for the other operatives to do. But the other operatives were not quite ready to follow their example, they became frightened. The manager of the mills had told them in a very candid manner that he could not pay them the wages which they

had been receiving. I may say that a year ago this man Paquette brought on a strike just at the time that the mills were in need of their men, they had orders from the west to fill, and they were caught by the throat, and had to give a 20 per cent increase of salary. But a change took place, orders were cancelled all over Canada, and then the manufacturers told their men in a very honest way that they could not continue paying the same salaries and keep their mills running, that they could only keep their mills running on condition of a reduction of 10 per cent in wages. Well, the men did not believe that, the agitators told them that it was not true. So when the mule spinners did go on strike, about one hundred of them, the mills were closed down, and the men were thrown out of work. There was an over production of goods, the stores were filled with merchandise, orders were cancelled, and the strike could not have occurred at a more convenient time for the employers. This took place during the last local elections. Now what I complain of is that Liberal politicians are responsible for this trouble, and the Minister of Labour is responsible.

The Minister of Labour gave these men to understand that they would appoint a royal commission, that that commission would settle matters, that it would go to the factory and find out, by looking at their books, if the company were in a position to pay the workingmen what they were asking or not. That was very unfortunate. My hon. friend knows that the Investigation Act passed last year gives him authority to compel public utilities to disclose their affairs, but that he has no right to go to a private concern and ask them to open their books to him. These men relied upon the statement of my hon. friend that he would do something for their relief, and they did not go back to work for nearly three weeks, involving a loss of about $150,000 in wages and otherwise. When I saw the appointment of the royal commission published in the papers, it struck me that it would be of no use. Mr. King, whether he is appointed under the Great Seal, or twenty Great Seals, could not, under the law, force any company to show their books if they refused to do so. We should be honest about this. What the cotton and woollen industries are complaining of is the tariff. My hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) knows very well that there are gentlemen sitting behind him who have been for the last ten days worrying him to do something with respect to the tariff. About $14,000,000 worth of cottons and about $10,000,000 worth of woollens come in to compete with the workingmen of Canada. You may appoint all the commissioners you like, you may drag the Great Seal from one end of Canada to the other, but until you give protection to these industries they cannot compete with the product of foreign workmen. You cannot pay a man $2 a day to make cotton and expect him to compete with a man in England who will work for 60 cents a day. Moreover, we give a preference to induce manufacturers in Great Britain to send cotton into this market. These factories in Canada to-day are working just on tolerance. At any moment they may close their doors, because they are not making any money. We cannot expect people to put their money into industries only to lose it. It is a matter of tariff and nothing else, and the appointment of this royal commission is only throwing dust in the eyes of these workingmen. It would have been better if the minister had gone to them and said: We cannot do anything for you; you will have to go to your employers and leave it to them; if they are in a position to pay you more wages they will, and if they are not we cannot help it.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Of course, I am not going to discuss the question of protection. It is late in the session to take up tariff matters. If, as the hon. gentleman says, this commission has been a sham to throw dust in the eyes of the public, I could have appointed it during the local campaign in May. But I did not do so. It is my duty as Minister of Labour to adjust any differences that may exist between capital and labour, and powers are conferred for that purpose upon the Minister of Labour by the Act. Yes, it is my duty to see that differences are adjusted between capital and labour. Here, in the case, were 6,000 men parading the streets of Montreal, Valleyfield, Magog and near the city of Quebec, and they were complaining bitterly that they could not stand the reduction which was imposed, that the reduction was too severe. I say 'imposed'; I do not know if circumstances imposed that reduction upon them or not.

Mr. BERGERON. If the manufacturers cannot pay them any more, what are you going to do about it?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I heard their side of the story. I heard from Mr. Gordon, of Montreal, and I saw Mr. Simpson in Valleyfield.

Mr. KEMP. Tell us what they said?

Mr. LEMIEUX. They said it was a question of tariff. But still the operatives retorted: They cut down our wages and they continue paying the same dividends, and in some cases pay increased dividends. I am not saying that statement is true. I have not ascertained for myself, except in a general way. But, Sir, as Minister of Labour was it not my duty to say to these 6,000 men parading the streets: Return to your work; you have not the means to remain on strike. I advised them, in a fatherly way, to return to work so as to help their

families. They promised me that they would return to work provided an independent commission was appointed to investigate the differences between themselves and their employers. The commission has been appointed. No man is better equipped to conduct such an investigation than the Deputy Minister of Labour, Mr. King. He is now proceeding with the work, and we will see what his report is.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend says that he met these men, and that he told them in a fatherly way to return to work and he would see that a royal commission was appointed.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. The royal commission was not appointed, and as a consequence of that they did not go back.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The commission was appointed.

Mr. BERGERON. Not at that time.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Mr. King was away.

Mr. BERGERON. But I understand that my hon. friend says that he could have appointed somebody else.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. And nobody else was appointed at the time; the consequence was that these men remained out of the mills when they would have gone back to work. They waited until they were starving, and they do not believe any more in the promises of the hon. gentleman, or in what is told them by agitators who, if they went to Valleyfield, would be thrown into the water. They have gone back to work: they could not get anything to eat in the butchers' or grocers' shops, but they went back to the mills and begged to be given work. They are out of the union to-day, and I pity the man who goes there to advise them to go into a union after this. They said: We want to work; we do not want to starve. The manager said: I will give you work at the rate of pay that I can afford to give you. My hon. friend says that these cotton companies are continuing to pay dividends. These men cannot put their money into these industries as a matter of public charity. They go into them with the idea of making money, and it is a good thing that they should make money. When they erect buildings like those which they have erected in Valleyfield, at a cost of $3,000,000, they do not do it for public charity, nor for their health but to make money, and if they do not make money they cannot employ 3,000 or 4,000 men. Mr. Simpson, of the Valleyfield mills, said to them: 'I will pay you as much as I can afford to; later on, if I can afford to do so, I will increase your wages.' We know that to-day, under this government, it costs the workingman 50 or 60 per cent more to live. The workingman who got $1.50 a day before this government came into power could live better than he can to-day at $2 a day. The crux of the whole situation is the tariff, and it would be a great deal better to say so instead of pursuing the course which the hon. minister has in appointing this royal commission. The Minister of Finance knows that there are lots of men in this House sitting behind him who are asking him to-day to do something with the tariff with regard to cotton and woollen goods, and, if that is so, there is no use trying to deceive us. These industries, cotton and woollen, cannot continue in a prosperous condition in Canada.

Mr. FIELDING. It may be well for my hon. friend to include in his statement to his friends in Valleyfield, that just across the border in the United States, where they have the blessing, if it be a blessing, of a much higher tariff than we have, the paralysis of the cotton industry was worse than in Canada.

Mr. BERGERON. I will not deny that but the circumstances are entirely different and my hon. friend knows, or if not he should know, that if we had not imported $14,000,000 worth of cottons and if they had been made in this country these working men would be continuing to work at the rates of two years ago.

Mr. FIELDING. That is quite debatable but it is too late to debate it.

Mr. BLAIN. Does Mr. Mackenzie King receive a special salary in addition to his regular salary?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Oh no, just his regular salary.

Mr. KEMP. What instructions has Mr. King as to the basis upon which he should go in forming his judgment? Has he been instructed to consider the tariff and dividends?

Mr. LEMIEUX. As will be seen from the papers he has summoned not only the employees but the employers. Several leaders in the cotton industry appeared in the court to-day in Montreal and offered their evidence. They offered to show their books to let Mr. King see what shall be seen. Mr. King of course will exercise his judgment. He is called on not to form a judgment but to report on what he will learn through the investigation.

To meet the cost of boring for oil, coal, gas, etc., $35,000.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Would the minister give some explanation of the boring for oil?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. We have given some assistance towards boring for gas near Calgary and for coal in the province of Nova

Scotia by private companies. After a company had sunk a hole 1,000 feet we gave in one instance $3 a foot for every foot below the 1,000 feet. We have $35,000 in the supplementary estimates and from this we purpose giving some assistance towards carrying on boring operations in Prince Edward Island. Representations have been made to us by the provincial government and others that the Geological Survey has carried on little work there since confederation. No coal has been discovered in Prince Edward Island although our geologists say there is a reasonable prospect of finding coal there and we purpose spending $20,000 or $25,000 in sinking three or four holes in different parts of the island in the hope of discovering coal.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How many wells does the minister intend to bore with the $35,000 ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. We anticipate from inquiries we have made that a hole can be sunk 2,500 feet for between $5,000 and $8,000 but much depends on conditions and circumstances, the geological formation, transportation, &c.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. At what points in the island will the holes be bored ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. One near Summerside, one near Gallus Point and at two other points to be located by the Geological Survey.

Mr. BERGERON. I hope this boring will not interfere with the tunnel.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. If the minister is going to spend $8,000 or $9,000 to drill a hole 2,500 feet deep it is an absurd rate. In our town we sank a well more than 4,000 feet at a less cost.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. My hon. friend may have accurate knowledge of what it costs to bore a hole but I have seen correspondence with well known contractors, some of them from western Ontario, and I am inclined to think he is very far astray. If we can get a hole properly piped at this price we would have nothing to complain of. I do not know whether this includes transportation of plant which is a considerable item. When it is landed from the steamboat, it has to be moved from one point to another on the island, which will cost considerable money. I should imagine that the diameter of the large pipe is 8 or 10 inches. We do not know whether the oil-bearing formation will be found on the island or not; but experts in well boring, better experts than my hon. friend, have given us estimates of the probable cost of this work. We have made no contract, but I firmly believe that if we bore a well 2,500 feet deep in Prince Edward Island and pipe it, for anything like $5,000 or $8,000—I am only speaking approximately—we will do very well.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I do not want to take up time in disputing anything the hon. gentleman has said, although I have been twenty years in the business and know something about it. Is Mr. Low still Director of the Geological Survey ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Yes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Does the minister expect to continue him at full salary ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Mr. A. P. Low, who was appointed Director and Deputy Minister of the Geological Survey two or three years ago, took sick about one year ago, and unfortunately he is still a very sick man. He is off on leave of absence, with pay. He is not entitled to superannuation, I am very sorry to say. I do not know how long his illness will continue, and I am therefore not in a position to say whether he will continue permanently in the service or not. Unquestionably if Mr. Low should recover sufficiently to return to work, he will be continued on full pay.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Has Mr. Dowling returned to the Geological Survey ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Yes, and he is in the west now on one of his expeditions.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I want to protest in the strongest language against the minister allowing the men of that department to go out and work for private companies, as he has done in the past. Mr. Dowling spent five years in gathering information in regard to the coal lands of the Northwest, and last summer a German development company engaged him for two months and he went out and located all the best coal lands in the western country for that company, and in the fall returned to the Geological Survey. Last spring he stepped out again, and, as the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) said a few weeks ago, was employed by another company at the rate of $5,000 per annum, and after being away for a few weeks, returned to the Geological Survey again, and he is now in the west gathering information which he can practically sell to private companies. If this is the manner in which the Geological Survey is going to be conducted, it is not in the best interests of the people at large. I only wish I had time to go into this matter more fully, and to show the minister that the work of that department needs his close attention.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I do not suppose there is any use in occupying the time of the House in repeating this old story. My hon. friend made all these statements a few weeks ago, and they were fully explained then. Therefore I do not see any use in repeating the explanation.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Does the minister intend to continue to allow these men to go out for private companies and come back to

the survey when they cannot get work elsewhere ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The minister is quite ready to give the services of any expert of the Geological Survey, I will not say to assist private companies, but to assist in the development of the great mineral resources of this country. That is all we did. Mr. Dowling is an expert on coal, one of the best men in the Geological Survey ; he has been some twenty years or more in the department. He is getting a small salary, less than $2,000 a year. He came to us and told us that he was going to leave the service unless we paid him more money. He wanted $2,500 or $3,000. He had an offer from a company of $5,000 per annum for a period of years. He was not anxious to leave the service. It seems that our geological friends think more of the opportunities they have for scientific work in connection with the survey than they do of work for a private company at a higher salary. Mr. Dowling had almost committed himself to resigning from the service and going to a private company. We desired that he should not leave the survey, though we were not able to increase his salary to the amount he wanted. Then he asked if he could get off for some months last year to go with the company. After considering the matter fully, we agreed to give him leave of absence without pay. I do not know what salary he received from the company, but probably at the rate of $5,000 per annum.

Mr. FOWLER. Is it the intention of the minister to send an officer to the old country to study the coal shales ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Some months ago instructions were given to Dr. Ells to go to Glasgow to be present at the investigation of shales that were being shipped over there, with the view of acquiring all the knowledge he could on the subject. This is another illustration of assisting private enterprise to some extent, although it will be seen at once how much benefit it is to the country.

Mr. FOWLER. What company is it—from New Brunswick?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. The New Brunswick Petroleum Company, of which the late Minister of Railways is the president?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I do not know. All I know about the company is that a gentleman named Mr. Lodge interviewed me in regard to it.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Lodge, of fragrant memory?

Mr. TEMPLETON. I do not know him. He said his company was on the point of shipping fifty tons of shale to Glasgow to have the oil extracted ; and all we are doing is sending Dr. Ells over, paying his salary while he is absent, and probably his expenses. It will not cost $1,000.

Mr. BLAIN. Has the government been appropriating money before for boring purposes ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. This is not new. The government about twelve years ago spent considerable money in boring for petroleum in the vicinity of Edmonton.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is there anything being done on the Athabasca or on the Saskatchewan at Edmonton?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Not by the department. Private enterprise has stepped in, and I know that in southern Alberta several companies are boring for petroleum.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The department sent a man a few years ago to plug a gas hole in Athabaska country. the same as they did the waterhole in the Yukon. Did they succeed in plugging it ? Quite a large expedition went down to plug up this gas hole away down the Athabaska.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. We did not send a man up to plug a gas hole. An inspection was made of a gas well.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Why, I saw the gentleman in Manitoba on the way down there. He was sent by the Dominion government.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. We sent a man to inspect the wells.

Mr. BLAIN. It is not so long as ten years ago when public money was appropriated for the discovery of oil wells in the Northwest. What is the policy of the government in respect of this matter ? There have been large amounts expended in Ontario during the past year for the discovery of coal oil. If application is made to the department, will the department furnish assistance to parties boring for coal oil ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I am bound to say that I do not think such an application would be favourably entertained. Some ten or twelve years ago efforts were made to find petroleum in Alberta. At that time no private companies were boring for oil, and the government gave its assistance in that direction. Since then, however, private enterprise has been expending large amounts in the endeavour to find petroleum in Alberta, and we are not spending any money in that direction any more than we would in western Ontario where petroleum is known to exist in very large quantities. We are justified in making an expenditure for the purpose of boring for coal in Prince Edward Island inasmuch as the island has no known coal deposits, although our geologists express the opinion that coal may possibly be found at a considerable depth and possibly oil and gas. It would be very

important if we could ascertain the fact that coal exists there.

Contributions towards the expenses of sending Canadian representatives to the Olympic games in London, $15,000.

Mr. DANIEL. How many have been sent to the Olympic games ?

Mr. FIELDING. Canada is sending eighty-four representatives, including sixteen men for lacrosse.

Mr. DANIEL. This is for competitors alone ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes. This matter is the hands of a committee of prominent citizens, including Colonel Hanbury Williams, Mr. P. D. Ross, Rev. D. B. Macdonald, with Mr. Pereira as secretary.

Mr. SPROULE. I regard such a vote as the height of absurdity. I think our country is running too far in the line of games and sports and too little in the direction of useful labour, and to sanction all this by a vote in the federal parliament seems to me to be going too far.

Mr. BERGERON. Do the other governments do this ?

Mr. FIELDING. The provincial governments are giving some assistance.

Mr. FOWLER. What provinces contribute ?

Mr. FIELDING. Ontario gives $2,000 and British Columbia $1,000. The contributions of the governments are supplemented by receipts in connection with the preliminary trials and, no doubt, by private subscription.

Grant to National Gymnastic Society to assist in sending representatives to games et Rome, $3,000.

Mr. FOWLER. What is this?

Mr. FIELDING. The National Gymnastic has its headquarters in Montreal, and is composed, I understand, chiefly of our French Canadian friends. This is to assist in sending competitors to games on the line of the Olympic games to be held at Rome.

Mr. DANIEL. I do not think parliament has heard about this National Gymnastic Society or knows what it is for.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Everybody has heard of the Montreal Amateur Athletic Association. But, though I am an old sport myself, I have never heard of this society.

Mr. DANIEL. Is this for games at Rome, in Italy, or in Rome, N.Y. ?

Mr. FIELDING. There is only one Rome and all roads lead to it.

To compensate the Canadian Bank of Commerce for services in the Yukon from April 1, 1907, to April 1, 1908, $4,800.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN.

Mr. FIELDING. The Bank of Commerce have acted as the government's agent in the Yukon, we allowing them a small commission. At first it was something like 2 per cent, but it has been whittled down until it is about one-quarter of one per cent.

Mr. FOWLER. Better cut it out altogether.

Mr. FIELDING. No, with the present condition of business in the Yukon, if that were not allowed, it is a question whether the bank would agree to do the business for us.

Further amount to provide for payment of the Civil Service Commissioners appointed May 8, 1907, including $600 to T. S. Howe, $12 to M. M. Hutchison and $70.75 to T. L. Mainguy, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act, $15,000.

Mr. FIELDING. This is to pay the further expenses of the three Civil Service Commissioners whose report is before the House. They have not sent an account, and we are estimating the amount that is likely to be necessary.

Mr. TAYLOR. It was money well spent.

Mr. FIELDING. I am glad to hear the hon. gentleman approve, so I suppose the vote will be carried.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I do not see their names here.

Mr. FIELDING. It is well known that the commission is composed of Messrs. Courtney, Fysche and Bazin. This is to pay for their services, and also for the secretary, stenographers and others who assisted in the work of the investigation.

Mr. DANIEL. What do you allow the commissioners per day ?

Mr. FIELDING. We assume that we shall be called upon to pay them $30 a day each.

Mr. FOWLER. Is it the intention to form a commission to look into some of the other departments which this commission had not time to investigate ? The Public Accounts Committee has been doing what it could, thwarted though it has been by the efforts of those who are known as the 'Obstruction brigade.' Is it the intention to appoint a commission to investigate, for instance, the Railway Department and take up these land deals such as those with Mr. Lodge in Moncton and Pearson in Halifax. Will the allowance of 25 per cent commission to the St. John 'Sun' on printing done in that city be looked into ? Is it the intention to look into the Merwin case, or to investigate Mr. Wallberg and the $100,000 that he is to receive for the building of a sewer for the new shops at Moncton—no tenders called for, using his men there as he likes, keeping no time book, with no supervision or inspection provided—is it the intention to inves-

tigate these things? I would suggest that considering the success we have had in finding out things with regard to the Marine Department, we should apply the same machinery to the other departments.

Amount required to pay expenses of the investigation into the Department of Marine and Fisheries, $15,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that the Cassels investigation ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes. It is expected that this amount will be sufficient to pay all expenses. My hon. friend will remember that Judge Cassels is not charging anything for his services, but there will be fees of the lawyers and expenses of witnesses.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it understood that the lawyers are to get $100 a day ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Mr. Watson is to get $100 a day, but the amount is undetermined what will be paid Mr. Perron, so I am informed by the Minister of Justice.

Additional amount required for general immigration expenses, $50,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Would the minister tell us something about the regulations that have been put into force to prevent labouring men from passing into Canada from the United States.

Mr. OLIVER. This vote is chiefly for that purpose. Since the change of labour conditions last fall, there has been a tendency for workingmen to come over to Canada from the United States, and we have found it necessary to take some means of putting into force the same exclusion against those people that the United States authorities have for a number of years past enforced against our people going into that country. This action is not taken to restrict ordinary immigration. These are exclusion officers, not properly immigration officers. At the minor points along the line this duty is entrusted to customs house officers, who watch the trains. But at larger points where travel is heavy, we appoint special agents.

Mr. SPROULE. Could the minister tell us what is the sum total that we have voted this year for immigration purposes?

Mr. OLIVER. The total for this year, including the vote we are asking for now, is $1,010,000.

Department of Marine and Fisheries Towards providing for purchase or construction of a steamer for hydrographic survey of Gulf and River St. Lawrence to replace 'La Canadienne,' $50,000.

Mr. BERGERON. What are you going to do with 'La Canadienne ?'

Mr. BRODEUR. 'La Canadienne' is a boat of uncertain age and requires to be replaced. In cases where old boats are of no more use we sell them by auction ?

Mr. BERGERON. Where is the new boat to be built ?

Mr. BRODEUR. In Canada.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the name of the flagship of the Canadian navy ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The 'Canada.'

Indians—New Brunswick—To provide a further amount for salaries, $400.

Mr. CROCKET. Is this to increase the salaries of the agents ?

Mr. OLIVER. No, this is to appoint an inspector and superintendent of schools.

Mr. CROCKET. Is that a new office ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. That is a perfectly absurd thing. There are only six schools in New Brunswick and there are only a little over 100 pupils in these schools. If you want to do anything along that line increase the salaries of the agents and put the additional work on them. The agents are capable of examining the schools.

Mr. CROCKET. Do not the agents inspect the schools now ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, there are two agents and the agents do the inspecting of the schools, but the agents have been appointed not with a view to their suitability to act as inspectors and it is thought desirable that there should be an inspection by some one who is fitted for that work.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Why not increase the teachers' salary by distributing this money amongst them ?

Mr. OLIVER. That is worthy of consideration, but it is generally considered that there should be a uniform standard and general supervision of education.

Mr. CROCKET. As far as the Fredericton agent is concerned, Mr. Farrell is a most excellent official, I doubt if you can get any better results from the Indian schools of Mr. Farrell's district by placing a superintendent of schools over him. I cannot see any necessity for such an appointment as this. If the Department of the Interior want to spend $400, let them increase the salaries of the Indian agents. Mr. Farrell has a salary, I think, of only $500 ; why not increase his salary rather than appoint an unnecessary superintendent over him?

Mr. OLIVER. $600 is Mr. Farrell's salary.

Mr. FOWLER. Whom have you picked out for this job ? Some one has been picked out for it.

Mr. OLIVER. The gentleman whom I intended to appoint as inspector is the Rev. Father Ryan of St. Mary's.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOWLER. I knew you would have some one picked out for it. The fact that it is Rev. Father anybody does not affect my mind.

Mr. PUGSLEY. You wanted to know who it was.

Mr. FOWLER. Certainly. I knew that there was a man picked out for it. That is your way of doing business—first pick out your man and then create the office for him. This $400 should be divided among the various agents in New Brunswick, men who, as far as I know have done their duty and are good men. Let them inspect the schools.

Mr. CROCKET. Is Father Ryan to be appointed for the whole province ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. How many schools are there in the province ?

Mr. OLIVER. There are six Indian schools. They are all Roman Catholic Mission schools. There are three in one district and three in the other.

Mr. FOWLER. They are not separate schools ; they are schools under the school board.

Mr. OLIVER. They are Mission schools.

Mr. FOWLER. I know, but they are schools under the school board.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, but still they are conducted under the auspices of the Roman Catholic church.

Mr. FOWLER. Why do you call them Catholic schools?

Mr. OLIVER. They are Catholic schools.

Mr. FOWLER. This is the province of New Brunswick you are talking about, there we have non-sectarian schools.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Are these not Indian schools ?

Mr. FOWLER. These are Indian schools but they are under the control of the board of education. They are non-sectarian.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Does the New Brunswick government pay anything towards these schools ?

Mr. FOWLER. They pay the teachers.

Mr. OLIVER. The Indian Department pay the teachers.

Mr. FOWLER. If these schools are under the board of education the teachers receive a provincial allowance.

Mr. OLIVER. My information is that these schools have no connection with the provincial school system. They are Indian Department schools but they are conducted by teachers connected with the Roman Catholic church.

Mr. DANIEL. How are they supported ?

Mr. OLIVER. The teachers are paid salaries by the Indian Department. All the New Brunswick Indians are Roman Catholics, and the teachers are of that faith; therefore we speak of them as Roman Catholic schools.

Mr. DANIEL. The province is not taxed in any way ?

Mr. OLIVER. The provincial government has no connection with the schools.

Mr. FOWLER. What did the minister mean by saying that they are under the board of education of the province ?

Mr. OLIVER. If I said that I did not intend to.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. $10 a school is the ordinary fee in Ontario for inspection and the same rate here would be ample. This inspection is done by a clergyman who probably receives his salary from other sources and it strikes me that $400 to inspect the schools is a waste of money. I beg to move that the item be stricken out of the estimates.

Mr. FOWLER. What do you pay to these teachers ?

Mr. OLIVER. On the average about $300 apiece.

Mr. CROCKET. Upon whose recommendation was this new office created? Did the agents recommend it ?

Mr. BARR. Or did the Indians ?

Mr. OLIVER. I could not say, who recommended it; I am responsible for presenting the item to the House upon the recommendation of the officers of the department. I am informed it is not on the recommendation of the agents but on the judgment of the deputy as to the requirements of the work.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. How long has this system been going on ?

Mr. OLIVER. There has not been such an inspection, we are proposing it now.

Mr. FOWLER. The minister's answer is a strange answer. He says it is the deputy. Does the minister think that we can believe the deputy, on his own initiative, without a recommendation from any one, has made this radical change in New Brunswick? I fancy that the same person who recommended Father Ryan for the position, recommended the position too. Could that possibly be the Minister of Public Works ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no hesitation in saying that this is an office in which the incumbent, if he is a man who is enthusias-

tic for the welfare of the Indians, will be able to do great public service. The Minister of the Interior has mentioned Father Ryan as the gentleman whom he has in mind for this position. I know Father Ryan and I am sure that his work——

Mr. CROCKET. An excellent man.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He is a man devoted to his work, he has taken great interest in the Indians in the parish in which he lives, he has erected a church there at large expense and has set aside a portion of it especially for the Indians. He is doing a very great work among them and if the Minister of the Interior appoints him, as he says, as inspector of schools, I am sure the appointment will be a good one. I am told that they have a similar position in British Columbia, and I am sure a man of education and an enthusiastic desire to advance the interest of the Indians will do useful work.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Where are these situated ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Some up the St. John river, one near Father Ryan's church, two in York county and some on the northern shore.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Will there be travelling expenses for this inspector ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They will be very small, the salary is small and I am sure the Indians will appreciate it and be benefited very greatly by his services.

Mr. FOWLER. I am satisfied now that it was the Minister of Public Works who proposed this arrangement and not the deputy, as the minister would have us believe.

Mr. CROCKET. Have the agents of the department been consulted in reference to the creation of this office by the minister ?

Mr. OLIVER. I could not answer that question, but I am under the impression they were. The department did not consult the agents on the subject but they approved of the proposition.

Mr. CROCKET. How does the minister know the agents approve of the proposition if they were not consulted ? I do not wish to be understood as saying a word derogatory to Father Ryan. I esteem him as a most excellent citizen. So far as his qualifications to perform such a duty are concerned, there can be no question. My objection is that there is no necessity for this office at all. Mr. Farrell, who has acted as Indian agent in the northeastern district of New Brunswick, is esteemed as one of the best officers in New Brunswick, and I do not think any man could perform the service better than he has done. He has had the complete superintendence of the Indians of the northeastern district. I have yet to learn of one single complaint having been made with reference to the manner in which he performs his duty. He has looked after these schools, and I do not think there is any need at all for placing a school superintendent over him. That is my objection. The government should have given Mr. Farrell and increase rather than create an unnecessary and useless office.

Mr. DANIEL. I asked about the number of the school children among the Indians.

Mr. OLIVER. About 135 enrolled, and probably about twenty-five per cent more than that would cover the total number. With regard to what my hon. friend from York (Mr. Crocket) has said, I am informed that Mr. Farrell has asked to be relieved of a part of his duties owing to his increasing age.

Mr. CROCKET. Has he asked to be relieved of the duty of superintending the schools ?

Mr. OLIVER. Not the duty of superintending the schools, but part of the duty of his agency on account of his advancing years. At the same time, I want to echo everything that the hon. gentleman has said as to the satisfaction given by Mr. Farrell in the performance of his duties as superintendent.

Mr. FOWLER. I think that this office is entirely unnecessary, and that this vote is an absolute waste of public money. I think the service could easily be performed in the future as it has been in the past. For that reason I will support the amendment.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say that I have the best of reasons for knowing that Mr. Farrell entirely approves of this proposition. I can say that with positive authority.

Amendment negatived.

Additional to persons employed permanently in the public service, and remuneration to any other persons for services rendered for and in connection with passing vessels through the canals of the government of Canada, from midnight on Saturday to midnight Sunday, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $6,500.

Mr. BERGERON. Do I understand that the canals are open on Sunday now on account of the break in the Cornwall canal? I think they were open last Sunday.

Mr. GRAHAM. I gave instructions to open the canal last Sunday and next Sunday, until the pressure is relieved.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Did you get the Rev. Mr. Shearer's permission ?

Lachine canal—to pay Joseph Richard for loss of horse, $225.

Mr. FOWLER. What about the horse ?

Mr. STANFIELD. I think the minister might put an item in the estimates for the two horses that were killed at Truro a short time ago.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is in connection with the Intercolonial Railway. With regard to this horse item, it is very questionable to my mind whether we are liable; I thought it well to put the item in the estimates. The horse was driven on the swing bridge, fell into the water and was drowned.

Mr. FOWLER. Who valued the horse?

Mr. GRAHAM. We had an investigation made by our own official.

Mr. DANIEL. Did nothing but the horse go through? What became of the harness and the rig?

Mr. GRAHAM. The harness would not get drowned. It went into the canal and no doubt they fished it out.

Mr. MONK. It was through a mistake of one of the employees on the bridge. There was a division of opinion as to whether the government was responsible or not. The horse was killed and the harness and rig injured. The man lost $400 and the government agreed to give him $225.

Mr. LOGGIE. About three years ago on the floor of parliament I asked the then Minister of Railways to put a sum in the estimates to pay some very pressing claims for cattle killed on the Canada Eastern Railway. I explained that claims of the same character had been up to that time paid by the proprietors of the railway, the Gibson Company, but when the government took the railway over they came under a different law. I impressed upon the minister the importance of treating the farmers living along the government railway as favourably as were those living along a corporation railway. The minister said he would consider the claim but there the matter ended. This would be an opportune time to put such an amount in the estimates, because the House has passed a law this year which brings matters of this kind under the same law as that which governs private railways.

Mr. FOWLER. For the comfort of my hon. friend from Northumberland, I may say that just before the election comes on, the government will pay all those old claims if he can prove that by getting them paid he will have a chance of being elected.

Mr. LAKE. Does the minister remember that I asked him for a report about the Canadian Northern Railway between its present line and Le Pas?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am sorry that I have not got it here, but I shall let my hon. friend have it.

Mr. BERGERON. Before you leave railways and canals, I would like to ask where the contract between the government and the McIntyre and Robert Syndicate stands. If I understand the lease, these gentlemen were to pay a certain amount at a certain time. Have they paid anything? I am referring to the lease of the Beauharnois canal.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will bring my hon. friend the information.

Mr. J. D. REID. Several parties are inquiring about that and would like to know if any rental has been paid and whether this company pays the employees on the canal in accordance with their agreement.

Mr. BERGERON. I would like also to know if there are any water-powers granted to any company or whether any company has asked for water-power there.

Mr. TAYLOR. Better let this item stand as the ex-Minister of Railways is not present and may have some questions to ask.

Item allowed to stand.

Annual drill—Further amount required including Quebec review, $200,000.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). This is necessary to carry out the review at Quebec. We found that it was costing more than we expected.

Mr. TAYLOR. Let that one stand and we will pass the other, reserving the usual privilege of discussing any of the others on this item.

Mr. J. D. REID. I would like to ask the minister if he has seen a letter published in one of the Halifax papers from the firm of Davis and Fraser regarding the matter we were discussing the other evening of the supplies furnished the troops. As I understand it this firm supplies the man who is now furnishing the bacon to the troops in Halifax. A contract was given for breakfast bacon.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The letter does not say so.

Mr. J. D. REID. The man who is furnishing the supplies purchases rolled bacon and supplies that to the militia except a little breakfast bacon to the officers. Seeing that this letter is published under the signature of Davis and Fraser, it does seem to me that the statement I made the other evening is correct, and that an inferior bacon is being supplied than what the government tendered for.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I read the letter pretty carefully. It does not say that the contractor is buying his bacon from them. It does say that the troops have not been supplied with breakfast bacon, but it offers no proof of this, and, in the end, admits that the troops are now receiving breakfast bacon but says that for a time they did not. But daily inspection was made by two or three officers, and no complaint has been made to me or the department, either at Halifax or here. The letter

is the letter of a disappointed contractor, and I take no stock in it.

Mr. J. D. REID. I feel confident that I saw in the papers in this case that these people were supplying the contractor.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do not think they are friendly enough for that.

Mr. J. D. REID. If the contractor was doing what is alleged, it was certainly unfair.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I called the attention of the director of contracts in my department to 'Hansard' containing the remarks of the hon. member (Mr. J. D. Reid).

Royal Military College—additional amount required $1,000.

Mr. FOWLER. What is that for?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. To increase the pay of the professor of English and the professor of French, who have been receiving much smaller salaries than their brother professors.

Mr. FOWLER. Are you increasing the salary of the commandant?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No.

Monuments to Battlefields—amount required towards the erection of a monument to commemorate the battle of Stoney Creek, $5,000.

Mr. FOWLER. What is that?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. This is near Hamilton, one of the most important battlefields of the war of 1812. The people in the neighbourhood have raised considerable money and have purchased the property there, and I thought it was the right thing to encourage them by giving them this amount. They are to raise an equal sum.

Mr. FOWLER. Very proper.

Gratuity to the widow of the late Surgeon Captain C. D. Murray, P.A.M.C., $1,000.

Mr. DANIEL. Is this the usual practice in such cases?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think it is. This officer did not come under the pension law, and he contracted his illness by performing his duty as a surgeon.

Mr. FOWLER. He was a permanent officer?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Gratuity for caretaker J. Donovan, Montreal, retired, $555.10.

Mr. FOWLER. The minister will remember Captain Mackenzie, who distinguished himself in the Indian Mutiny, and who was for thirty or forty years connected with the militia of Canada, particularly in New Brunswick. He has been a very useful man in connection with militia matters in that province. Is it the intention of the government to do anything for him?

Mr. EMMERSON. Is that the man who wrote a book?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes; a very good book.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I agree with what the hon. member has said concerning Captain Mackenzie. He has done good service to the country and to the empire. But he is a pensioner of the British army in receipt of a very fair pension, and he is also the holder of an absolute sinecure in connection with the drill hall at Fredericton. I think he is doing very well.

Mr. CROCKET. I thought he had been removed from his position in connection with the Fredericton drill hall.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I would not be absolutely certain, but I think we give him pay.

Mr. FOWLER. If he has been removed the minister will give him a gratuity, I suppose?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. In that case, I think he might receive one.

Mr. TAYLOR. There are two items of public works left, and when these have passed that will finish the latter part of the supplementaries.

Public Works—Chargeable to collection of revenue—operating and maintenance expenses—telegraph lines—$55,600.

Mr. FOWLER. There is a matter I wanted to discuss in connection with the telegraph lines, but I suppose I shall be allowed to speak on any item?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Any item: no objection.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is the government erecting towers here and there throughout the country in connection with the Marconi telegraph system?

Mr. BRODEUR. No; we have been erecting some in British Columbia——

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I mean in Ontario.

Mr. OLIVER. The towers referred to are probably those of the geodetic survey, the object of which is to establish fixed points throughout the country from which to true up, so to speak, the existing surveys.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Who is in charge?

Mr. OLIVER. Dr. King, of the astronomical surveys branch of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. BERGERON. Part of this vote is for the Yukon telegraph system. Is that the system we built some years ago?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Is this for repairs?

Mr. PUGSLEY. For renewals and repairs. I regret to say it is a very expensive system to keep up. The hon. gentleman can understand that, as it is far from civilization and passes over vast wastes of mountains.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the total amount voted for this service in the main estimates?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Yukon system, $22,600. The operating expenses of the Yukon system, $180,000, were provided for in the main estimates.

Mr. BLAIN. Has there been any reduction in the rates recently ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, after consideration I gave directions to make quite a large reduction on the western telegraph line from 50 cents to 35 cents, and in many cases to 25 cents.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Has there been much interruption to telegraph communication in the Yukon ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There are interruptions from time to time. Within a day or two my attention has been called to interruptions to the line which have been caused by the contractors cutting the right of way for the Grand Trunk Pacific. Trees have fallen down from the mountain side and interfered with the wires. I have given instructions that every reasonable care shall be taken to prevent that occurring. We shall insist upon the contractors repairing the line.

Mr. FOWLER. You have a telegraph lnie, I understand, in the counties of Chicoutimi and Saguenay?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Down the northern side of the St. Lawrence.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the purpose of that ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The telegraph line was extended down the St. Lawrence for the purpose of primarily assisting shipping, that is, to communicate more quickly with vessels in distress. That was the primary object of the extension of the system. But my hon. friend can see that from time to time demands would spring up to have connection made with business centres along the route. From year to year there has been an extension of the system, and now it serves a commercial purpose. That is the case both in the east and in the west. The telegraph system is being extended in various sections where it was not supposed that the lines would be commercially profitable, and therefore where companies would not undertake to establish a service.

Mr. BERGERON.

Mr. FOWLER. My information with regard to this matter is, that the department has been in the habit of building bridges and roads, and performing work that should be done by the municipal authorities, or at most by the local government, and that this work has been done by the department for the Dominion. I will read what my instructions are with regard to this matter.

There is a county road between Chicoutimi and St. Alphonse on Ha Ha bay, about midway. There is a swamp some three miles long, which should be under the care of local authorities. But the people desiring to rid themselves of this burden made application to the federal member for the county of Chicoutimi and Saguenay, to get this road cut across the swamp. Being a somewhat ingenious personage, he thought it would be a good plan to tack this on to the telegraph line. He did so. and was able to prevail upon the department to accede to his wishes, and they have been building a mile each year. The work is now about completed. In the Auditor General's Report of 1905-6, D—306, will be found certain items. The whole line is 12 miles long. I am told the amount spent on it is out of proportion. For the two years the total amount spent is about $1,300, for the 12 miles. There are charges for sand that was to be put in the holes for the telegraph posts, and this sand, I understand, has not been piled up around the posts, but a wide ditch has been dug, the poles are outside the ditch, and the sand is spread on the road. They have also been building bridges. I find that they have built a bridge at Anse St. Jean.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What is the cost of the bridge.

Mr. FOWLER. I will come to that later. I am speaking on the question of principle, about the Dominion government building works that should be built by the local authorities.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It might be that the men repairing or constructing the telegraph line have erected a bridge for their purposes.

Mr. FOWLER. They did not do anything of the kind. There is a population living on both sides of the river. Formerly there was one school on the north side and two on the south side.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. Is the hon. gentleman reflecting the information gathered by the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames).

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) is capable of taking care of himself.

Mr. CARVELL. In the Public Accounts Committee the engineer gave all the evidence on this question, and there is no necessity for the hon. gentleman replying to it.

Mr. FOWLER. There was no evidence given with regard to this particular bridge, or any other matter that I am bringing up now.

Mr. CARVELL. So much the more reason why you should not bring it up. The hon. member for St. Antoine spent two days examining witnesses over this question in the Public Accounts Committee, and my hon. friend cannot make this committee believe that there was anything down there that the hon. member for St. Antoine did not find. If you will read the evidence that is given I will not have any fault to find.

Mr. FOWLER. I can quite understand that if my hon. friend from St. Antoine did bring a matter up in connection with bridges how great a difficulty he would find to get in any evidence with regard to it when the obstruction brigade, of which the hon. gentleman was one of the chief movers, was there in full force. But the obstruction brigade cannot get their work in now and I propose to put it on 'Hansard.' I want my hon. friend to understand that it takes a great deal heavier force than he is to prevent me doing anything that I desire to do here.

Mr. CARVELL. That is not sworn to.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is my hon. friend now giving some facts from his own knowledge or from any testimony given before the committee ?

Mr. FOWLER. I am giving the facts as they are stated to me. Appoint a commission and we will bring evidence to prove them up to the hilt.

Mr. PUGSLEY. By whom are they stated ?

Mr. FOWLER. They are stated by me.

Mr. PUGSLEY. By whom ?

Mr. FOWLER. I am not required to state by whom and I do not propose to do it. When I make a statement here I say what my authority is. I say that I am presenting this statement according to my instructions.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I want to know if it is from your own knowledge ?

Mr. FOWLER. No. I was telling the committee about the reason that was given for the building of this bridge across the river. There were two schools on the south side of the river and one on the north side. It was found necessary in the interest of the school district to consolidate these three schools and there was no bridge. So, at the suggestion of the local member the party came to the rescue again. The result is that a bridge was built.

Mr. CARVELL. And the engineer swore in his evidence before the committee that this bridge was built not for the accommodation of these schools but for the purpose of the telegraph line. The hon. gentleman will find that in the evidence.

Mr. FOWLER. There are twelve miles of telegraph line and they bring this officer up and compel him to swear that the bridge is necessary for the telegraph line.

Mr. CARVELL. Your own evidence is not sworn to as I have stated.

Mr. FOWLER. If it were possible to state anything wrongly my hon. friend would state it wrongly.

Mr. CARVELL. My hon. friend takes good pains not to state it at all.

Mr. FOWLER. The highway ran along the south shore of the river one hundred feet from the bridge so that the telegraph does not touch the bridge at all.

Mr. CARVELL. That is not evidence.

Mr. FOWLER. I am giving the evidence as I have it here.

Mr. CARVELL. My hon. friend cannot show any sworn evidence that has been given before the Public Accounts Committee. I was there and I know what the evidence was.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I have not said anything about what was stated before the Public Accounts Committee. I am giving a statement of what the facts are as I am instructed.

There has been $200 expended on this bridge. It has nothing whatever to do with the telegraph service.

Saguenay river repairing bridge, west side; $200 has been spent on this work. This is a municipal bridge and ought not to be kept in order by government money.

Ferland via Grand bay. Expense, $201.75. A small stream, the Bras Hamel, flows into the Ha Ha river. Up this stream there are three or four farmers out in the woods west of the Ha Ha river, the main line of telegraph between Ha Ha bay and Baie St. Paul is east of the Ha Ha river. This branch line three miles long was built for no other purbridge and repairing the road. No messages ever come down this line except for hunters pose than to give an excuse for building a in the cariboo season in the fall. Expenditure wholly useless.

Rivière aux Cedres. Expense, $187.63. This money spent in entirely remaking a bridge which is on the provincial road from Chicoutimi to Baie St. Paul. The road is a provincial government road and the provincial government spend money every year in keeping it in repair. The Dominion government also do the same.

St. Felix d'Otis. Expenditure, $199.96. There is a lake known as Otis lake in the township of Otis. A small stream flows northwest from this, empties into the Saguenay river. Where the provincial road crosses this river a bridge has been built. It should not have been built with Dominion govern-

ment money. It is a municipal bridge like the others.

Last summer the bridge was built on the Balin river. This will appear in the next Auditor General's Report. Several hundred dollars was spent last summer under the same circumstances. This bridge is between St. Anne and St. Fulgence, both thickly populated and well to do municipalities on the highways.

There are five or six houses at a place called Lac Clair in the township of Falardeau. It is a place where sportsmen go to fish. A line has been built from St. Anne de Chicoutimi in Canton Tremblay to Lac Clair, 22 miles distant. There are perhaps 20 families along the line and three stations. The first station, No. 1, in range 6, at a very small saw-mill, Canton Tremblay; station No. 2 at the end of Lake Charles where there are about three or four settlers, and station No. 3 at Lac Clair, where there are three or four settlers. The line is used by sportsmen but never by the settlers except in emergency where doctors or priests are required. A very rough road leads in to Lac Clair, passing for about three miles through a limestone belt. The government spend each year about $100 in work upon the road at this point in Canton Tremblay. It is probably covered by the item; Canton Tremblay, right of way, roadway and property in municipality, $300.

It is a general rule that much of the money voted for the telegraphs is spent in rebuilding or repairing bridges, in repairing roads and doing other work which is entirely outside the function of the Dominion government.

I have also some information in connection with some of these wharfs and to show that what I stated to the minister was a fact——

Mr. CARVELL. This is the hon. member for St. Antoine again.

Mr. FOWLER. Is it ? Well this is the member for Kings and Albert who is discussing it now. There are two counties—Laval and Terrebonne.

Mr. CARVELL. It is a pity you have not some moving pictures to illustrate them.

Mr. FOWLER. You would make a nice moving picture to keep crows out of a harvest field. There is a river separating these two counties, and a scheme was gotten up to build a wharf at a place called St. François des Sales.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What is the name of the river ?

Mr. FOWLER. I will have to look. The minister laughs. It is very funny that I should not know the name of a river in Quebec ! I think that my knowledge of geography will compare with that of the Minister of Public Works or of the burdocks who laugh when he gets off his funny speech. A wharf was built at Terrebonne and a wharf was built in the county of Laval at St. François des Sales. There was no necessity for a wharf at that place. There was no business to be done at it.

Mr. FOWLER.

Mr. PUGSLEY. How does the hon. gentleman know that ?

Mr. FOWLER. Because these are the facts. Does he say there is any business done at either of these wharfs ? My hon. friend is silent upon that point.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman is making a certain statement and he is making a charge that certain wharfs were built where there was no business. My hon. friend will see that it is due to himself that he should give the committee the source of his information so that one may ascertain whether the statements of the hon. gentleman are to be relied upon.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister built those wharfs and he should be able to say whether there is any business at all ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I presume they were built before I became minister.

Mr. TAYLOR. You are responsible if your department did it.

Mr. FOWLER. The minister does not seem to know anything about his department and whether these wharfs are built on navigable water or not. I have here a statement with reference to this :

It appears that during 1904-5 and 1905-6 there was expended about $30,000 in construction of two 'wharfs' on opposite sides of the river between Terrebonne and Ile Jesus. After the 'wharfs' had been constructed the town council of Terrebonne built a bridge and connected them costing $28,000. This Terrebonne bridge connects Ile Jesus with the mainland to the north crossing the River de Prairie. It is some considerable distance above the Canadian Pacific Railway bridge, which is not a draw bridge and effectually blocks the river except for small boats. There is no navigation on this river above Lachenais four miles below the bridge, yet the government has expended within recent years $56,600 for dredging between Charlemagne and Terrebonne. This dredging has no other purpose than to give countenance to the expenditure at Terrebonne and St. François des Sales No boats have been up the river as far as Terrebonne since 20 years and then only at high spring tide. The result of the dredging is merely a ditch of about 20 feet wide with earth thrown up on both sides which washes back in again.

Then we have the River du Moulin in the Lake St. John district. This comes under the head of protection work. As to this I have this statement :

Rivière du Moulin—Protection work.

In the Auditor General's Report for 1905-6, page V-229 appears the item $4,090.73; again in Auditor General's Report for 1906-7 page V-165, under Lake St. John wharfs appears $676.22 and again at V-176 an item $1,469.39 altogether a total of $6.236 spent within two years. The River du Moulin is a fair sized stream entering the Saguenay from the south, quarter of a mile east of the town of Chicoutimi. The regular public highroad between

Chicoutimi and Bagotville crosses the stream by a bridge about 200 feet from its mouth. There was formerly a wooden bridge across the stream built by the municipal authorities. They desired to have this replaced by an iron bridge and decided to do so. The township of Chicoutimi paid a contractor to make a stone abutment on the east side and persuaded the resident engineer to recommend to the government the erection of a concrete pier of similiar size on the west side and an iron bridge built by the municipal authorities connecting the two piers. The bridge and the stone pier by contract cost about $8,000; the concrete pier alone on the west built by the government cost $6,236. The municipality did not want to spend $8,000 or $10,000 for the bridge which could not be built for less than $15,000 including abutments. They applied to the provincial government and got a few hundred dollars from that source, than they undertook to interest the local federal member, Mr. Girard, and he advised them to draw a petition which they did stating that the river was filling up the Saguenay and increasing the dredging and Mr. Girard stated that on these representations he would endeavour to get money from the government and the engineer although knowing the facts made a report along these lines. The river is a rocky river, the bed covered with boulders and little sand ever comes down. More than that the Saguenay river is very deep from the entrance of the River du Moulin down for some distance and the dredging operations are upon bars four miles down stream. Consequently the excuses given for these improvements were absolutely fictitious. This is called a protection work but as a matter of fact there are wooden wharfs on both sides of the pier which amply protect the bank at that point and part of these banks is rocky.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If there was no navigation there what do they want wharfs for ?

Mr. FOWLER. You can call them piers, wharfs, piles or what you like.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Who had built the wharfs before ?

Mr. FOWLER. I do not know, that has absolutely nothing to do with the question.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is that one of the wharfs you have a photograph of ?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes, I shall send it to the minister ; I have even the plans. Now, I am going to give my hon. friend some further information :

At Clark city on the west side of the Bay of Seven islands several years ago the North Shore Power, Railway and Navigation Company commenced building a large pulpwood plant. This company was first formed by people of Toronto. Later many Americans became interested. The first year of their operations at the above-mentioned place they began building a wharf. Later they persuaded the federal government to undertake this work for the benefit of the general public of Canada, which was done. The department which has this class of work in hand sent down their own engineer with the county engineer in charge, and the work was started on account of the government, which when about half completed and had already cost over $75,000, owing to wrong construction toppled over partly into the sea.

You would not need any better evidence that this was a government work undertaken by this government, after the experience we have had. The Laurier tower fell in a heap; the Laurier bridge is lying to-day at the bottom of the St. Lawrence river; the Laurier dredge sank to the bottom, and we know what is going to happen to the Laurier government when the next election comes.

The most expensive wood used for this purpose had been imported from the southern states, pitch pine, which originally cost on the spot 12 cents per foot of 12 inches square. The wood and cribwork was about the best I had ever seen, certainly better than any work to be seen about the Montreal harbour when of wood construction; but unfortunately, owing to want of experience of this famous engineer in charge, less than one-half the necessary amount of iron was used in construction, considering the strain the work was expected to stand. However, this was not the cause of the collapse. The bottom on which fourteen feet of this heavy cribwork was supposed to rest (the wharf was about 1,400 feet long by 50 feet wide) was on top composed of four to six feet of soft oozing mud in which it was possible to shove down a pole six feet. Under this for over twenty feet the soil or bottom consisted of sand and gravel mixed. After putting the cribwork in place, with sufficient rock ballast to keep it down, this bright engineer decided to get a dredge and deepen the water on each side of the cribwork to thirty feet. This was undertaken and partly completed when suddenly over 600 feet of the wharf turned half over, part on one side and part on the other. In fact, this part had a full half twist and resembled a corkscrew. It had cost the government somewhere about $75,000 to complete this work. I have been informed the original vote was $90,000. Last year the work of reconstruction was again handed back to the above company who first started it wholly for their own individual interests, no other parties doing business ever going there unless they have business with the company.

At Seven Islands there is another wharf to be built. The small village there has lately been incorporated, and the member for the county of Saguenay decided two years ago that it would be advisable in the interest of retaining their votes in his favour to get the government to build a wharf for them. He was down there last summer, and at a meeting the wharf was discussed. He mentioned in the course of his speech that owing to the government having voted money for a wharf at Seven islands—referring to the one under construction at Clark City—they would have to apply for one for County Arneaud. No person being familiar with the vicinity, it would not be known that the request to the

government really meant two wharfs for Seven islands. It is situated on the east side of Seven Islands bay. This wharf will be of no practical utility, the water being very shoal for a long distance off the shore, and no steamer could approach it were it built for a reasonable sum of money, considering the heavy cost and the small service which will be rendered to about twenty fishing boats which frequent the place and fish only a part of each summer, and not half of these boats will make use of the wharf, as the settlement is directly along the beach, only one range of buildings consisting of about eighty families, many of the men having long ago given up fishing to work at the various lumber establishments in the vicinity.

Something like that elevator-shaped building.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does the hon. gentleman say that another wharf is under construction at Seven Islands ?

Mr. FOWLER. No, one proposed. I am warning the minister against this demand for a wharf, not at Seven Islands but in the adjoining county. There is a telegraph line at Esquimaux point owned by the government. Several years ago since 1896, the parties there decided that a new bridge over a creek that runs through the parish would be advisable, but how to get the government to put up the money for it was the problem. The member soon solved it. He proposed that it should be represented as a necessity in connection with the government telegraph line. He apparently represented the matter thus in Ottawa, and the following summer a bridge was built over the creek, which at times has about four inches of water over it, at an expense of $400 and charged against the department telegraph lines. The cost of the work was reasonable, but there was no necessity for it.

The latest plan to get money, and one to which the memebr for Saguenay appears to be agreeable, is for building roads. Funds for this purpose are voted from time to time, and of course spent, but one fails to perceive any improvements in the roads. Gangs of men are sent out under a local foreman, but they generally go along the telegraph line which has been cleared years ago, cutting the second growth of short spruce or fir. I would go more into details of these matters only for the fact that it is now nearly twelve o'clock. Here is another expenditure to which I shall briefly refer.

A bridge is to be built over the Chaudière river connecting the counties of Beauce and Compton in the town of Lake Megantic. This is not in the county of Chicoutimi but evidently the representative of Beauce and Compton took a leaf out of the book of the hon. member for Chicoutimi. No doubt the hon. gentleman's supporters will point to him as a wonderful man in getting lots of money from the government to be spent in his constituency, but there will be other constituencies where perhaps this thing will not appeal to the people in the same way. But apart from that. I take it that the public money which belongs to the federal government should be spent for federal and not for provincial and municipal purposes and that all parts of Canada should be treated alike. I have pointed out before to the minister and earnestly besought him to do justice to his own province, and I am showing him here the great favouritism enjoyed by certain sections, such as the county of Chicoutimi, and contrasting that with the injustice done the province of New Brunswick.

This Lake Megantic bridge is to be built over the Chaudière river, connecting the counties of Beauce and Compton in the town of Lake Megantic. This river being non-navigable, the Dominion government is to build one half from the Beauce side calling it a wharf, giving the town of Megantic permission to build a wharf from the Compton side to connect. The provincial government in some manner will grant the town of Megantic $2,000 to help to defray their portion of the cost. And I think we voted in 1905-6, $5,000, in 1906-7, $5,000, and a revote now of $5,000. There has been expended so far about $12,000 in connection with this work. So that not only in Chicoutimi but in other districts throughout the country we find the same thing carried on and the federal money devoted to works that should be done by the provincial and municipal authorities.

Mr. J. GIRARD (Chicoutimi). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, with your leave, I think I should give a few explanations as regards the manner in which the public funds have been expended in the constituency which I represent here. I regret I am not in a position to present these with as much ease in English as in French, and for the sake of clearness and brevity, I shall take advantage of the right I enjoy of expressing in my native tongue.

My hon. friend from Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler) has assumed the task of arraigning the government in consequence of certain works which have been carried out, with the consent of the minister, such as bridges, repairs to telegraph lines, the latter having been built through my district in the public interest, and not at all for local purposes.

I have the honour to represent here a constituency of exceptional importance and extent. The greater part of the north shore of the St. Lawrence lies within my county. For the purpose of assisting navigation, the government built a telegraph line along that coast. That line is entirely for the benefit of the country as a whole, and not for that of the residents in my constituency. It so happens that along that telegraph line there are small groups of

population, small villages, at certain places, inhabited by fishermen, or by both fishermen and farmers; but in the majority of cases there are no municipalities in existence. In other parts, in order to enable people to vote, municipalities have been organized, the valuation of which is very small. That telegraph line was built without foresight or care; it was practically forced on the people against their will. The posts were set in spite of provincial and federal legislations, and each post which was put inside of the road ditch was an impediment to travel. That work was done at the time the friends of the hon. member for Kings and Albert were in power. I mean the work which was carried on between 1880 and 1896, previous to my occupying a seat in this House; and to-day, the government and your humble servant are called upon in honour and conscience to mend past errors, inasmuch as the law and common sense will allow. And now, my hon. friend, not knowing who are the people moving him in the matter, comes out with this unfair criticism and compels the people concerned to put matters in their true light, through my voice, and to place the responsibility where it belongs.

I regret that my hon. friend does not understand what I am saying, but having the right to speak in French, I want to prove to the government and to the Minister of Public Works, that this whole investigation that has been going on in the Public Accounts Committee, through the efforts of my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames), has no real foundation, but rests merely on the machinations of a group of local politicians, so-called Liberals or Tories, who really belong to neither party. A small ring of speculators in my county have supplied the hon. member for St. Antoine with the information on which he has based his charges, being unaware that such information has no foundation in fact, is untrue and unfair, and the member for St. Antoine, in turn, has passed on this information to the member for Kings and Albert, who has very cleverly brought it once more before the House. However, he did not really know what he was talking about, being content with to repeat here strings of stories of which he would never have spoken, had he taken the pains of verifying the statements; for then he would have known that he had no interest in repeating stories like these, which finally fall back on his friends.

About forty years ago, the Canadian government thought fit, and rightly so, to build a telegraph line from Bay St. Paul, in the county of Charlevoix, to the city of Chicoutimi, in the county of Chicoutimi and Saguenay, with a view to providing the people of that district, which was then very much out of the way, the benefit of an up-to-date means of communication. For that purpose, advantage was taken of the road which the local government had opened through the Laurentian hills, between St. Urbain and St. Alexis. That road, as soon as the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway had reached Chicoutimi, was given up by the local government, and since then, the Dominion government, in order to protect their rights as to the telegraph line just referred to, was, and is still, obliged to repair that road for purposes of maintenance.

Eighteen miles from the parish of St. Alexis is the township of Ferland, where a small group of settlers have located under favourable conditions. On account of the remoteness of their location, they have, through me, applied to the Minister of Public Works requesting him to be so kind as to allow them to connect, on the main line running from Bay St. Paul to Chicoutimi, what I might call a side line, about two miles long, which would enable them to communicate more easily with the rest of the world. That application was immediately granted with pleasure, the expenditure called for being very small and the service thus rendered to settlers in my district being of great value to them. Now, having found this out,—although I see here nothing that should not be highly commended, my hon. friend from St. Antoine, the other day, before the Public Accounts Committee, flushed with virtuous indignation and gave an exhibition of himself which hon. members then present will long remember. The settlers concerned, to whose knowledge will be brought the facts which I am stating to-night, would gladly listen to my hon. friend's argument, if he were so kind as to come and point out to them wherein there is a scandal or a waste of money in connection with work.

The bridge on the Cedar river referred to by the hon. member is situated in that part of the road I have just spoken about, and, consequently, forms part of the maintenance of the telegraph line. Further west, is the swamp to which the hon. member for Kings and Albert has referred, on the road between St. Alphonse and Chicoutimi, and where he has also discovered some sort of scandal. Let me tell him that if, while building that line, his friends, instead of putting the telegraph posts inside the road ditch, had put them, as the law required, in the proper spot, outside the ditch, there would have been no necessity for his informers to maliciously use him as an instrument for misleading public opinion and unfairly criticising the government. After all, that is only a mere business proposition which was carefully considered by the officers of the department and the council of St. Alphonse, the latter, in consequence of the trouble and damages inflicted by the improper building of the

line, claiming from the government the compensation to which they were entitled, or else the removal of the line. All parties concerned have accepted as equitable the settlement now proposed, which is one of the most practical and acceptable which the government could make under the circumstances.

Reference has been made by my hon. friend to a bridge at l'Anse St. Jean, which he managed to mix up with a school-house matter, and stated, in support of his contention, that the bridge had no connection whatever with the telegraph line. I am willing to pay the expenses of my hon. friend if he will visit the spot, so that he may be in a position to judge of the fairness of his informers; and he will find out that the bridge referred to is right in front of the telegraph office of the parish, and facing the house of the man employed to repair the line between l'Anse à Cheval and St. Alexis. He will also find out that with a paltry $200, the amount voted for that purpose, it would have been impossible, in the ordinary course, to build a bridge 200 feet long, suitable for general traffic. Then, if he inquires, he will learn that the people there, hearing that the department needed such a bridge, as a facility in the work of repairing the line, joined hands with the department and built a bridge costing $700 or $800; and I do not think there is anything to find fault with in this connection.

Now, let us proceed to St. Félix d'Otis; it is a building put up in the woods; there is no municipal organization there; only a group of settlers along the mail road from St. Alexis to l'Anse St. Jean. The government had to build a shelter there for the protection of the postman in stormy weather. A bridge was crumbling to pieces; the same reasons which justified the Dominion government in building a shelter for the postman, and paying $40 a year to the keeper, for the safety of travellers, justified them in repairing the bridge referred to without laying itself open to a charge of graft or embezzlement.

My hon. friend has spoken of the telegraph line to Lake Clair, north of the Saguenay river. Here again we have a building similar to that in Ferland township to which reference has been made a moment ago, put up for the benefit of isolated settlers, cut off from the rest of the world, but who nevertheless are contributors to the public chest, just as my hon. friend who is complaining, and who have the same right as he has to obtain from the Dominion government, when common sense warrants it, the permanent works they are entitled to. My hon. friend has spoken of subscriptions in connection with the roads in the parish of Ste. Anne. If his informers who have loaded him up, had been willing to tell him the truth, he would have learned that in order to secure a short

cut through the parish, it was arranged with the council that the telegraph lines would be allowed to pass over private property, in consideration of the sum of $300 which was paid to them, an entirely clear and fair bargain to the advantage of the department.

Suddenly my hon. friend jumps from Ste. Anne to Esquimaux Point, a distance of about 600 miles, where he discovers another telegraph bridge. If he had looked over the map before delivering himself up as a tool to his informers, who have so utterly deceived him, before the House, he would have found that between Ste. Anne and Esquimaux Point there are 25 or 30 streams, over which, with a view to the maintenance of the telegraph lines, bridges have been built by the department; and that built at Esquimaux Point is only one among many others. Now, at the place I have just mentioned there is a village inhabited by poor fishermen of the north shore, who will be much pleased, no doubt, to learn through the newspapers that the Conservative party has taken upon itself, on the floor of the House to cast aspersions on the government, unabashed for all that, because there are houses in their village, to build a bridge in it, just as they would do if it were in the bush.

My hon. friend will realize that under the circumstances, he has been humbugged by an organization of people who are certainly not his well-wishers, and still less the well-wishers of his party; and I trust that in future, before lending himself to such trickery, he will take the means of ascertaining the real worth of the people claiming his services as a critic here.

I am not quite through dealing with the insinuations made in connection with repairs to telegraph lines carried on in my constituency. Once more, I think it my duty to state that the county of Saguenay, which is comprised within the limits of my electoral district, occupies a peculiar geographical situation, and comprises a widely scattered population, settled here and there, according to the natural advantages offered by the various localities. And that population has been utterly neglected and practically forgotten by the Quebec government for all time, and by the Dominion government until the last seven or eight years. However those people, who number some nine or ten thousand souls, have contributed to the Dominion chest a large amount of revenue since confederation; and I am sorry, indeed, to find that one of my good friends in this House thinks that this government is not doing right in looking after the welfare of these people, in endeavouring to improve their conditions, and granting them a modicum of the improvements which they have a right to claim. However, I do not wish to condemn too severely the hon. member, being satisfied that he acted in good

faith, and never perceived that, in making these charges which he has just made, he was merely being used as a tool in the hands of people down there who are greatly amused at the trick they succeeded in working on him.

But before proceeding further, I think it is my duty to state to the House that these criticisms are not endorsed by public opinion in our county and that all this is merely the result of a plot on the part of a few schemers who, unwilling to assume the responsibility for their deeds, have not had the courage to allow the use of their names to the hon. members for St. Antoine and Kings and Albert. On the contrary, they have sought to cast on the Conservative party of my district all responsibility for their action, by voicing their grievances through two members of the opposition in this House. But I am happy to state that I am in a position to defeat the effort which is being made to mix up certain people in this business. A few days ago, I received a letter from one of the leaders of the Conservative party in the county of Chicoutimi, stating that the Conservative party in the district denied all connection with the plot which was going on, apparently under its name, and rejoiced at finding that no French Canadian member of the opposition had been willing to undertake what he frankly called the dirty business which others have been made to do. He requests me to assure the government that the Conservative party as a whole, with the exception of a few of its members whom it disowns, is generous enough and self-respecting enough not to wage war on the government, be it Liberal or Conservative, on the ground of favours which it has itself applied for on several occasions. I trust the government will realize the importance of such a statement.

My hon. friend spoke of a bridge pier on the River du Moulin ; he showed a photograph which he afterwards handed to the minister and read a series of written statements which were, of course, supplied to him by the ring of which I have just spoken ; statements which are false throughout. Let me state to my hon. friend that the pier referred to was built by the engineers of the Department of Public Works as a protection pier, because the wooden sheathing which he mentioned was beginning to give way, that wherever this happens, the bank is eaten up as a result of frosts, and that, one of these days, this wooden sheathing will have to be replaced by masonry extending from the said pier. Otherwise, the dredging of the Saguenay river, which has been started and is practically going on, would be of no avail, the channel being filled up by the material kept back heretofore by the woodwork referred to. My hon. friend claimed that, in the vicinity of that pier, the bottom of the River du Moulin is rock. That is true as regards the east side ; but, when building that pier, it was necessary to put in piles 30 feet in length ; it will thus be seen that the rock bottom, if such exists, is very deep, and that his facts are far from being correct. That is the exact truth as regards the department. When that pier was built, the parish of Chicoutimi forwarded a petition to me signed by all the inhabitants, endorsed by the council, requesting that the government allow them to place thereon the western end of a bridge which they were building. The minister sent no reply, and the council took upon themselves to use the pier as they intended. But even admitting that the object in view was really the building of a pier for the bridge, I do not think I would have reason, or the government have reason, to be ashamed of it. And here are my reasons for saying so: in 1903 I had the honour to represent the county of Lake St. John in the Quebec legislature. Colonization in that district was then almost at a standstill ; it was necessary to undertake large works in order to restore confidence. Two bridges valued at $50,000 were to be built without delay. The local government resolved to undergo that expenditure, but sought the co-operation of the Dominion government for that object I was sent to Ottawa as a delegate to discuss the matter with the Hon. Mr. Ouimet, Minister of Public Works. I submitted the plan to him; he called in his deputy minister, Mr. Gobeil, and his chief engineer, Mr. Coste, to whom he submitted the queston. After considering the matter, the minister decided with pleasure to pay $2,000 for the construction, as wharfs, of two piers on each side of the Grande Décharge of Lake St. John. The Quebec department of colonization was advised of that decision. The bridge was built and in September, 1894, the Auditor General allowed the payment of these $2,000, mention of which is made in the Public Accounts, and in the following letter :

Quebec, March 18, 1908.

Joseph Girard, Esq., M.P.,
House of Commons, Ottawa.

Sir,—In answer to your letter of the 15th instant, to the Hon. Mr. Devlin, I beg to inform you that the bridge at the Grande Décharge was built during the years 1893 and 1894.

We received as a contribution from the Dominion government the sum of $2,000.

Yours truly,
F. DUFAUX,
Deputy Minister.

The Hon. Mr. Ouimet, in giving these instructions, stated he was happy that the Dominion law and especially the Hon. Mr. Foster, then the faithful guardian of the treasury had given him a free hand in the matter, towards promoting the settlement of the Lake St. John country, the advantages of which were known to him, and wherein settlers were seeking to build homes for

themselves under such favourable circumstances. If in 1904 the then Minister of Public Works and the then Minister of Finance, with the assent of the Auditor General, approved of the idea of contributing to the building of bridges in my constituency, with a view of promoting colonization, I cannot preceive why, in 1908, the friends of the hon. gentleman should take exception to the same policy when carried out by a Liberal government. There should not be two weights and two measures, and and what was perfectly right in 1894 cannot be all wrong in 1908. I have followed in the footsteps of these hon. gentlemen in my efforts to accomplish some good; I am not sorry for it, but they should not blame me to-day for carrying out their teachings.

A moment ago my hon. friend handed over to the Minister of Public Works, with a sarcastic smile, a photograph of the bridge which he finds fault with. I may be permitted in answer to show a photograph of part of the bridge of which I have just spoken, wherein will be seen the piers towards the building of which the Hon. Mr. Ouimet was so happy to contribute $2,000. If my hon. friend had known the history of the case he would have avoided dealing with the matter; for in 1894, at the time of the interview above stated, the Hon. Mr. Ouimet was very glad to give instructions to his engineer, Mr. Blais, to build, as approaches to a wharf to be built later on, three miles of road right through the woods, towards promoting the settlement of Talon township, in the Lake St. John district. These instructions were put down in black and white, and are on record in the department. Now, Mr. Speaker, is there much more harm in the present government building approaches to a wharf with a view to facilitating trade impeded by obstacles in the shape of bad roads, than in the government which was in power in 1894 ordering the building of a colonization road three miles in length as an approach to a wharf which was not yet in existence?

I regret that I should thus be obliged, in order to answer my hon. friend's charges, to recall the political history of the last few years; but it is impossible for me to do otherwise. The Hon. Mr. Foster, speaking in this House on the 12th of March last, stated that the Dominion legislation did not exactly define the exact limit between local works and Dominion works, and that, in consequence, abuses arose from time to time; that it was necessary that such a state of things should be put an end to, and the limit exactly defined. He seemed to blame this government for not doing so. I have no objection to this government taking such action, should they think fit to do so; but I wonder why this government should be under greater obligation than the old government to modify legislation enacted with sound sense by the fathers of confederation; and I cannot admit that the hon. gentleman has the right to blame the present government for doing what he himself was only too glad to do when he had the keys of the chest, and he was called upon to promote the development of some outlying part of the country, even though it be Chicoutimi and Saguenay.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think my hon. friend realizes that those who requested him to make those charges before the House are not his best friends. I believe he himself has not seen them and that he is purely and simply entrusted with the task of carrying on the work started by the member for St. Antoine. Possibly he thought he was dealing with friends, though he did not know their names. I may be allowed to tell him who are the people working this scheme: Mr. Allain, Mr. Savard, Mr. Dubuc, Mr. Joseph Guay, of Chicoutimi, allies of Mr. Ben. Scott, of Roberval, who have as their agent Mr. Simon Lapointe, the latter having come to Ottawa to load up hon. members of the opposition. Mr. Savard and Mr. Allain claim to be Liberals, but in their committee they receive with pleasure those of whom I have just spoken, and who call themselves Conservatives. Together have they prepared the plot; together have they delegated Mr. Lapointe to Ottawa; but on the very day that Mr. Lapointe left Chicoutimi, Mr. Allain and Mr. Savard wrote to a prominent man in Ottawa a letter which I have seen, advising him that Mr. Lapointe was proceeding to Ottawa to supply the hon. members on the other side with ammunition against the government, but that it was in spite of them. So, I am in a position to-day to state to the hon. gentleman that, instead of helping the cause of his Conservative friends in the county of Chicoutimi and Saguenay, he is merely working for the benefit of certain people who claim to be Liberals, but who employ Mr. Lapointe, a so-called Conservative, to make war on the government, without the latter finding them out. Such are the lofty feelings of these hypocrites which I desire to make known to the House and to submit to the appreciation of the ministers who hear me. At the bottom of all this, there is jealousy, there is a desire to promote private ends, which the public as a whole does not suspect, but which people at home keenly appreciate.

My hon. friend has spoken of the wharf at Clark City in the bay of Sept-Iles and has described in a more or less gruesome light. I may say that this wharf has been built by the government with a view to securing control over the landing at that point, instead of leaving it in the hands of private concerns which might have taken advantage of it, to the detriment of others. The company which is doing business at

Clark City has spent heretofore about $3,000,000 or $4,000,000 of entirely American capital, which has been applied in developing one of the finest industries in the country, and the products of which will, within a few weeks, be put on the market. This company has contributed towards the building of the said wharf an amount as large, if not larger, than that contributed by the country itself; but they have agreed to let the government have full control of the wharf, and business men consider such a departure to be in the public interest. Presently at Clark City there will be a large town, towards the building up of which the Dominion will have contributed a relatively small amount; and I understand that it has been customary all over the country that the government should co-operate in the building up of industries so beneficial to the public weal.

On the 12th of March last, my hon. friend from Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) launched out in great style against the government at the instigation of those same people I have just named, because the government had built on the River Saguenay and close to Chicoutimi booms similar to those in the St. Maurice. He complained at the same time that the pulp company had not paid any dues and refused to pay them, under pretense that these booms were so badly constructed that the pulp company, after applying for them, refused to take advantage of them. That question has come before the Public Accounts Committee. An investigation was held. It was shown and proven by all the officers of the department who have to do with the question, from the chief engineer down, that these booms have been well and properly constructed, according to the ordinary plans in use by the department; but that the Pulp Company of Chicoutimi who had been insisting on the government putting in these booms, had on the day following that on which the government decided to do so, insisted that the government should buy their own booms, consisting in a chain and a single log of small diameter, old and poorly put in, for the price of $30,000. Experts were sent to establish the real value of these fixtures, and it was estimated at $5,000, or $6,000 at most; and the whole endeavour of the company since has been to run down the government booms, unheedful of the reputation of the officials who had to do with this work, in the hope that the government would be constrained to buy up their old plant at $30,000. I shall now read a letter which throws some light on the subject:

Chicoutimi, February 9, 1906.

Joseph Girard, Esq., M.P.,
St. Gédéon.

My dear Girard,—I have been requested by the board of directors of the Chicoutimi Pulp Company to come to some understanding with you regarding certain matters which have already been discussed pretty often, though without much success, owing to circumstances known to us. I am authorized to state to you that my fellow directors, at this meeting, which was held during the absence of Mr. Dubuc in Europe, acknowledge that you are not in any way to blame in this connection.

Our company is just now under stringent circumstances, and that should not surprise you, being aware that we have always been in need of capital, and that our establishment has cost nearly $2,000,000. The directors of the company have shown public spirit in establishing this company in Chicoutimi, and have invested in it their whole capital, their whole credit, all their belonging, and even more.

After subscribing $600,000, wholly paid-up, issuing $400,000 worth of debentures, disposing of $400,000 of preferential stock, we have still to tackle a floating debt of more than $200,000, which will have to be paid up without fault and without delay; and it is in order to request you to assist us as best you can that I have been asked to write to you, and to meet you if you so desire.

You are a man of resources, you have shown it on many occasions; you are aware of the importance of our undertaking, you know what its downfall would mean for Chicoutimi. You know that should we go under, our plant would fall into the hands of Americans, who have their eye on it, and you are patriotic enough to be willing to do what is in your power to prevent that, hon. sir.

If you wish me to meet you, we can discuss what means are at your disposal towards assisting us, and you may count on the gratitude of the directors of the company. I stated openly in public not very long ago, what are my feelings toward you. You may rest assured that these sentiments are wholly shared in by my fellow directors who have requested me to meet you.

Believe me, etc.,
J. D. GUAY,
Vice-president of the Pulp Co.

The pulp company of Chicoutimi being in very bad straits, having failed to secure from the city of Chicoutimi a subscription of $75,000, was striving to restore matters somewhat by extorting from the Dominion an amount of $25,000, which probably would have been very welcome. I deemed it my duty to submit that request of the company to the officials and to the ministers. After realizing that the proposal which was being made could not be considered in a fair light, I let the department deal with the matter as they thought advisable, and I am not sorry for doing so. However, the result has been this plot before the House and before the Public Accounts Committee against the government and against myself, owing to the fact that none of us were willing to endorse such gross boodling as had been proposed. Had I been willing to be the tool of these gentlemen, and stooped to that dirty business, you may be sure that neither the government, myself, nor the House, would have

ever heard of those strictures concerning a few hundred dollars spent in the public interest and for the interest of poor people who are worthy of the government's consideration, and particularly because they are honest and loyal.

With the co-operation of these same gentlemen, and their full approval, the government decided to complete the dredging of the Saguenay begun by the Hon. Mr. Ouimet in 1894, and interrupted later. Matters were going on peacefully, the work had been started and was proceeding in good order, when on a sudden Lord Strathcona, Canadian High Commissioner in London, as may be ascertained by a return to an order of the House, wrote to the Minister of Marine here, on behalf of a certain Mr. Becker, whom nobody knows, that the dredging of the Saguenay was an act of madness, that the undertaking should be given up at once, and that the seaport for the district of Chicoutimi should be located at a spot along the River Saguenay which is called 'Les Batures.' I was consulted in this connection. Knowing what was the consensus of opinion in my district, I opposed this demand, although not knowing whence it came, and the government proceeded with the work. Since I have had constantly to battle against a certain party, whom I always found in the way without perceiving what was the reason of it all. But I have here a letter which will make known to you the promoter of this abusrd project, and which shows why the gentleman named is endeavouring to satisfy his hatred and a desire for vengeance against me. I shall now read two letters which will explan my meaning:

Quebec, April 3, 1908.

Joseph Girard, Esq., M.P.
Ottawa.

My dear Girard,—I understand that an application has been made by Mr. J. A. Dubuc, for the construction of a wharf at the Battures and for the extension of the railway up to deep water at that place. That application will be made on behalf of the new harbour company.

Heretofore the Chicoutimi Pulp Company has requested the dredging of the shoals (battures) as far up as Chicoutimi. You and the government have acceded to that request; large amounts have been spent, and there is no reason of recent occurrence why that undertaking should not be proceeded with. I have discussed the situation with Mr. G. S. Scott, Mr. Lemoine and others, and their views coincide with mine, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. Dubuc claims that the dredging is almost at a standstill. I know, for my part, that the work is well under way, and that even greater progress would have been made if you had been given a free hand last summer. Half of the dredging is being carried on to a depth of 18 feet. I know that if the work is proceeded with this year and next, the dredging at the government wharf will reach a depth of 18 feet. That is a matter of great importance for Chicoutimi, for us and the pulp company.

Mr. Dubuc is indignant against Chicoutimi; he has a grudge against the city council and so states to all comers. My views differ from his in this respect.

I shall to-morrow return to Chicoutimi; I shall endeavour to cross Dubuc's plans, call a meeting of the city council and of the citizens, and we shall send a delegation to explain matters to the government as soon as you so desire.

If the building of the railway is to be proceeded with, a proposition to which I do not object, it should have its terminus at St. Alphonse, instead of the Battures, but we would like the dredging to go on just the same.

You can rely on me, on my paper, on my friends, on the whole population, I think, for support in this connection.

Do not give up, this is a critical hour, and we need your help.

Yours truly,
J. D. GUAY,
Vice-president of the Pulp Co.

April 10, 1906.

My Dear Girard,—I received your letter on Sunday, just as I was leaving for Quebec, and I met Taché yesterday morning here at the Frontenac. He has given me good news.

Your stand will have the general approval of the people at Chicoutimi, barring the Dubuc faction, which is not very numerous, as you know.

You shall have our petitions by Easter.

Taché tells me that we may rely on the dredging being done. I was informed here yesterday that the people in Quebec are expecting to have the dredge 'l'Internationale' for the Louise basin here, as soon as navigation opens. Have your eye on these people; nobody can tell when they will be through.

Our farmers will be glad to learn that you have obtained $4,000 for them. You are already aware, no doubt, that we have voted the by-law unanimously, thanks to your telegram, which I have explained as best I could.

Yours truly,
J. D. GUAY,
Vice-president of the Pulp Co.

I am glad to be in a position to lay these letters before the House, in order to enable the government and my fellow members to judge of the plots against which I have to contend just now, and of the esteem in which your humble servant was held by the vice-president of the Chicoutimi pulp company. I have not done anything wrong since, neither have any of my friends, notwithstanding which we are no longer held in the same estimation. There is no longer any hope of obtaining the $30,000.

A word of explanation concerning this whole matter. The county of Chicoutimi and Saguenay, for its development, is dependent on various industries. Some are in the hands of millionaires; others in those of would-be millionaires. Those of the first class, such as that located at Jonquière, grow and prosper for the benefit of the people as a whole, and of the shareholders,

without noise or trouble. Peace prevails in the neighbourhood, and it is a Protestant, Wm. Price, who is the foremost director of the undertaking, in the midst of an entirely Catholic and French Canadian population; and the same thing may be said of other industries in the county of Saguenay.

At Chicoutimi, the only industry in existence is in the hands of French Canadians, in the midst of a French Canadian population; and there is in that locality any amount of quarrelling, litigation, disputes, plots, etc., and even a ring whose influence is felt right here, consisting of people who, though poor, are intent on getting rich quick and have made up their minds to crush any who refuse to follow their dictates. It matters not what is the status or the influence of the person whom they resolved to undo. As an instance, take the case of Judge Gagné, appointed for the district, an absolutely honest and honourable man, whom the Chicoutimi organizer, Mr. Dubuc, has denounced in the papers, and in a circular letter addressed to the members of this House, shamelessly and unscrupulously. Now here is the manner in which the hon. Judge Langelier has lately characterized such conduct :

> Lastly, a Mr. Dubuc has published a letter in which he threatened in plain terms Judge Gagné with impeachment, should he decide adversely to his contention in a pending lawsuit. Whoever ventured to make such a threat to a judge in England would probably have been sent to jail for a term of six months.

In this connection, I wish to enter my emphatic protest against the malicious and slanderous attacks which the ring branded by me are unceasingly directing against the said judge, who has attained to his high position owing to his honesty and on that account cannot be made a tool of.

The clergy of Chicoutimi have not been spared. The newspapers of the province of Quebec, unfortunately, have been imprudent enough to spread abroad reports incorrect for the greater part as to the troubles experienced by the bishop, who perceiving that his good faith was being taken advantage of, hastened to grant to the person whom the ring was anxious to ruin in his esteem a certificate of good citizenship and Christian conduct. Two weeks later, one of the ring stated in a well-known office in the city of Quebec, that the bishop of Chicoutimi must have lost his head to act in such a way, and that he was bound to go. But His Grace knows that he still enjoys the full confidence and respect of the whole Catholic population.

Before the Public Accounts Committee, the inquiry was directed mainly against the engineers of the Department of Public Works, whom the ring had failed to bend to their own objects. The investigation clearly showed that the officials, chief engineers, resident engineers and other employees assigned to the district, are absolutely honest and above reproach and entirely beyond any slanders which the ring might be capable of devising, in spite of their cleverness, for their great talent consists in resorting to calumny unceasingly. There were left only the government and your humble servant who had not been the objects of attacks on the part of that gang of bold speculators. Now it is our turn; word has been given and we must suffer; and so it is that in every station of life we find victims of that gang; the clergy, the judicature, public officials, the government and your humble servant. However, none of us are dead as yet; we all have in hand an antidote in sufficient quantity against the poison distilled by the gang; we have honesty; we are impervious to their venom. In the minds of these organizers, this whole business may be considered as a personal attack on my honesty and that of my friends. Cowardice has prevented them from making their charges openly; but the whole trend of that affair was an insinuation to that effect. The investigation before the Public Accounts Committee has clearly shown the correctness of all accounts. However, since it has been deemed advisable to entrust Mr. Lapointe with the task of investigating our honesty, I shall supply him for the next six months with the following information to be laid before the public: How can Dr. Savard, who was paymaster at Chicoutimi between 1886 and 1900, explain the various payments made to a certain Archibald McLean, an invalid, for square timber sold to the government during the years 1898, 1899 and 1900 for the wharf at St. Alphonse, to the amount of several hundred dollars? How is it that J. Tremblay, in 1900, an unknown, has sold wood to the amount of $690 for the wharf at St. Alexis? How is it that a man by the name of P. A. Potvin, in 1899, sold wood to the amount of $232.75 for the Pipe wharf? Who is L. P. Bilodeau, who managed to sell to the government ordinary board nails for $5 to $9 a keg, and machine oil at $1 a gallon, when everywhere else throughout the country nails were selling at $3 to $3.50, and oil at 30 cents? My hearers know what that means. Then, how is it that in 1899, B. A. Scott received from the government $1,000 for a buoy service on Lake St. John, which at present costs only $300? How comes it that the same B. A. Scott was obliged to return a cheque to the amount of $202 for square timber which he had not sold? I call upon the informer of my hon. friends from St. Antoine and from King's and Albert to look up the public accounts from 1896 to 1900 with especial care, and to report at the next session. That would be of great interest.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) In what year did these facts occur?

Mr. GIRARD. (Translation.) Between 1896 and 1900.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) So it occurred under this government?

Mr. GIRARD. (Translation.) Yes; but they are the same people to whom I have referred, and who in an indirect way have brought about my election in 1900, the electors having returned me by way of protests against these abuses. I am happy to state, and I wish it to be clearly understood, that the leader of this government having been advised of these facts previous to the elections, allowed me to be returned practically without any opposition, his intention being to have it understood that his good faith had been imposed upon by people who were utterly unworthy of his confidence.

This being understood, I wish to emphasize once more what I said a moment ago, viz., that this whole plot before the Public Accounts Committee and in this House is far from being advantageous, from a political point of view, to the party who is waging war on the government, the latter having taken advantage of all honest means which the law put at its disposal to promote the interests of all parts of the constituency which I represent, and particularly those of the poorer localities. The government has acted in good faith and with the greatest honesty possible. Your humble servant, supported in the various parishes by the most prominent citizens friendly to the government, considered himself in honour and conscience bound to repay under the form of loyalty and respect the confidence and generosity which the Prime Minister reposed in the district and in its representative. Those hypocrites who expected they might remain hidden while the opposition would be waging war on the government on their account, because the said government practically had been working in the interests of the county, will find it difficult, in spite of their expertness, to satisfy the people that the government have done too much on their behalf. Accordingly, I can assure the House that the government candidate at the next election, in the county of Chicoutimi and Saguenay, will have no difficulty in securing his election, the people knowing what they owe to the present Prime Minister; and I may assure the opposition that, as a sequel to the war which they have been waging against the interests of the county, it will be well for them not to put a candidate in the field, unless they are willing to forego his deposit.

Mr. TAYLOR. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman is not speaking to the item under discussion.

Mr. GIRARD.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I hope the hon. gentleman will not press the point of order, because the hon. member for King's and Albert (Mr. Fowler) went out of his way to make an attack on the hon. member for Chicoutimi (Mr. Girard) in regard to the expenditure of public money in his county. I think the hon. member for Chicoutimi should have an opportunity to reply.

Mr. FOWLER. I did not go out of my way to make an attack on anybody. I merely read statements and gave facts.

Mr. PUGSLEY. You must take the responsibility of your statements.

Mr. TAYLOR. An arrangement has been made between the two sides of the House to bring this session to a close on Saturday. If my hon. friend does not want to carry out that arrangement, this side is willing to stay here until next week or next month.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will the hon. gentleman say that after the member for Kings and Albert, at this late stage of the session and the night, made the attack he did with regard to expenditures in Chicoutimi, the hon. member for that county should not be allowed to reply?

Mr. FOWLER. Certainly, let him reply as long as he likes.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman from that county has already occupied more time in the reply than my hon. friend from Kings and Albert did in his statement. I was a party to the arrangement made last night, that in the time allotted to this subject we were to have practically the whole time. That arrangement is now broken.

Mr. GIRARD. I did not like to break any arrangement that has been made, but the hon. member for Kings and Albert has been dealing with so many things in my own riding that I think I should be allowed to answer him.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. GIRARD. I regret Mr. Speaker, I have spoken at such length. My hon. friend from Kings and Albert has compelled me to do so. I thought I had the right to answer every one of his charges. I wish to repeat what I said a moment ago, that the Conservative party of the district have not approached the opposition in the person of Simon Lapointe, who came to Ottawa to meet I know not whom. He may represent and belong to a certain class of Conservative parasites who associate with a small number of Liberal people of the same kind, whose existence in the county, unfortunately, we cannot avoid admitting. But I repeat it, the Conservative party in the county has not used this gentleman as its spokesman; and the government may rest assured of one thing, which I am anxi-

ous to impress on the mind of my hearers, and it is this: In my district we are new, we are poor, we are needy, but the majority of us are not looking for honours, because we have been brought up in an environment where honour is not a matter of jest; and no one would dare in our midst to try and knife whomever had extended a helping hand to him, whomever had been of service to him, be it the government or be it an individual, should he be a Liberal or should he be a Conservative. We are proud of our education, we glory in it; it may not give as brilliant results, but it is nobler, grander, better.

In our midst there is no Chateau-Saguenay paid ten cents on the dollar, nor people paying their debts with worthless cheques; we make it a point to brand the few amongst us who act otherwise.

I am not ashamed of what I have done for my county. I glory at the thought, and my mind is quite made up to persevere. Always and everywhere have I acted toward the government and my constituents loyally and honorably. The government have not to regret what they have done. Far from it, the people concerned will seize the first opportunity of showing their gratitude. In the future the government should do as in the past, and those who are trying to hurt the government in these parts of the country where those questions are not well understood, will not get much benefit from it, if they only have courage enough to say publicly what was said by the honorable member for Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid). He said before the Committee of Public Accounts, after becoming acquainted with the charges made: 'That is too small for me.' Such is the verdict of an impartial member of this House, who had followed the trial, and it absolutely exonerates the government, its officers and myself, and we have reason to be proud of such a verdict.

Mr. CARVEL. Notwithstanding the lateness of the hour, I propose to place on 'Hansard' the facts of the case. For many years the federal government have been constructing federal lines of telegraph in the eastern portion of the province of Quebec known as the Chicoutimi district. Some weeks ago the papers regarding payments in the Auditor General's Report were ordered by the Public Accounts Committee, and Mr. Tache, the chief engineer of the Public Works Department, was brought here and was examined by the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) for nearly two hours, and by other members. He was examined about every item in the Auditor General's Report regarding the payments of money over these telegraph lines, he was examined about roads and bridges, and he stated emphatically that not one dollar of that money had been spent for any other purpose except purposes in connection with the telegraph lines. He said that in certain places they had built a bridge which was used by children going from one portion of the village to another, but he said that by building that bridge they saved four or five miles in going around to repair the telegraph lines, and that it was absolutely necessary. He stated that in one or two places there were long distances without a single settler, and that they had to repair these roads in order to get along so as to repair the telegraph lines. And some person, I presume the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames), has prepared a statement absolutely at variance with the facts as given before the Public Accounts Committee. There is not one word of truth in that statement. That is a pretty strong statement for me to make, but I make it deliberately. And the hon. member for Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler) is the honourable medium by which that dishonest statement is placed on the records of this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOWLER. That calls forth applause from hon. members opposite—not because they understand what they are applauding but simply because it is a sweeping statement made by one on their own side. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Carvell) is a lawyer, and he ought to know that he is not warranted in making the statement that there is not one word of truth in the statements that I have read——

Mr. CARVELL. Not a word is true according to the evidence before the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. FOWLER. So far as personal knowledge is concerned the hon. member (Mr. Carvell) has absolutely no acquaintance with the facts; he has never been in the place, never saw one of these bridges or the telegraph lines. He is taking his story from what some one else has said, whether on oath or not is another matter. He says that in all I have said there is not a word of truth. The evidence of which the hon. gentleman speaks related to the telegraph line and the bridges built supposedly in connection with it. But I took up other matters. And yet the hon. gentleman, without knowledge, without having heard any sworn testimony with regard to these matters, makes the sweeping statement that the whole thing is untrue. That of course, is to be expected from the hon. gentleman—and he is the honourable medium by which that honourable statement is made to this honourable House, to use his own phrase.

Mr. FIELDING. To carry out the arrangement, we shall have to take some Bills. We might rise now for that purpose, and we may go into Supply again.

Some resolutions reported.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

On the order :

Third reading of Bill (No. 109) to authorize a bounty to volunteers who served the Crown in South Africa.—Mr. Oliver.

Mr. TAYLOR. Before we take this up, do I understand that after the Bills the hon. minister (Mr. Fielding) proposes that we shall go again into Supply?

Mr. FIELDING. I take it that hon. members on both sides would prefer to do so. We can do it only by general consent. If there is any objection, it will not be done ; the hour is late.

Mr. FOWLER. No more Public Works estimates at any rate.

Mr. CARVELL. We can stay here a month, if necessary. I do not like this——

Mr. FIELDING. There is nothing to be gained by saying what shall or shall not be done. I am not anxious to remain here unduly.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister told me we were to adjourn early.

Mr. FIELDING. We will not have trouble about that. We are merely carrying out the arrangement to take up Bills and dispose of them. Let us do that, and, if there is any objection to further sitting, I am prepared to meet the wishes of the House.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 109) to authorize a bounty to Volunteers who served the Crown in South Africa.—Mr. Oliver.

Bill (No. 209) to amend the Canada Shipping Act.—Mr. Fielding.

MANITOBA GRAIN ACT—INSPECTION AND SALE OF GRAIN.

House in committee on Bill (No. 188) to amend the Manitoba Grain Act.—Mr. Oliver.

Mr. TAYLOR. There are two Bills here that run somewhat concurrently, this one and Bill (No. 203) to amend the inspection and sale Act as regards grain. Would it not be well to have both discussed while we are in committee ?

Mr. FIELDING. If it is agreeable to hon. members generally. It will be understood, then, that we can discuss both at the same time, and when the motion for the reading of the second Bill is made there will be no discussion. I have no objection to that.

Mr. OLIVER. The Bill to amend the Manitoba Grain Act has already been in committee and its provisions have been agreed to in committee. I asked the House to leave the Bill in committee so that, if amendments were made to the Inspection and Sale Act that were found to clash in any way with the Grain Act, the Grain Act could be amended without serious delay. If possible, I would like to have the Inspection and Sale Act considered with that view.

Mr. STAPLES. That is, we will take up both together.

Mr. FIELDING. Treat the two Bills as one subject.

On section 2,

Mr. STAPLES. I understood that we were taking up the Inspection and Sale Act as well as the Manitoba Grain Act.

Mr. FIELDING. We could substitute the Inspection and Sale Act amendment for the other.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. We can do so by agreement, but the Bill to amend the Inspection and Sale Bill has not been referred to the committee.

Mr. FIELDING. It will simplify it if we rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again on this Manitoba Grain Act, and take up the other.

Progress reported.

House in committee on Bill (No. 203) to amend the Inspection and Sale Act as regards grain.

On section 3—definition.

Mr. LAKE. I would like to know the reasons for inserting this clause. The grain dealers of the Northwest, at a meeting, asked that the hardness and soundness of wheat should be the test rather than the colour. This appears to disregard their wishes entirely because it makes it absolutely certain that colour is to be the main consideration.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not able to answer that definitely. This is the Bill as it comes from the Senate and the Senate in its wisdom has seen fit to make a provision such as is here. It is clearly the intention to specify as thoroughly as possible that the wheat must be hard, of red colour and of the Red Fife variety. There is evidently no intention to relax any of the provisions with regard to the quality of the wheat.

Mr. LAKE. I do not agree with the view of the Senate with regard to this matter. I think it would be very much better that we should leave it as it was before in which case there was a certain amount of discretion given to the chief inspector. I would move that clause 3 be eliminated.

Amendment (Mr. Lake) negatived.

On section 5—amended tariff of fees.

Mr. OLIVER moved that the section be stricken out.

Motion agreed to.

On section 6—cost of appeal.

Mr. OLIVER moved:

That section 6 be stricken out and that the following be substituted therefor:
Subsection 4 of section 81 is amended by striking out 'inspecting officer' in the first line and substituting 'department' therefor.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 8—commercial grades.

Mr. OLIVER moved that section 8 be struck out.

Mr. STAPLES. Is there any substitution?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, there is a substitution later on, but the effect is that under the Act as it stands to-day there is no provision for the grain standard board to vary the grades of oats. The proposal of the Bill CCC is that the grain standard board shall have the right to vary the standards of oats under certain circumstances. This is objected to and in place of the right to vary the standards it is proposed to add 'No. 1 and 2 black and mixed oats' so as to provide for all reasonable contingencies and to leave the standard as now made without any question of variation.

Motion agreed to.

On section 9—grain to be inspected in Winnipeg district.

Mr. OLIVER moved that the following be inserted as subsection 2 and 3 of section 123.

2. Grain which is shipped from points west of Winnipeg to Winnipeg for orders, as provided in section 99c of the Manitoba Grain Act, and which goes forward without delivery in Winnipeg, shall be inspected at Winnipeg and the certificate of inspection shall be issued at the end of the period of detention: provided, however, that on the written order of the agent of the shipper a car of grain held at Winnipeg shall be inspected on its arrival and the certificate of inspection issued.
3. In the case of grain which is being shipped east from elevators in Winnipeg or St. Boniface, the sample for inspection shall not be drawn from any car until the car has been billed for shipment by the railway company.

Mr. STAPLES. Will the minister explain that?

Mr. OLIVER. The first of the two subsections provides that grain which is being held at Winnipeg for orders shall be inspected at the end of the period of detention. If the car has been held the inspection shall be made when it is going out and not immediately after it has come in except that the shipper may order it inspected after it comes in. If he does not so order it is inspected as it goes out.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Why on going out?

Mr. OLIVER. It is necessary to inspect it at some time and if it is to be sold on sample it is not desirable to inspect it before the sale is made; but if it is not sold in Winnipeg it is necessary that the inspection shall be made before it goes east from Winnipeg in order that no grain may go east from Winnipeg except under inspection.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Would it interfere with the sample market to have the inspection before the grain goes on the sample board?

Mr. OLIVER. It was thought that if it had been already inspected and the certificate issued the grain would be ticketed as of a certain grade, the buyer would buy on that grade and much of the advantage of the sample market would be lost.

Mr. STAPLES. Is this the only clause in the Bill providing for a sample market?

Mr. OLIVER. The only provision.

Mr. STAPLES. How does this compare with the sample market, say in Minneapolis?

Mr. OLIVER. The cases are not parallel. Winnipeg is on the direct route to the head of the lake.

Mr. STAPLES. The owner of a mixing elevator in Winnipeg can buy grain, mix it as he sees fit, put it on track, call for inspection and forward the grain on that inspection.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. STAPLES. Does he not think that is throwing the door open towards the mixing of grain and losing the identity of our wheat in its shipment to the foreign market. I do not think this meets the wishes of the Grain Growers' Associations.

Mr. OLIVER. There is undoubtedly every objection to the mixing of grain once it has been graded, but there can be no objection to mixing before the grain is assembled at the point of inspection. If we can guarantee that from the point of assemblage and inspection forward there shall be no mixing we will have achieved the purpose in the mind of every western man interested in this trade. There must be some point at which the grain trade changes from sample to grade and it is generally conceded that the point should be Winnipeg.

Mr. STAPLES. For grain that does not pass through Winnipeg but goes, for instance, through Emerson there can be no advantage from the sample market.

Mr. OLIVER. No, that grain is sampled for inspection at Emerson.

Mr. STAPLES. I suppose a mixing elevator could be established at Emerson, and that eventually a sample market could be established there the same as in Winnipeg.

Mr. OLIVER. Of course the sample market is of no value unless there is a large number of samples and a large number of buyers. One of the difficulties about the sample market at Winnipeg is that there may not be enough sample buyers to make the proposition successful.

Mr. STAPLES. Suppose that somebody thinks that it is to his material advantage to erect an elevator and go into the mixing business and establish a sample market, does this Act restrict any such operation?

Mr. OLIVER. No; there is nothing against it.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Does the minister think that the sample market will be of any advantage to the farmers, restricted, as it is, to the period after the middle of December? I understand that they cannot use it prior to that date.

Mr. OLIVER. I doubt if there are enough buyers at Winnipeg to make the sample market a success, even if it were carried on all the year round. It is only an experiment, and my hon. friend is aware that there are great objections urged against the experiment by the railway companies on the ground that it is liable to tie up traffic. My view is that it is not advisable, in urging any changes, or what we think are improvements in connection with the grain trade, to create a position that might be blamed upon this advanced legislation, as we call it. We think it is better to go cautiously in this experiment, and not risk what the railway companies, who are good authorities on the subject, contend would be a serious disturbance of trade conditions, until we see how the matter is likely to work out. Therefore, it is provided that the provision as to an order point shall only prevail from the middle of December to the first of September. I move to insert the following as clause 7a of the Bill:

7a. The following section is inserted immediately after section 108:

108a. Every elevator operator who allows the grain in a car which has been ordered east of Winnipeg or St. Boniface, from which he has signed a bill of lading and from which a sample of grain has been drawn for inspection as provided in subsection 3 of section 123 of this Act, to be returned, without the permission of the grain inspector, to the elevator from which it was loaded shall, for each offence be liable to a penalty not exceeding $50.

Mr. STAPLES. That is a pretty small penalty. If the dealer wants to manipulate the grain in this manner, to put it back and touch it up a little provided it has failed to reach the standard he was anticipating, he can do so with the permission of the inspector. Does the minister think that it is in the interest of the grain producers of the west to allow that?

Mr. OLIVER. Of course, we do not anticipate that the inspector will give such permission, unless there should be some physical reason why the car should be unloaded. The understanding is that he shall not do so except for some physical reason which has nothing whatever to do with the grain trade.

Mr. STAPLES. Should not the wording of the clause be made a little more explicit?

Mr. OLIVER. In any matter that is at the absolute discretion of the inspector, the intent of the law is sufficient for an honest inspector; and, of course, we do not want a dishonest one.

Mr. LAKE. I would suggest that we substitute the chief grain inspector for the inspector.

Mr. OLIVER. I am quite willing to do that.

On section 10,

Mr. STAPLES. Will the minister explain to what extent special binning is going to be permitted, because I understand that it is very apt to create great congestion in the forwarding of our grain?

Mr. OLIVER. The provisions as framed in the amendment to the Manitoba Grain Act seem to me to guard effectually against any possibility of a congestion of the trade. In the first place, the conditions are not operative through the rush season; and, in the second place, the privileges cannot be availed of except with the permission of the warehouse commissioner, and he would not give permission for special binning under circumstances that would be likely to cause congestion. This provision is looked upon rather as an experiment. We have carefully guarded, we believe, against any ill effects, and the provision will give a fair opportunity to work it out and see what value there is in it.

Mr. LAKE. Will the inspector be able to inspect and control special bins which are given in any but the elevators operated by railway companies? If the Canadian Pacific Railway elevators, which are the only elevators there now, have to give the whole of the special bins, that may cause some congestion.

Mr. OLIVER. Every elevator at Fort William and Port Arthur will be subject to the same restrictions with regard to special bins or anything else. The section we agreed to in the amendment to the Manitoba Grain Act declares that at any point declared to be a terminal point all elevators are to be public elevators.

Mr. LAKE. Then the inspector will have full discretion to divide the special bins among the various elevators.

Mr. OLIVER. He does not divide the bins but will give permission to the person who applies, if he thinks the interest of the trade will not suffer, and that person makes his own arrangements.

On section 7—In the month of August stock shall be taken of the quantity of each grade of grain in the terminal elevators.

Mr. LAKE. There is just one question. You will have a very large number of different grades of oats provided for now and all mixing of grain in bins apparently is prohibited. Has the minister taken that into consideration so as to determine whether there will be sufficient bins to accommodate all the different grades we are getting. We are providing a large number and also for special binning. This has been taken into consideration, I presume, in the discussion the minister has had with his responsible officers.

Mr. OLIVER. There will not be any larger number of grades necessary under this Bill than without it. There are a larger number of grades established by statute, but during the past season, under the peculiar conditions that prevailed, the grain standards' board had authority to establish commercial grades so that there was last season a considerably larger number of grades than is provided for under this Bill.

Mr. LAKE. How many grades of oats were there last year?

Mr. OLIVER. I could not say how many actual grades there were, but my hon. friend knows that in wheat at any rate the number of grades was very large. There were five statutory grades of oats last year.

On section 17—grades of spring wheat.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Are these satisfactory to the grain growers?

Mr. OLIVER. This is in place of the proposal which caused so much discussion in the Senate. The difference between the proposal discussed in the Senate and this is that the proposal in the Senate undertook to permit scoured or dried grain to go into the regular grades on the judgment of the inspector. This provision makes a separate place for scoured and dried grain of No. 1 and No. 2 quality, but as to No. 3, it is to go into the regular grades or not at the discretion of the inspector.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). At both points—Winnipeg and Port Arthur?

Mr. OLIVER. Winnipeg is where the inspection is made.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I know that this matter was discussed at some length in the Senate; I shall not take up time in discussing it here. But when we have a sample market, and when it has been proven that this wheat, after it is sent to the hospital and doctored, is of the same value for milling purposes as other wheat, it does seem but fair that the farmer should have the benefit of the grade. I followed, as well as I could, the discussion in the Senate. As well as I can gather, the objection to the proposition is that it somewhat lowers the type or grade of wheat in the British market. But, if the wheat is of equal milling value, it seems to me the farmers should get the benefit. I believe the grain dealers have made a great deal of money on this wheat. We have been so unfortunate in my district as to have some smutty wheat—not very much of it, but by the processes they use they are able to turn it into good wheat.

Mr. LAKE. This covers three different varieties of No. 1—No. 1 hard, No. 1 spring and No. 1 northern.

Mr. OLIVER. That is why the word 'No. 1' is not repeated where the expression is used 'to the grade to which it belongs.'—No. 1 hard, No. 1 spring, or whatever it may be.

Mr. LAKE. There is only one No. 2 grade, but the same wording is used. Could it lead to any confusion? It is pretty clear to my mind, but I make the suggestion.

Mr. OLIVER. I think it is all right. Whatever grade the grain may be, if it is scoured, it shall be given that grade, but the word 'scoured' shall be attached to it, if it is No. 1 or No. 2. But, if it is No. 3, the word 'scoured' shall be attached, or may not be attached, at the discretion of the inspector. I think the provision is very carefully drawn and is all right.

Mr. HERRON. This Bill provides for a grade of 'Alberta red.' Has any representation been made regarding the weight in these classes No. 1 and No. 2 Alberta red? I have heard complaints of many farmers within the last two years. It is said that these grades were two pounds too high, which was a great disadvantage to the growers.

Mr. OLIVER. I have not heard any objections to this. Of course, my hon. friend will see there has been a regrading—Alberta red, Alberta white and Alberta mixed. So, the condition is considerably changed from what it was last year.

On section 18—grades of wheat.

Mr. HERRON. No. 1 Alberta red is to be 62 pounds to the bushel. It has been contended that this is two pounds to the bushel higher than it should be. But, as I have had no request to have this reduced, I let it go.

On section 19—grades of oats.

Mr. LAKE. Is the minister really satisfied that there is need for the large number of different grades here as well as power in the standard board to create more?

Mr. OLIVER. After I explained the proposition to place in the hands of the standard board the right to fix grades for oats, it was objected to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

MANITOBA GRAIN ACT AMENDMENT.

House in committee on Bill (No. 188) to amend the Manitoba Grain Act.—Mr. Oliver.

Mr. STAPLES. I was in hopes up to the present moment that there would be inserted in this Bill that very particular request of the Grain Growers' Association of the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. It appears that what they have long been earnestly seeking for has been entirely overlooked. I am not in a position to know what took place at the various conferences that have been held, and up to the present time that matter has not been discussed to any extent on the floor of the House. I refer to government operation of terminal elevators.

If there is anything that the Grain Growers' Association have endeavoured to get it is that. I regret very much that the government had not given that point more consideration and had not incorporated in this Bill a provision to take over the control of the terminal and transfer elevators. What have the Grain Growers' Association got out of this for all the trouble they have gone to? They have had conventions in Manitoba and Saskatchewan, and they have passed resolutions and these meetings have cost no small amount of money. They have also sent delegates down here. They sent them down to the first conference that was held with the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright). Then, in order that they might be able to secure the passage of this legislation, they sent their representatives down again, they are here at the present time and I regret very much that the government have not undertaken the operation of the terminal and transfer elevators. The government have gone pretty nearly the whole distance in so far as cost is concerned. This legislation will require the appointment of a sufficient number of officers, in my opinion, to operate the terminal and transfer elevators; so that the government might very easily have gone to the extent that the delegates of the Grain Growers' Association have been asking them to go. I think it is very important that I should call the attention of the committee to some of the resolutions that were passed at the conference of the Grain Growers' Association. I hold in my hand:

Extracts from minutes of meetings of conference of representatives from the Grain Growers' Associations of Manitoba and Saskatchewan, and the Farmers' Association of Alberta, held in Saskatoon, February 15 and 17, 1908.

Whereas the Royal Grain Commission, in a report to the Hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce, dated February 1, 1907, report that the tendency at Fort William and Port Arthur is for elevators to go under control of private companies, that the operating of terminal elevators by private companies under present regulations would be detrimental to the trade, and destroy public confidence in the result obtained therefrom;

Whereas the commission in their report laid on the table of the House of Commons, state that the private corporations operating terminals at Fort William are composed largely of the shareholders, officers and directors of grain firms and country line elevators in Winnipeg, and as such have a direct financial interest in much of the grain passing through Fort William;

Whereas the commission in their report recommended as a remedy the weighing, cleaning and binning grain in all terminal elevators under the supervision of officers appointed by the Dominion government; and

Whereas we are of the opinion that the remedy suggested by the commission is inadequate to meet the requirements of a terminal system of elevators and maintain the public confidence in the result obtained at such terminals; and

Whereas the Farmers' association of Alberta and the Grain Growers' Associations of Saskatchewan and Manitoba at their annual conventions each passed a resolution urging the Dominion government to acquire, own and operate the terminals at Fort William and Port Arthur;

Be it resolved that we endorse the findings of the S.G.G.A. and the M.G.G.A. and the A. F.A., as expressed in their respective annual conventions re urging the Dominion government to acquire, own and operate a complete system of storage terminal elevators, and further that each of the executives of the above associations appoint two delegates to form a joint delegation to wait on the Dominion government to present the views of the grain growers of the three prairie provinces.

Whereas there is danger that in the transfer of grain on the various routes from the lake terminals to the sea-board, that much of the advantage obtained by the government ownership and operation at the lakes will be lost unless the transfer elevators are also owned and operated by the Dominion government;

Be it resolved that the delegates to Ottawa be instructed to urge that these transfer elevators should also be owned and operated by the Dominion government.

What they desire the government to do is set out clearly there. The delegates that came down here, after listening to the evidence that was adduced by railway corporations, bankers, &c., sat down and made a digest of the discussion that took place

at that conference. They have sent to me, and, I presume, to all the members of the House, quite a lengthy synopsis of what they desire to have crystalized into legislation. Here is one of the principal recommendations they make:

The most important resolutions and the ones which induced the conference to the length of asking the several associations, to send delegates to Ottawa, were (1) the one urging the Dominion government to acquire (which may be by construction, purchase or lease without interfering with the essential future) and operate the terminals at Fort William and Port Arthur, (2) the resolution growing out of this asking that the Dominion government acquire and operate the transfer elevators and (3) another providing for the special binning of grain at the terminals in order that a satisfactory sample market might be developed in Winnipeg to the mutual benefit of the producer and miller.

The government undertakes to classify western wheat into grades according to certain specifications. The safeguarding of the producer of that grain as well as the millers of Ontario and Britain requires that the government surround that grain in transit with such protection as will insure its delivery at points of destination as inspected by the chief inspector.

There is a growing and well grounded conviction among growers of grain in the west that existing conditions at the terminals at Fort William and Port Arthur and the transfer elevators between these terminals and the Atlantic sea-board, afford opportunities for manipulation detrimental to the best interests of the country. This conviction is borne out by the report of the Royal Grain Association. On page 18 of the report the following statement appears; say there is a possibility of the elevator operators mixing grain contrary to the Grain Inspection Act—in some cases samples were produced to us that would lead us to believe that there had been either manipulation or serious mistakes made somewhere.

This shows that the existing conditions not only afford an opportunity for mixing grain contrary to this Act, but that mixing and adulteration actually does take place. Again on the same page we read: There is a very general complaint throughout Ontario that they do not get the regular grades of Manitoba grain of wheat especially in as clean a condition as is called for by the Inspection Act. We also found from examination of arrivals in Great Britain, that the grain as received there contains too great a percentage of foreign matter.

I think I have read sufficient to show the House that what the Grain Growers' Association really want is government operation. I shall not argue at present whether it is preferable to obtain that by construction or purchase but I do urge upon the government the necessity of getting the control and operation of those elevators by lease. They have gone to the distance of appointing officers to check the grain through the elevator system, and the government should have gone one step further and obtained control of the elevators and operated them. That was suggested on this side years ago and had the proposition of the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) received the attention it should we would by this time have worked out the system which the grain growers want. To show that members on this side in the last parliament called the attention of the government to the necessity of government ownership and operation of terminals, I shall read an extract from a speech made by the leader of the opposition. It will be found in the 'Hansard' of 1903, at page 12626. Mr. Borden at that time fully realized that in order to protect the identity of our wheat it would be necessary for the government to undertake a system of terminal and transfer elevators, not only for Fort William but clean through to the sea-board. Mr. Borden said, replying to the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux):

My hon. friend the Postmaster General grew merry over my proposal to equip the Georgian bay, the St. Lawrence, and maritime ports. At page 9777 of 'Hansard' he actually derides this proposal, and in effect declares—and I think the attention of the country should be called to it—that it is no part of the policy of the government of this country to spend one single dollar upon the Georgian bay ports, or upon the St. Lawrence, or Atlantic ports. I say that after having examined the language of the Postmaster General, and I will show to the House and to the country how I gather that distinct enunciation of policy from the language of the hon. gentleman. The hon. Postmaster General is making a fair comparison—he has stated that over and over again—between my proposal and the proposal of the government. He calls attention, at page 9778 of 'Hansard' to the fact that the debt of the harbour of the city of Quebec amounts to $5,803,538, and he calls attention to the fact that the debt of the harbour of the city of Montreal amounts to $8,054,156. He does not go into the cost of the equipment of other ports, he does not give the figures in regard to them, because he has not the figures before him, but he takes the figures which he has, and he deliberately adds them to the cost of my proposal, and adds not one single dollar to the cost of the government proposal. He is either making an unfair comparison, and I cannot charge him with that, or else it is not the policy of the government to spend one dollar on the equipment and development of the Georgian bay ports, the St. Lawrence or the Atlantic ports. If there is any answer to that, I would like to know what it is. We have a member of the government, put up by the government to criticise the financial part of my proposal, deliberately adding $5,803,538, the debt of the harbour of the city of Quebec, and $8,054,156, the debt of the harbour of the city of Montreal, to the cost of my proposal, and not one dollar for any of these works does he add to the proposal of the government. Is it not an accurate and necessary deduction from that to say that not one dollar does the government propose to expend on the development of the Georgian bay ports, the St. Lawrence or the Atlantic ports? Either that is the policy of the government or

else the hon. Postmaster General has made a deliberately unfair comparison. I leave the hon. gentleman and the right hon. leader of the House to say which of these alternatives he desires to accept.

After some cross-firing between himself and the then member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) the leader of the opposition said :

My hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) has perhaps misunderstood me a little. I do not think my information went so far as to say that there are state-owned elevators, but my understanding is the state takes such control over them that the certificates issued for grain deposited in these elevators bear upon them the stamp of the state, that farmers receiving these certificates can look to the whole credit of the state to see that they are paid and that, in fact, they are practically regarded as negotiable instruments by the farmers of the west. I would defer to the superior knowledge of my hon. friend from Selkirk in regard to that, but I am informed by people who profess to be conversant with the facts that such a condition exists in some of the western states.

If we had had such legislation as the leader of the opposition then proposed it would have been most beneficial in the west last fall. It will be remembered that last fall we had difficulty in financing on our wheat. When the wheat was loaded on cars we could not get the banks to advance money on it, but if we had the government of the country behind us, there would be no difficulty in financing on a bill of lading. Mr. Borden continued :

I would not suppose that it was a very radical thing after all to suggest that the government should consider the economic saving in providing elevators or warehouses at a minimum cost, instead of having farmers themselves provide them at a minimum cost. I think perhaps my hon. friend from Selkirk will agree with me in that view although he may have some modifications to suggest. For example, if it should cost a cent a bushel to warehouse grain for a certain period of time, and if by such assistance as the government could give to the farmers of the west that grain could be stored for a quarter of a cent a bushel during the same period of time, surely a suggestion of that kind is not so utterly absurd that the government should not take it into consideration. That was all I asked. I did not put this forward as a proposal. I put it forward as something which I thought the government should consider. I adhere absolutely to that opinion, notwithstanding the sneer of the hon. Postmaster General, and I think it is a suggestion which the government will have to take into consideration in the not very distant future.

I was very much pleased indeed in looking up information on this important question of government operation of terminal elevators to discover that the leader of the opposition five years ago had this in mind and was anxious that the government should have worked out the legislation which the grain growers of Saskatchewan and Alberta are asking now. He even went further than that and incorporated that proposal in a resolution which was voted down by the government supporters. It was incorporated in a resolution of some length. I will not read the whole resolution, but only the portion that refers to this particular matter :

Perfecting a system of elevator warehouses, and creating free terminal facilities, and securing absolute and thorough control of rates in consideration for assistance thus given.

I am very sorry that when this question has been discussed in a great many conferences in the room of the Minister of the Interior we on this side of the House had not an opportunity to go there and try to induce the government to take over and operate the terminal elevators at Fort William, as well as the transfer elevators farther east. To my mind, the best way to do it would be to lease them as an experiment for ten years. I understand that the constitutional rule prevents us on this side of the House from moving an amendment or I certainly would even now move an amendment and divide the House upon it. But that is a privilege that we on this side of the House do not possess.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I am very much in sympathy with what has been said by the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Staples). Anyone who has resided in the west during the last twenty years can come to no other conclusion than that a very grave suspicion has arisen between the producer and the grain dealer. I am not going to say that there have not been good reasons for this suspicion, but it certainly does exist. There is a feeling that the producer is not getting his fair share of the profit, that too much of it goes to the dealer. To my mind, that arises very largely from the grading of wheat, and it is a feeling that is not peculiar to Canada alone. The same condition of affairs exists very largely in the western states. I find that some bankers in the western states took this matter up in connection with the terminal elevators at Duluth, and I think it is only reasonable to believe that a very similar condition exists at Port Arthur and Fort William. One of the great difficulties there is that most of the elevators are owned or controlled by private dealers. The same dealers who control these elevators also own or control what we call the line elevators. That gives them a great advantage in connection with the transfer of wheat. This question of line elevators has to be met sooner or later, and the resolution which the hon. member for Macdonald has read shows that the grain growers of the west have but one opinion on the matter. They want the miller in the east or the British market to get the wheat, and the same grade of wheat, that the farmer gets his pay for. I have

here a statement signed by five of the leading bankers of Minnesota and Dakota, and if I spent two hours in talking I could not say more clearly what I believe than it is expressed in this statement. My opinion is that that condition of affairs has existed in Port Arthur and Fort William for many years, and the producers of wheat have been great losers in consequence. These bankers report the quantities of the different grades of wheat that were shipped into the elevators at Duluth and the quantities shipped out. Of No. 1 Northern 99,000 bushels were received, while 196,000 bushels were shipped out; of No. 2 Northern 141,000 bushels were received, while 464,000 bushels were shipped out; of No. 3, 272,000 bushels were received and 213,000 were shipped out. There were also received of No. 4 201,000 bushels, of no grade 116,000 bushels and of rejected 59,000 bushels. I have stated all the grades that were shipped out. Of No. 4, no grade and rejected, none were shipped out at all. This shows the very thing that our farmers in the west are suspicious of—that their wheat goes into the elevator at a certain grade and comes out at a different grade. Until the government, who represent the farmers, get control of these terminal elevators, the farmer will never be able to get his share of the profit of producing wheat. That report of the bankers of Minnesota and Dakota should have great influence with this government in inducing them to control in some way these terminal elevators.

Mr. LAKE. It is now more than a quarter past two in the morning, and I can only express regret that this most important measure to the Northwest has been delayed to the very last days of the session and to such a late hour of the night; but I do wish to add a word or two to what has been said by my colleagues on this side of the House in favour of the proposal of the grain growers that the government should operate the terminal and transfer elevators. The grain growers who had this proposition very much at heart sent down here a delegation to discuss the question. Certain evidence was given during the discussion which took place in the office of the Minister of Trade and Commerce and certain points came out there which it is important to call attention to. The proposal is of course that, as the government undertakes to classify and grade this wheat and give it a certificate, it should see that the grain is kept in its purity from the point of production until it reaches its ultimate market. The government proposes to have a very large staff of inspectors to take care of this grain and have absolute control over it from the time it goes into the elevators until it reaches the market. That will mean practically doubling the number of persons at work in those elevators. There will have to be as many inspectors as operators, and the expense on the grain will be practically doubled. I doubt very much whether the control will be effective. And I doubt very much whether it will be workable to have two sets of men with joint control. That will be sure to result in friction. All this extra cost must be borne by the producer. It would be very much better to have the one set of officials operate under the government itself in the capacity of government employees. In that case you could do with many less officials. Government operation need not be costly. Evidence was given before a committee of this House a couple of years ago to show that the western inspection department was more than self-supporting already. The prices which the producer now has to pay for the operation of the elevators, as well as for an efficient inspection, would much more than meet all the expenses of government operation.

As regards the private elevators, a gentleman representing the Winnipeg Grain Exchange and who in that capacity also represented the owners of the privately-owned terminal elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur gave evidence at the conference which was held before the Minister of Trade and Commerce. His evidence was to the effect that he believed there would be no objection on the part of the owners to the government taking over the elevators and operating them. The Canadian Northern Railway has already sold out their terminal elevators and the Canadian Pacific Railway would no doubt also be willing enough to do so. There is no reason why they should object to government operation, provided that operation was as efficient as their own, and I have no doubt it would be. We ought also to have the transfer elevators under government operation in this country. This evening we provided for wages of officials to operate the government elevators at Port Colborne. There are also government elevators at Montreal, Halifax and St. John. The proposal to have elevators operated by the government is not a new one, as my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Staples) has pointed out. If, as he suggested, it would be in order for a private member to move a resolution involving the expenditure of public money, a resolution would be moved from this side to the effect that the government should take over the operation of our terminal and transfer elevators. Such a resolution would be ruled out, and therefore we have to content ourselves with stating our views and regretting that the government has not seen fit to meet the wishes of the grain growers.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). I simply desire to add my voice to that of my hon. colleague in expressing my regret that the very reasonable request of the grain

growers of the west has not been complied with, as regards the government operation of terminal elevators. I have had numerous opportunities of meeting deputations of grain growers associations in my constituency, and I do not think there is anything in connection with the carrying, inspection and handling of grain that they urged with greater force than this question of the government operation of terminal elevators, and that of car distribution, and I am glad the distribution is not going to be unfair but must express my regret that the government have not acceded to the desire of the grain growers by taking, as an experiment, a lease of the present elevators and operating them as a government enterprise. This would establish the confidence of our farmers in the system of inspecting and the handling of grain, which they have not today. Whether warranted or not, there is a deep rooted conviction that there is mixing going on and grading to their disadvantage in the private elevators. To restore the confidence of the farmers is to have the handling of their grain under a system of government operation.

Mr. HERRON. I want to say that I acquiesce in the statement made by the hon. members from the western provinces, and had there been an opportunity to vote from the opposition side of this House, I would certainly cast my vote in favour of government ownership and operation of the terminal elevators. Where I live the people have been looking forward to having that put in this Bill, and they will be disappointed to find it is not there.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 183) to amend the Canada Shipping Act.—Mr. Brodeur.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

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

Mr. FIELDING. Railway subsidies and resolutions concerning the guarantee in aid of railways.

Mr. TAYLOR. What about the Election Act?

Mr. FIELDING. I presume it will come up later, if the railway subsidies are disposed of early.

Motion agreed to, House adjourned at 2.30 a.m., Thursday.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, July 16, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. HONORE GERVAIS (St. James, Montreal). I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Taylor :

That the second report of the Select Standing Committee on the Debates of the House be amended by striking out the words 'the first of April, 1906' and substituting therefor the words '28th November, 1907'; and that the said report as amended be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

THE RESTAURANT.

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

That a committee of this House consisting of the Speaker, the Deputy Speaker and Mr. Barker be appointed to confer with a committee from the Senate on the question of a joint restaurant for the two Houses.

Mr. BERGERON. I am glad my hon. friend has made this motion because this question has been talked off for a number of years and nothing has ever been done, notwithstanding that the administration of the restaurant has always been very defective. When Mr. Hyman was Minister of Public Works he spoke of using part of the new wing as a restaurant and I should like to know if that is the intention.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The plans for the new wing have no doubt been prepared with the idea that the large room in the upper portion of the building should be utilized for the restaurant and with the convenience of the elevator which is to be installed it would be admirably adapted for that purpose. Those of us who have been giving attention to the matter thought it would be very desirable if the Senate would concur with the House of Commons in arranging for a joint restaurant. This committee will confer with a committee of the Senate with a view of endeavouring to come to an understanding which would be mutually agreeable.

Motion agreed to.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 211) to amend an Act of the present session intituled 'An Act respecting the Dominion Guarantee Company, Limited.'—Mr. Pringle.

QUESTIONS.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—GROSS EARNINGS.

Mr. FOWLER asked:

1. What is the amount of the gross earnings of the Intercolonial Railway for June, 1908, and for the three months, April to June, inclusive.
2. What are the working expenses for the two months of April and May, 1908, respectively?
3. What were the earnings and working expenses, respectively, for April, May and June, 1907?

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). Stand.

Mr. FOWLER. You will answer it before the House closes?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

H. A. QUILTY.

Mr. FOWLER asked:

1. Has H. A. Quilty passed the examination for train despatcher on the Intercolonial Railway? If so, how many times has he passed such examination?
2. In promotion in the service, has the said Quilty been passed over? If so, for what reason?
3. What position does Mr. Quilty now occupy in the service, and when was he appointed to his present position?

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

1. Yes, Mr. Quilty was up for examination for train despatcher, in January, 1902; but he did not pass. He passed an examination successfully on April 7, 1907.
2. No.
3. Despatchers' operator and relieving despatcher at Newcastle appointed April 7, 1907.

INTERCOLONIAL CONFERENCE AT LONDON.

Mr. BERGERON asked:

1. What was the amount of money voted by parliament to defray the expenses of Canadian ministers attending the intercolonial conference at London in 1907?
2. How many ministers from Canada attended that conference officially?
3. Was the whole amount so voted expended, and how much did each minister receive?
4. Was any other official mission accomplished? If so, who was the minister, and how much did he or they each receive for such services?

Mr. FIELDING. Stand.

Mr. BERGERON. How long will it have to stand; the time is getting short?

Mr. FIELDING. I think the question has already been answered and is on 'Hansard.'

Mr. BERGERON. I have not been able to find it.

Mr. FIELDING. I will undertake to see that my hon. friend gets it before the session closes.

Mr. SPEAKER. Dropped.

TRANSCONTINENTAL COMMISSION—SALARIES, &c.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

1. What have been the totals for each year of the expenses of the Transcontinental Commission for salaries, rents, travel, and contingencies, including everything not going into construction?
2. Are these expenses charged up to construction account against the Grand Trunk Pacific eastern division?

Mr. GRAHAM. Stand.

Mr. FOSTER. I am very anxious to get this information.

Mr. FIELDING. I think this is the first time it has been on the Order Paper.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, but the first time comes very near being the last time.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will see about it to-day; this is the first time I have heard it.

BOUNTIES PAID BY GOVERNMENT.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN asked:

1. What is the estimated amount of bounty payable by the government for the year ending March 31, 1909, on the following products or articles: (a) petroleum, (b) iron, (c) steel, (d) lead, (e) binder twine, (f) other articles upon which bounty is paid?
2. What is the actual amount paid on each of the above items for the year ending March 31, 1908?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance.) The Minister of Trade and Commerce has given me the following answer:

1.	(a) Petroleum	$ 400,000
	(b) Iron	825,000
	(c) Steel	1,000,000
	(d) Lead	250,000
	(e) Manilla fibre, used in the manufacture of binder twine and cordage	50,000
	(f) Wire rods	350,000
2.	(a) Petroleum	$ 391,217 09
	(b) Iron	863,816 75
	(c) Steel	1,092,200 71
	(d) Lead	51,001 00
	(e) Manilla fibre	41,983 77
	(f) Wire rods	347,134 89

SALE OF ORDNANCE PROPERTY.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House do to-morrow go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolutions:

1. Resolved, that it is expedient to confirm the following orders in council that is to say:

(a) An order in council, dated the sixteenth day of May, 1904, authorizing the sale to the corporation of the city of Toronto of certain ordnance property in that city, consisting of the whole of the military property lying between and including the old fort and the exhibition;

(b) An order in council, dated the sixth day of December, 1905, authorizing the sale to the city of Montreal of the ordnance property in the St. Lawrence river, opposite to the said city, known as St. Helen's island; and

(c) An order in council, dated the twenty-seventh day of July, 1907, authorizing the conveyance to the city of Montreal of a portion of the ordnance property in that city known as Lafontaine park, and to authorize the sale and disposal of the said ordnance property in the manner and subject to the conditions by the said orders in council, respectively, provided and subject to such further and other conditions as may be imposed by His Majesty and accepted by the corporation of the city of Toronto and by the city of Montreal, as the case may be.

2. Resolved, that the purchase moneys received from the corporations of the city of Toronto and the city of Montreal for the said ordnance properties may be used and applied, and are hereby appropriated to and for the purposes, of the purchase of sites and construction of buildings thereon for military schools of instruction in connection with the permanent force in those cities, respectively —Sir Frederick Borden.

He said: I may say that His Excellency the Governor General has been made acquainted with the subject matter of these resolutions and recommends them to the consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC AND THE QUEBEC BRIDGE.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Before the orders of the day are called I would ask the Minister of Railways or the Minister of Finance for information as to whether there is any agreement by which the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway is to take over the Quebec bridge at a rental, or on payment of interest on cost, or anything of that kind?

Mr. FIELDING. No. There is no such agreement concerning the Quebec bridge. It comes up incidentally, to what extent may be debatable, under the general contract.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the Minister of Railways if he has made any progress in finding out how much the Transcontinental Commission know and are willing to give us of what has transpired from March 31, 1907, to March 31, 1908, as the report of the commission does not come down beyond 1907?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have given to the House at different times in answer to questions and during the debate the other day, all the information I have received from the commission covering what took place up to March 31, 1908.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to give notice to my hon. friend that when we meet again, if these commissioners do not bring up their information to a later date, we will have to move to strike out their salaries.

Mr. GRAHAM. Their report is up to the end of the fiscal year the same as any other report.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, and that is sixteen months ago.

EMBARGO ON CATTLE.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the orders of the day are called I would like to ask the government whether their attention has been directed to a cable despatch setting forth a very important statement by the Prime Minister of Great Britain. It appears that in answer to a deputation which waited upon members of the British government to advocate the removal of the cattle embargo, the Prime Minister expressed himself in a very sympathetic way and stated that if he were convinced that live cattle could be admitted safely he would be in favour of abolishing the embargo. He also stated that if after consulting his colleagues he found any good purpose could be served by holding the inquiry requested he would grant it. Having regard to this very important statement respecting a matter that has often engaged the attention of the House and of the government I would like to know whether it is the intention to open up communications with the British government for the purpose of demonstrating—as I believe we can demonstrate—the absolute safety of the admission into Great Britain of live cattle from Canada. Is it the intention of the administration to open communications with the British government for the purpose of undertaking to demonstrate, as I believe they can, the absolute safety of admission into Great Britain of live cattle from Canada?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not believe that anything could be done which has not been done long ago. When Sir Charles Tupper was High Commissioner for Canada, we demonstrated that there was absolutely no danger in admitting Canadian cattle and that our Canadian cattle were absolutely free from infectious disease. We do not admit that there is anything of that character existing in Canadian cattle and simply stand on the ground we have always maintained. So far as I know the difficulty does not lie in that direction; but if the Prime Minister of England expressed himself in that way, we shall take note of what he said and if anything can be done, it will be.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the report in the 'Free Press' is accurate, his statement

seems to point to a new condition and call for further action.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT—AMENDMENT.

Mr. AYLESWORTH moved the third reading of Bill (No. 115) to amend the Dominion Elections Act.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). Before the third reading I wish to make a few remarks to remove the impression that seems to have gained currency in connection with the making of the new lists in the province of Ontario. We are told over and over again that these are to be judicial lists, made by judges. To my mind that is absolutely absurd. The judges are not going to make the lists in New Ontario any more than they make them in the older parts of the province. The judges are the final court of appeal and that is practically all that they will be in New Ontario with the exception of the fact that the enumerators, who are to form the lists in the first instance, are to be named by the judges. Beyond the fact that the enumerators are appointed by the judges instead of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, the judges themselves have nothing whatever to do with the making up of the lists. I was very much surprised to find the right hon. the First Minister take exception to the making up of these lists by enumerators appointed by the Lieutenant Governor and yet be willing that they should be made by enumerators appointed by judges. Both the Lieutenant Governor and the judges are the appointees of this government. Wherein then lies the difference which makes the one preferable to the other? Should we not have just as much confidence in the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario, the chief magistrate of that province, the highest official in it? Are you going to say that we have no confidence in that gentleman but we have confidence in the judges? To my mind the judges occupy a secondary position compared with that of the Lieutenant Governor. My desire is to dissipate the idea that these are to be judicial lists. That is entirely erroneous. The judges practically will have no more to do with the making of the lists than I will, until the lists go to a court of appeal, and possibly only in a few districts will there be an appeal. So that all that the judges will have to do as regards the making of the lists in the new districts of Ontario will be comparatively trifling, and I do not want the idea to go abroad that these lists will be purely and simply judicial lists made by the judiciary. Of course we are told that the judges are all angels without politics. If they are, I have not discovered any. I generally find that the judges have politics in Ontario as well as other people. I do not say that they exhibit any political feeling offensively, but no man can get rid of the idea that he was once a Liberal or a Tory, and there can be no doubt that in appointing these enumerators the judges will have to appoint Grits or Tories. Whom they will appoint I do not know. Where they will get their recommendation I can conceive. I do not suppose that the judges know who are the best men to appoint as enumerators, and they must get their information from some source. What that source will be, I can only surmise. No doubt there will be plenty willing to offer advice, perhaps unsolicited, and the judges will no doubt be aided materially. I do not say that they will be improperly influenced, but the enumerators must be Grits or Tories. They certainly will not be judges who will make up the lists in the first instance. All the judges will have to do will be to decide whether a man should be stricken off the list or added when there is an appeal. Let us get rid of the idea that these will be Heaven-born lists made by angels in the shape of judges and that nothing can be wrong about them. If that be the character of the lists, they will be extraordinary lists—a little more so than those in the older Ontario. I can see nothing in this Bill which will give the people greater confidence than they have in the Ontario law under which the Lieutenant Governor appoints the enumerator.

Mr. A. C. BOYCE (West Algoma). I do not think any good purpose can be served in my doing more than reiterate my protest against section 1 of this Bill. The attitude of the government is wholly inconsistent with its professions and absolutely irreconcilable with the circumstances in that northern country. I move in amendment:

That this Bill be not now read the third time but be referred back to the Committee of the Whole House for the purpose of amending the said Bill, especially section 1 thereof, so as to provide that the provincial voters' lists in the province of Ontario, whether in organized or unorganized districts, shall be regarded as of equal force and validity for the purpose of the federal election as those of other provinces, and so as to avoid any discrimination against the province of Ontario in that regard.

Mr. A. E. KEMP (East Toronto). My only object in rising is to place on record what the position of the present administration was in 1898 and show clearly where this government stood on the question now before the House and as embodied in the amendment. I desire to read two short extracts from the speech of the Prime Minister in 1898. The first is from 'Hansard,' page 4015:

But I would not have hesitated to accept the franchise provided by a Conservative legislature in Quebec, because, though there were many things in that franchise, on the whole, to which I would have objected, still as it satisfied the province it would have satisfied me. It is in the same way as regards other

provinces. It is possible that the control of the several provinces may pass into the hands of the Conservative party; still on a question of this kind I am quite disposed, for my part, to accept the franchise prepared by the legislature, whether Liberal or Conservative.

Then, the right hon. gentleman went a little further than that. Some hon. member, speaking on this question a few days ago—I am not sure that it was not the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson)—said that the position of his party at that time was based upon the fact that the lists were to be municipal lists. But here is what the Prime Minister said in 1898 as reported at page 4312 of 'Hansard':

We do not submit such a proposition; we do not want the lists prepared by our appointees. We are satisfied to have them prepared by either the provincial or the municipal authorities.

Of course, it is in order for the present administration to be inconsistent—they can be inconsistent if they desire. I am not now referring to what took place before the Liberal party came into power, but what took place in 1898 when they decided to accept the provincial lists as the basis of the franchise; and in this second quotation which I have given, it is clear that the intention was to accept the lists of the provinces whether municipal lists or otherwise. I have risen only to make these quotations and to protest once more against the action of the government in discriminating against the province of Ontario. I repeat what I said: I believe that the province of Ontario is as competent to make voters' lists as any other province in the Dominion. If we are to accept provincial lists for Dominion elections, let us not discriminate against Ontario; if this government, or any other government, wishes to make Dominion lists let it apply the same rule to all the provinces of the Dominion.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). It would be sufficient to observe to my hon. friend that in this legislation there is not intended to be, nor is there, any discrimination against the province of Ontario. The amendment put is rather insidious. Let it be remembered that the Bill refers only to the unorganized portion of the province of Ontario. I have stated before that there is good and valid reason why this was done. There is no proposal whatever in the Bill which is now before us for its third reading to attempt anything with regard to the Ontario lists prepared for the organized portions of the provinces. But the provisions of the Act now in force in Ontario for the revision of the lists in the unorganized districts lays this parliament altogether at the mercy of the provincial authorities. It is provided, under the law passed in 1907 and now in force, that the Lieutenant Governor in Council may pass orders whenever it suits their purpose to prevent registration taking place in the unorganized portions of the province. They can prevent the revision of the lists this year, or next year, or the following years. In fact, at the present time, there is a proclamation by the provincial government to prevent the revision of the lists in the unorganized portions of the province. Then, what will take place? That will take place which has taken place in the past—that is, there will be no revision of the lists for two or three years. In the province of Ontario, in 1904, no provincial lists were provided except those of four years before. We had to make our own lists, and we had to do it in a hurry, giving no satisfaction to the people at large, as has been shown by the facts brought out in the debate on this Bill. Therefore, it is far preferable that we should have power to make our own lists as the Bill provides. And this is represented as an attempt against the province of Ontario. I was more than surprised when I heard my hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Bristol) telling me here across the floor that I should be the last man to invade the privileges and rights of Ontario. I cannot see why I should be selected in this way or what was the insinuation or innuendo of the hon. gentleman in making such a charge against me. There is no such intention. The attempt is made here to create the impression that we are invading the rights of the province of Ontario. My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) went so far as to say that the changes would be rung on this theme in every town, in every village, in every township in Ontario. I know the province of Ontario, I think, as well as if I had been born in that province. In this matter I know I can rely on the good sense of the province of Ontario against this cry. The people of that province know that when their rights are invaded they can defend those rights; they are not to be gulled in this way when there is no attempt against them.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton). I think the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will find that the people of Ontario are not to be 'gulled,' to use his own words, by any such statement as that which he has made. It is idle for the Prime Minister to say that there is no discrimination against Ontario, because this Bill which it is proposed to put on the statute-book shows precisely the reverse. On what is this discrimination against the province of Ontario based? Is it based upon the idle statements, unsupported by any evidence, recently made in this House and relating to only two of the six ridings of northern Ontario? Is it based on that, or is it based on something else? These hon. gentlemen do not seem to know. I now put the question squarely to them across the floor, and not one of them knows how to answer. And no wonder, for, as a matter of fact, this

legislation is being placed upon the statute-book, upon the demand, the imperative demand, of two of their partisans in this House, and for no other reason. The Prime Minister declares there is no discrimination! Are there not lists made in other provinces in Canada by enumerators and revised by judges? And are not these left as good and valid lists for federal purposes without any interference by this parliament? On what ground is this legislation affecting the unorganized districts of Ontario based? Is it based upon the fact that the lists in those portions of Ontario are not municipal lists? There are lists that are not municipal in British Columbia, in Manitoba, in some parts of Quebec, if I am not mistaken, and in Prince Edward Island. None of these are interfered with. But in the unorganized parts of northern Ontario, where lists of precisely the same character are made up and revised by judges, these are selected by the government for the purpose of special treatment and discrimination. There is no doubt about it. The pages of the statute-book, when this Act goes into effect, will demonstrate what I say.

The Prime Minister resorted to another argument which is quite as fallacious as the one to which I have just alluded. He says that the Ontario government can prevent the lists from being made up, and therefore it is necessary for this parliament to interfere by legislation. He is apparently, when he makes that argument, either ignorant or forgetful of the provision of his own statute, because section 7 of the Dominion Elections Act as it at present exists, makes provision for that very contingency. It is not necessary to read it again, it has been read over and over again. I challenge contradiction by the Prime Minister, or any other gentleman on that side of the House. Section 7 of the Dominion Elections Act makes provision already for that very contingency which the Prime Minister puts forward as the reason for this enactment. Hon. gentlemen opposite will not challenge that assertion because they cannot. Any challenge of that kind would be followed by the reading of the section which makes that special provision. Therefore, so far as that argument is concerned, it falls to the ground.

There is therefore no other alternative for the people of this country to accept than the one which is set forth in this resolution, namely, that by the legislation now before parliament, and which this government by its majority intends to drive through, special discriminatory provision is made in respect of six northern ridings, and that is done without a shadow of pretense or excuse except the hearsay statement put forward in this House by two hon. gentlemen sitting on the government side. It is not necessary to repeat this, it has been made abundantly plain to the people of this country. I venture to think that if no better excuse for that can be put forward than that which has been urged by the Prime Minister, the people of Ontario will not be likely to regard this provision in that kindly light which has been predicted by my right hon. friend.

Mr. E. BRISTOL (Centre Toronto). The right hon. gentleman says that there is no discrimination in this legislation against the province of Ontario. I venture to think that not only is there discrimination against the province of Ontario in this legislation, because legislation already exists which provides for making the lists by the federal government if the lists are more than a year old in Ontario and throughout Canada, but discrimination is obvious from the fact that all these alleged reasons which are advanced by every one else than the Prime Minister, came into existence after this legislation had been planned and brought down to the House. That seems to be overlooked by the Prime Minister. In that legislation at first, Ontario and Quebec were coupled so far as the unorganized districts were concerned. But now Quebec is left out and Ontario is left in. I want to say to the Prime Minister that he has discriminated against the province of Ontario in another way, a way which is contrary to the courtesy which he has always shown to gentlemen on either side of politics, or anywhere else, and that is in the fact that he was not above communicating with the premier of Manitoba and the Manitoba government in reference to the lists of Manitoba, when a strong protest was put up in this House. But did he communicate with the premier of Ontario, or the Attorney General of Ontario in reference to this legislation or these complaints? Not a solitary communication of any kind. I have been informed by the Department of the Attorney General of Ontario that there were not three persons affected by all these alleged complaints that have been made in this House. So I wish to reiterate that I think it would have been in accord with decency and harmony if the Prime Minister or the Minister of Justice, instead of allowing his supporters on almost the last day of parliament to make these unsupported statements before this House, had courteously communicated this complaint to the Attorney General of Ontario and asked to have new lists framed, as there is power to frame them, if there was anything in these complaints, on or before the 1st of July. But no complaints have been made to the Attorney General of Ontario and the usual proclamation has been issued stating that it is unnecessary to go to the expense of having another revision two months later in these northern districts, and now special legislation against the province of Ontario is being enacted. It would have been a simple matter to place

these alleged facts before the Department of Justice of that province and have an investigation, and if there was found to be anything wrong, I am satisfied that there is not a man in this country who does not believe that the Ontario government would have done justice to the hon. member for Rainy River or any other member.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In addition to that, the Prime Minister of Ontario and the Attorney General of Ontario offered to have new lists made up under the provincial laws in any ridings where any serious irregularities were shown. They were prepared to do that, and that was well known.

Mr. BRISTOL. So, Sir, I think the animus of the right hon. gentleman and his government is shown by one passage in his speech where he said that he did not propose to leave this House to the mercy of the provincial government of Ontario. I was astonished that he should use language of that character in reference to a matter of this kind, if he was desirous of showing that he was not discriminating against Ontario. I leave it to this House and to the people to say whether the right hon. gentleman is not discriminating against Ontario, both as regards this legislation, and as regards the ordinary business treatment and courtesy that one government should show to another.

Mr. JAMES CONMEE (Rainy River). I have stated on a former occasion, and I repeat it now, that there is no attack whatever upon the government or the province of Ontario with reference to provincial lists. I cannot for the life of me find by what process of reasoning hon. gentlemen opposite can persuade themselves that there is anything in this Bill that reflects upon the province or the government of Ontario. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. Bristol) stated further that the reason that the proclamation was issued, if I understood him correctly, cutting out the preparation of the new lists, was because no complaint was made against the lists. The hon. gentleman is aware that during the recent provincial election the Liberal press in the ridings were full of complaints, and these complaints led to official proceedings. I read to the House a few days ago the evidence given at a trial that took place in the district of Thunder Bay, and I sent that report to the leader of the opposition. I was surprised to hear that hon. gentleman say to-day that no evidence had been given to this House, nothing but mere assertion, but no positive evidence of a sufficient character that there was anything wrong with the lists.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN The statement which the hon. member submitted to me was merely a report from his own solicitor.

Mr. CONMEE. That is correct. My honoured friend believes a lot of things on testimony. I suppose he believes that there is such a place as the city of Jerusalem. But did he ever see it? What evidence has he that there is such a city? He believes it on testimony. I submit there is ample testimony as to the wrong preparation of these lists, showing that they were of a partisan character. That fraud was committed upon the opposite political party is amply established by testimony. We have not had a committee. We have not had men here to examine them. If my hon. friend wishes to take advantage of a legal technicality of that kind, well that is a lawyer's privilege. It is only a quibble though. The fact that there has been testimony cannot be denied, my hon. friend can treat it in any way he pleases, but I make the statement knowing that it is correct that the result of this investigation is that Mr. Cummings' lists have got to go through the procedure that the law requires. Under the ruling made by the judge, before whom the case was heard, Mr. Cummings has been informed that he must post up his entire list, not subdivisions of it, that he must give notice in the public press as the statute provides, that the fifteen days must now run and that he must make the affidavit that he has done this before the judge can give a certificate.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If it is the case that the matter is being dealt with by the judge under the provincial laws, and if the laws are thus being remedied, why should this parliament interfere?

Mr. CONMEE. I am very glad that my hon. friend asked me that question, because that is the serious part of the whole situation. I made a statement with regard to Mr. Cummings' list. I am told that the same condition exists with regard to Mr. Hogarth's list. Mr. Hogarth never published any notice, never posted up a completed list, never gave the people notice that it was posted up and never made the affidavit that the law requires him to make in order to obtain the certificate that the statute calls for. My hon. friend says that this shows that you have a legal procedure by which he can deal with these lists. That is only so as to two divisions. What about the twenty or thirty other divisions in which legal proceedings have not been taken in time to bring out these facts? The door is closed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman why the same proceedings were not taken to invoke the powers of the judge under the law, and if it is to be expected that this parliament will interfere whenever people do not see fit to avail themselves of the remedies which are at their disposal?

Mr. CONMEE. Why should it be necessary? Why should the voter be put to the

expense of forcing law suits, and expensive litigation, against the province to get his rights? That would be a sufficient answer, but the answer has already been given. The law was changed, the people did not understand the amendment by which the time was cut down to fifteen days. This amendment was passed at the last moment, in the closing hours of the legislature; it was not an amendment to the Voters' List Act or to the Election Act, but it was an amendment to the Statutory Land Amendment Act. I couud not get it. I could not find a lawyer in Port Arthur or Fort William who had it, who knew anything about it, or who could give me any advice with regard to it. Under these circumstances, I am surprised indeed that the hon. leader of the opposition or hon. gentlemen opposite do not consider that such legislation as that now before the House is necessary. Is it that they desire to obtain a partisan advantage? What are the conditions which call for this legislation? As to the reason for the legislation, my hon. friend said that the Dominion statute provides machinery for preparing lists even if the province of Ontario did not prepare lists. That is not an answer to the argument that this legislation is necessary, because it is admitted that the machinery has proved defective. Hon. gentlemen opposite complain against it. The hon. gentleman behind him (Mr. Boyce), on several occasions, has declaimed loudly against it. I would like to know now if my hon. friend is prepared to say that he will be satisfied with the existing law.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is perfectly obvious that the proper thing to do in that case is not to make a discrimination against the province of Ontario, but to amend section 7 in the way my hon. friend suggests.

Mr. CONMEE. My hon. friend will see that the province of Ontario is the only province in which the lists were ever prepared under the Dominion law, and under those circumstances where is there a discrimination against Ontario? When the lists were prepared in 1894 nobody ever thought of such actions being a discrimination against Ontario because they were prepared there and nowhere else. The reason is that the conditions existing in Ontario do not exist elsewhere. In the province of Quebec it is not the legislature that prepares the lists, but the counties. In Prince Edward Island, I am told, they have no lists at all, that a man simply gets a ballot and votes. In the Northwest there are different conditions. Ontario presents the only conditions with which we are compelled to deal, and now that we are dealing with them I cannot see that there is any justification for the assertion that we are discriminating against or offending Ontario. Why should the Ontario government be offended?

Mr. LANCASTER. Because you introduced the Bill before these reasons existed.

Mr. CONMEE. Not at all. That is only in the mind of the hon. gentleman. It has been introduced upon sound principles. But hon. gentlemen say that the Ontario government will be offended. I would like to know upon what ground? Has the Ontario government gone into politics to assist gentlemen opposite by preparing stuffed, fraudulent or illegal lists for the purpose of dictating to this House who its members shall be? I do not believe it. I do not think that the Ontario government would hold for a moment that it is their business to interfere with the rights of this parliament. Provincial rights exist, but the question of provincial rights in this House only arises where the undoubted privileges and rights of the legislature are invaded. I would like to know how it is invaded by this Bill. It is within the competency of this parliament to pass this Bill, and there is no question of provincial rights involved in it.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). Mr. Speaker, this matter has been so largely discussed on the motion for the second reading and in committee that I have very little to say, but I wish to make a few remarks by way of answer to some of the objections that have been urged to this proposed change in the law. I think that an important consideration is to remember what the existing law is, to compare the proposed change with the existing law and to judge by that comparison whether or not there is an improvement in what is now proposed, and whether or not, therefore, what is now proposed ought to be accepted. Under the existing law the lists for the unorganized portion of the province of Ontario will be prepared anew in accordance with the provisions of the existing statute if a Dominion election at any time fail to be held at a period of more than twelve months after the preparation, in this portion of Ontario, of the provincial lists. That law as applied to this unorganized portion of Ontario has been subjected, in this House, in the e course of the present debate and previously, to very severe criticism as being a provision of the statute which, if not altogether unworkable, it is at all events, impossible to work out satisfactorily. Of necessity, that provision of the law must be worked out after the writ for any Dominion election issues, because, up to the very date of the issue of the writ, no man can tell whether or not there will be a provincial list not too old to be used at that election.

If the provincial list at the date of the issue of the writ is less than 12 months old, it is to be adopted under our present statute and it is only when such provincial list is more than 12 months old, at the

date of the issue of the writ that a new list is to be prepared for that portion of the province under the provisions of the Dominion law. Accordingly it is only after the issue of the writ that those steps can be taken under the present provision of the law. That time, it is said, will not be adequate and in any event the men by whom that new list is to be prepared will necessarily be selected by the Dominion government. Those objections have been urged more than once to the present law as applicable to the new or unorganized portions of Ontario, if there should be a necessity for relying upon that law.

In the condition of things which we have to-day as to the unorganized portion of Ontario, it is at least of equal probability that in case the present Bill is not passed the provisions of the existing Dominion law would have to be invoked to obtain a voters' list at the next Dominion elections. The provisions of the present provincial law as to the unorganized territory require the work of the enumerator to be done during June, he has to begin on or after the first day of June in each year unless his work is dispensed with, and he has to conclude on or before the 30th day of June. During June in the present year that work was not done; it had been done before June or may have been in course of completion during the first week of June just passed. On the 30th of June a proclamation was issued dispensing with the preparation of any lists for the unorganized territory during 1908, no such preparation can now take place under the provisions of the Ontario statute, so that if a Dominion election comes to be held at any time during the present year or at any time in the year 1909 before or during the month of June it would be impossible to have any list for that Dominion election unless you took the list prepared under the existing provincial law to which such serious objection has been raised. If the Dominion elections are held before June next it would be possible of course to adopt. if any one were so minded, the lists which have been prepared during the spring months of the present year by the provincial authorities and which have been discussed here. I do not intend to go into any discussion of these lists beyond pointing out that when objection was made to their character the answer that came was simply ridicule of the statements of members on this side of the House as to the character of those lists and the manner in which they were prepared. The statement was made by the hon. member who has just spoken that these lists have been prepared and published in sections, the enumerators certifying them in parts or in sections, from time to time as new sections or parts were prepared. The statute plainly contemplated only one list, only one certificate when it was completed, and one period of 15 days after the whole list was completed within which appeals from that whole list might be taken. It was said when objections were made that they were entirely without foundation, they were absurd, and this list was a right good list. The hon. member who was making these statements has now demonstrated at the end of judicial proceedings that this list is utterly incorrect, utterly illegal and stands exactly as it left the enumerator, not having been subjected to any judicial revision whatever, and being but an improper, incomplete and entirely imperfect list upon which to run an election. The moment that is demonstrated as the result of a judicial inquiry the whole ground is shifted and you hear the cry: Why do you not go on with your appeals? In the meantime an election has been carried on on a list of that character, and if the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) had not gone to the expense of a judicial inquiry by which he has established their utter illegality and impropriety these very lists, in the absence of legislation now in question before this House, would have been forced upon him or any other Dominion candidate for that constituency. That is the kind of inspired, heaven-born list which hon. gentlemen opposite say is immensely superior to a judicially prepared list, for the preparation of which all necessary time will be given and all proper means and facilities afforded for correcting it before the judges of the country.

The issue here is simply whether the existing law is to continue or whether this measure is to be substituted for it. A great deal has been said about an insult to Ontario by the proposition made here. I reply that I have exactly as good a right as any other member in this House to speak for the province of Ontario. I do not recognize any better right on the part of any hon. gentleman opposite, no matter who he is, to speak for Ontario than I claim for myself. I think further that I am speaking here not merely for myself but for at least 38 other members of this House from Ontario who are here supporting this measure, and if we are insulting anybody it certainly is not the province, or the whole province of Ontario by any means. We constitute more than 45 per cent of the representation of the province of Ontario in this House and speaking for more than 45 per cent of the electors of Ontario I resent the arrogance of hon. gentlemen opposite who talk about an insult to Ontario.

It is said that we ought to have communicated with the provincial government of Ontario before we introduced this Bill. I would like to know what more the provincial government or legislature of Ontario has to do with the means by which we shall regulate the preparation of voters' lists for elections to this House than we in this House have to do with the means whereby the provincial government or legis-

lature of Ontario shall regulate its own franchise. We have just as much right in this House to control our own franchise and our electoral lists as the legislature of Ontario has to control its lists and its franchise, and there was no more reason why we as members of this House should consult the legislature of Ontario before proposing any legislation we saw fit with regard to the preparation of our lists than there was why the government of Ontario should have consulted us before passing their Voters' Lists Act last session. There was no more want of courtesy in the one case than in the other; the one legislature is as independent as the other in the preparation of its lists or in regulating the means whereby the franchise will be determined for elections to its own house. Hon. gentlemen have attempted to work up great indignation and to represent this as a matter in which some insult has been offered to Ontario or some discrimination made against it. If hon. gentlemen opposite think they will receive any benefit at the polls from this stage performance they are perfectly welcome to it. It is a measure which I should be happy to discuss before any assembly of electors, and I am perfectly willing to meet any hon. gentleman on the subject at any time or place and discuss it before any audience in Ontario.

When this measure was first introduced we heard a great deal from hon. gentlemen opposite about its operation as applied to the little province of Manitoba and the plea was made: You are afraid to take somebody of your own size. We do not hear that now, there is no whine or cry of imposing on the little province of Ontario but the ground is shifted and now it is said: Here is some intolerable insult that is being flung into the fact of a majestic, a mighty and a great portion of this Dominion. It seems to me the two lines of argument are hardly consistent, and when added to all that the effort is made to show that by reason of some sinister influence within the cabinet or out of it, there has been some effort to discriminate against Ontario in favour of some other portion of the Dominion, surely the ridiculous has come to its fitting conclusion.

Why in Quebec there are no lists whatever in respect to the unorganized territory. Indeed, according to the argument of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) there is no such thing as unorganized territory within the province. At all events no lists have been prepared within that territory and to-day if there are residents there entitled to vote they are not upon any list. It is not then a matter of choosing between provincial lists and Dominion lists so far as that province is concerned, it is a matter simply of considering whether or not this parliament should step in and as to that part of the province of Quebec do what its own local legislature has, up to this time, not seen any necessity for doing. If there is any call or necessity for the preparation of lists in that portion of Quebec which is known as unorganized, and if the provincial legislature applies to that portion of the province a method of preparing the lists different from that which obtains in the remainder of the province, as unworkable or as unlikely to work satisfactorily, as unlikely to produce a fair and impartial list as experience has demonstrated the provisions of the similar law with regard to the province of Ontario are, then it will be time for this House to consider whether or not the lists so prepared for the unorganized portion of Quebec are lists which this House ought to accept as determining its franchise for the purposes of elections to this House. But that time has not yet come and until there are lists prepared in some shape or other and until it is a question whether or not those lists so prepared shall be accepted for that portion of the province of Quebec, there was no occasion for this provision so far as that province was concerned.

When this Bill was originally introduced, it applied to all portions of this Dominion, not already provided for, in regard to which the lists were not prepared in accordance with the system pointed out in our existing election law. That was objected to, the measure was, so far as Manitoba was concerned, modified, as gentlemen know and I need not go over those circumstances again. That modification taking place, the complaint now is that we have retained not the original measure but a measure modified as proposed by the leader of the government six weeks ago, referring this question to judicial determination, and because we have retained that so far as Ontario is concerned, this prolonged objection to the present proposed provision is now made.

The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) this morning says that this is no real judicial preparation of the voters' lists. I can only refer him to the language of the Bill which, if passed, it will fall to those judges themselves to interpret, and which is certainly worded as plainly as any words I am able to find could make it. This Bill provides that the board of registration shall appoint as many enumerators as are necessary and that the duty of those enumerators shall be to do their work how? Under the supervision and in accordance with the directions of such board of registration. I do not think those words are by any means meaningless. They were inserted for a purpose and I believe that before any body of judicial interpreters they will have full effect. I do not mean to say that the judges themselves or any of them will go from house to house like census enumerators looking personally for the voters or registering them, but I do say

that having appointed some men as their substitutes, or delegates, as their appointees to do that work, the preparation of the lists will be done by those men under the actual supervision of and in accordance with the actual directions which may be given from day to day or for that matter from hour to hour, if that is necessary, by the judges themselves. And these judges are therefore under this statute as literally to prepare these lists by themselves as is the man who builds a house literally doing that building if he stands there day by day and sees the workmen laying the bricks, building the stairways and putting on the roof. It is true they do not do the work with their own hands, but it is being done under their immediate direction and supervision by men appointed by themselves and under their entire control. I maintain that it is in every respect a judicially prepared list as effectively as though the actual work of enumeration was done by a judge's own hand.

The hon. member for Halton has gently, but still unmistakably, conveyed to the House and to all who may read his remarks the impression that although a judge has accepted and is in discharge of his high judicial duties, he cannot, he does not, forget the political alliances which may have existed in his case before his appointment to the bench. So be it. If my hon. friend in seriousness means it, if he thinks it, so be it. We have in this territory of New Ontario six constituencies and nine district judges. Three of their number were appointed before the present government came into power. I say nothing more than that with regard to political affiliations, but I do remind my hon. friend from Halton that if out of nine judges in Ontario there are three appointed under such circumstances as I have pointed out, there is, proportionately at least, exactly the same representation that hon. gentlemen have to-day in the political complexion of this House. I say then that we are here talking of this work of the judges of the land as we find them. I know that no more impartial tribunal could possibly be selected for the work that is in hand, and it reduces itself simply to this point, that the objections which have been taken to this proposition in committee and here to-day mean that hon. gentlemen opposite believe all voters' lists perfect so long as they are prepared by political partisans selected by hon. gentlemen themselves or their political associates while if such lists are prepared by political partisans selected from this side of the House, then such lists are utterly objectionable. But even if such lists are prepared by impartial judicial authorities, they are equally to be condemned because nothing will satisfy hon. gentlemen opposite unless they can prepare with their own hands the election lists upon which we appeal to the electorate.

Mr. AYLESWORTH.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I wish to say a few words in reply to the observations of the Minister of Justice. The hon. gentleman claims that he has as good a right to speak for Ontario as any member in this House. Well, in this connection, I do not think he has as good a right to speak for the province of Ontario as the men who were here years ago when the Liberal party put itself on record, time and time again, by declaring that the provincial lists, and no other, were the proper lists to be used. That was the stand taken by the present First Minister, by his colleagues who were then in the House, including the late Hon. David Mills and the Hon. Edward Blake. Men of the greatest prominence and importance in the Liberal party of that day declared over and over again that the provincial lists, and no other, were the lists to be used in the Dominion as well as the provincial election. That was one of the planks of their platform on which they went to the country. But in this Election Bill, the government are deliberately setting aside that principle as regards the province of Ontario. They deliberately refuse its application to the unorganized districts of that province. That would not be so bad if the province of Ontario was the only one which had unorganized districts. But other provinces also have them. The same condition exists in other provinces in that respect as exists in Ontario to-day, yet there is no application of this Bill to them. Is it not an insult to Ontario that she should be thus discriminated against? I say it is a deliberate insult to the province of Ontario that this Dominion government refuses to trust to the honesty and integrity of the Ontario officials or the Ontario administration. In the face of this measure, the Minister of Justice cannot claim to speak for the province of Ontario. What is the reason for this? The right hon. the First Minister says the object is to give a man in the unorganized territory a vote by providing for the making up of a list in that territory where now there is none. But if that be the case in the unorganized districts of Ontario, it is equally the case in the unorganized districts of the province of Quebec. Yet he has made no such provision for that province. There he is willing to leave the matter in the hands of the local government, but Ontario, for which province he claims to speak, he treats differently.

Mr. TALBOT. Are you the protector of these men in the province of Quebec?

Mr. SPROULE. I am not, but the present government has declared that this measure was necessary to protect the rights of the voters in the unorganized districts of Ontario. Why do they not protect the rights of these electors in the province of Quebec as well? The object of the Bill, they say, is to give the voter the right to vote where there are no municipal lists. But there are

no municipal lists in these unorganized districts in the province of Quebec any more than there are in the province of Ontario. Why then this discrimination? I could well understand the government taking these lists out of the control of the province if they took the ground that this parliament ought to enact its own franchise law entirely. But they do not take that ground, and when this particular clause is made to apply to Ontario alone, when that spirit of partiality is accentuated by the remarks of the Minister of Justice, we have the right to complain. I heard a remark made by a supporter of the government after the provincial elections in Ontario, to this effect: Wait until our government at Ottawa puts through a franchise law and gives us the making of the lists, and we will show you where we stand. I could mention the names of men who spoke to me in this way. A man named Marcil, very closely related to a member of this House, and another, a very prominent henchman of his, were very active partisans during the late election, one of them at one time acting as the deputy returning officer and the other, I believe, the poll clerk. They are both officials on the Transcontinental working for the Liberal party. Neither in the federal area nor in the local has the Liberal party ever depended on an honest election in this district. Need I point to D. A. Macdonald who issued dodgers in the district of Algoma announcing that the election was to be held on a certain day after the day fixed for the election so as to keep the people from going to the polls to vote? Two days before the date fixed in his notice the election was held, and about 125 voters were deprived of their franchise by the wilful deception practiced by one of the officials of the Mowat government. The hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) knows very well how D. A. Macdonald corralled the Indians in an election out there, took them, in a mass to the poll, and made them poll their votes in favour of the Reform candidate, and then after those Indians had voted, he compelled them to change clothes with their squaws, who were corralled in a building, and the squaws, dressed in male attire, went and polled their votes.

Mr. CONMEE. Where does the hon. gentleman say that occurred?

Mr. SPROULE. In the Algoma district I heard the boast made by D. A. Macdonald himself.

Mr. CONMEE. Under what government?

Mr. SPROULE. The Mowat government. I am speaking of what is a matter of historical fact to-day. I heard the man who did that boast of it on the Pacific boat coming down the lake in 1892. That was one of these devices on which the hon. member for Rainy River has always depended for election. In fact the Bill now before the House ought to be called the 'Conmee Bill,' because its main object is to secure the election of that hon. gentleman. It is because of the knowledge of these things that we are to-day resenting the insult offered to the province of Ontario. We all remember the tricks that were resorted to by that hon. gentleman in the past and I am sure his right hand has not since lost its cunning. At one time it was the 'Minnie M,' at another D. A. Macdonald, and at another something equally disreputable.

To-day these hon. gentlemen opposite desire to be in a position to do what their friends boasted they would along the line of the Transcontinental. The minister, however, has yielded to the strong arguments against the Bill, but nevertheless now, at the tail end of the discussion, he talks very violently against those who compelled him to amend it. Why did not he address these arguments and reproaches to the House weeks ago? He dare not, because he knew they would be answered. But to-day, because he knows that time will not permit an answer, he becomes very valient and very important. But the people of Ontario will remember, when the day of retribution comes, and, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth), the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and their friends will be punished by the electorate, when that electorate has an opportunity to pronounce its verdict upon this Bill which is being forced upon the House.

Mr. CONMEE. I would like to ask the hon. member a question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CONMEE. The election the hon. member speaks of never took place.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member has a right to ask a question.

Mr. CONMEE. I state that the election——

Some hon. MEMEBRS. Oh, oh. Ask your question.

Mr. CONMEE. I ask the hon. member where he has any proof that such an election ever took place, when a man named Macdonald ever ran in Algoma?

Mr. SPROULE. I did not say Macdonald ever ran. I said that Macdonald was the agent of the Reform party. I heard him boast of having taken the Indians in to vote, then causing them to exchange dress with the squaws and taking the squaws down and voting them.

Mr. CONMEE. When was that election?

Mr. SPROULE. And I heard him telling that he had himself posted up a notice at a certain mill, where there were a large number of Conservative voters, that the election was to be held two days after the

date really fixed by the proclamation, thus keeping these men at home on election day, with the result that the election was carried against them. It is by such devices as these that the hon. member for Rainy River has so long managed to be a member of some legislature in Canada.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that the hon. member (Mr. Sproule) goes beyond what is proper in suggesting that an hon. member has managed to be elected by devices of the sort he indicated. I think that should be withdrawn.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw.

Mr. SPROULE. I have only this to say, that I have it from the mouth of the man who did it——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The point is that the hon. member (Mr. Sproule) has suggested that another hon. member has always relied upon certain improper devices for election. That is an improper suggestion to make.

An hon. MEMBER. Did the squaws vote?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order. Withdraw.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that statement should be withdrawn.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

An hon. MEMBER. Withdraw the squaws.

Mr. SPEAKER. Some hon. members appear to treat this as a matter for levity. It it not a matter for levity, but a question of order and decorum in debate in this House.

Mr. TAYLOR. They don't know any better——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Hon. members must preserve order and treat the rules of debate with decency and decorum. The statement that an hon. member has relied upon improper means for election is not a proper statement to go on record in this House.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought I was within the rules, Mr. Speaker, in saying what I did; but, in obedience to your ruling, I withdraw the statement.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). I think that for the Act about to be passed —because I assume that it is to be passed by a majority in this House—only one man is responsible, and that man is the Prime Minister and leader of this House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The province of Ontario, when it comes to fix the responsibility, will hold the Prime Minister responsible for this action. Sir, the Prime Minister has had twelve years of power in this Dominion. He has taken many grave political chances in his time. He is making a political gamble on this legislation—nothing else. He should ask himself if the elections—which I hope and trust will come on this fall—are likely to show that this Bill is worth what it will cost him. This Bill is intended to affect only six ridings at the very outset. It cannot possibly affect the riding of Muskoka. In the last local election the Liberal party had not a candidate there. The result there will not depend upon any list that can be made, even if any person wished to make unfair lists, the unorganized vote there being so small. Practically the same would apply to West Algoma and East Algoma. So it comes down to two ridings—Nipissing and Rainy River. Now, is it worth the Prime Minister's while to take the risks involved in this Bill for such possible results? Even these two ridings are affected greatly by local lcircumstances, as they were in the last campaign. The hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) fought with the determination, vim and go with which he fights every election. Every means was resorted to to win. There were thrown into the riding of Rainy River the men who have been disgraced in the courts of Ontario for improper and illegal election proceedings. Cap. Sullivan was in the riding, and the hon. member for Rainy River and he were together——

Mr. CONMEE. The hon. member (Mr. Bennett) is making a statement which has no foundation in fact. I never saw Cap. Sullivan in that riding, either in the last election or any other election.

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask the hon. member this question?——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The hon. member (Mr. Conmee) has denied the statement, and the statement should be withdrawn.

Mr. BENNETT. I accept the hon. member's statement. Now, I would ask him: Prior to the last local elections, early in the month of May, was he with Cap. Sullivan on the line of the Transcontinental Railway, between Selkirk junction and Port Arthur?

Mr. CONMEE. Which election does the hon. member (Mr. Bennett) refer to?

Mr. BENNETT. The election of June last.

Mr. CONMEE. I never discussed that election with Cap. Sullivan at all.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BENNETT. I ask the hon. member, is the statement correct, as made by him, that he never saw Cap. Sullivan within a month before the date of polling on the

Transcontinental line between Selkirk and Port Arthur ?

Mr. CONMEE. No, I never did.

Mr. BENNETT. Then I make this statement on the authority of Dr. Gunn, who lives at Kenora, that he saw the hon. gentleman and Cap. Sullivan there together.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member is merely reiterating in effect the statement that has been directed to be withdrawn.

Mr. CONMEE. Is that the Dr. Gunn who is a physician on the Transcontinental Railway?

Mr. BENNETT. The same gentleman.

Mr. CONMEE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) has been misinformed, for I was not west of Port Arthur during the whole period of that election, and never saw Sullivan anywhere in the province about the time of the election.

Mr. BENNETT. Then the statement of Dr. Gunn is untrue. I say that all means were resorted to in that riding in the local election, and it resulted in the election of the Conservative candidate. Now, the Prime Minister is placing legislation on the statute-book that will not enure to his political benefit. I say this, and I am confident that my statement will be proven true, when—I hope within the next few months—the people of the ridings affected have an opportunity to express their opinion.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Boyce.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Alcorn,
Armstrong,
Avery,
Barker,
Barr,
Beattie,
Bennett,
Bergeron,
Blain,
Borden (Carleton),
Boyce,
Brabazon,
Bristol,
Broder,
Chisholm (Huron),
Christie,
Clare,
Clements,
Crocket,
Elson,
Foster,
Fowler,
Haggart,
Henderson,
Hughes (Victoria),
Jackson (Elgin),
Kemp,
Lake,
Lalor,
Lancaster,
Lefurgey,
Lennox,
Leonard,
MacLaren,
McCarthy (Calgary),
McLean (Queens, P.E.I.),
Marshall,
Martin (Queens, P.E.I.),
Monk,
Morin,
Northrup,
Owen,
Paquet,
Perley,
Porter,
Pringle,
Reid (Grenville),
Robitaille,
Roche (Marquette),
Sproule,
Stanfield,
Staples,
Taylor,
Tisdale,
Walsh (Huntingdon),
Ward,
White,
Wilson (Lennox & Addington),
Worthington,
Wright (Muskoka)—60.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Archambault,
Aylesworth,
Beauparlant,
Beland,
Brodeur,
Bureau,
Caldwell,
Calvert,
Carney,
Caron,
Carrier,
Carvell,
Cash,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Clarke,
Conmee,
Copp,
Delisle,
Demers,
Dugas,
Emmerson,
Fielding,
Finlay,
Finlayson,
Fisher,
Fortier,
Galliher,
Gauvreau,
Gervais,
Girard,
Graham,
Hall,
Harty,
Hughes (Kings, P.E.I.),
Hunt,
Jackson (Selkirk),
Johnston,
Kennedy,
Lachance,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),
Lanctot (Richelieu),
Lapointe,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Lavergne,
LeBlanc,
Lemieux,
Logan,
Loggie,
Lovell,
Macdonald,
Maclean (Lunenburg),
Macpherson,
McCarthy (Simcoe),
McColl,
McCool,
McIntyre (Perth),
McIntyre (Strathcona),
McKenzie,
McLean (Huron),
McLean (York, C.),
McLennan,
Major,
Marcile (Bagot),
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Martin (Wellington),
Michaud,
Miller,
Oliver,
Pardee,
Parmelee,
Paterson,
Parent,
Pickup,
Power,
Pugsley,
Ratz,
Reid (Restigouche),
Roche (Halifax),
Ross (Cape Breton),
Ross (Rimouski),
Ross (Yale-Cariboo),
Rousseau,
Savoie,
Schell (Glengarry),
Schell (Oxford),
Sinclair,
Smith (Oxford),
Stewart,
Talbot,
Telford,
Templeman,
Tobin,
Tolmie,
Turcotte,
Turgeon,
Turriff,
Watson,
Wright (Renfrew),
Zimmerman.—99.

PAIRS :

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Borden (Sir Frederick),	Wilmot,
Dyment,	Maclean (York, S.),
Ethier,	Seagram,
German,	Osler,
Gordon,	Daniel,
Crawford,	Ganong,
Burrows,	Smith (Wentworth),
Boyer,	Forget,
Greenway,	Macdonell,
Guthrie,	Ames,
Knowles,	Herron,
Law,	Lewis,
Sifton,	Thompson,
Sloan.	Schaffner.

Amendment negatived.

At one o'clock, House took recess.

House resumed at three oclock.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not intend to delay the House for more than a moment, I wish to call attention in the first place to a paragraph which I find in the editorial column of the Toronto 'Globe' of Saturday, July 4, to which my attention has been directed only recently. The paragraph to which I allude is this :

There need not much be said regarding the Dominion Elections Bill, which has at last reached the committee stage in parliament. But, in the interests of truth, it should be put on record that the concessions which the opposition now declare to be satisfactory were offered early in May last. The time since wasted might far better have been devoted to serious public business.

I am inclined to agree with the principle enunciated in the last sentence of this extract, but in so far as the statement of alleged fact in the second sentence is concerned, namely, that the concessions alluded to were offered to the opposition early in May, I desire to say in all sincerity, that the statement has no foundation in fact whatever and that it is absolutely devoid of truth. I do not say this by way of imputing any desire of misleading to this journal but simply to place the matter on its proper basis as far as the facts are concerned.

I have already, in Committee of the Whole House, moved a resolution for the amendment of the Bill now under discussion by way of providing that the poll in a general election in Canada shall be held in every constituency on the same day except in so far as the Yukon Territory is concerned. By section 90 of the Dominion Elections Act five electoral districts are excluded from the general rule. As to certain of these there may be some question, but as to others I think there is no question. The Kootenay division of British Columbia, at least, according to the statement of Mr. Smith Curtis, the Liberal candidate for the riding should not be included in this list. As far as other British Columbia ridings are concerned, I have the same information. My information with regard to them has been controverted by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. As far as the Kootenay riding is concerned, I am supported not only by the provincial government of British Columbia, not only by the circumstance that the provincial elections are all held on the same day in that province but also by the statement of Mr. Smith Curtis, to whom I have referred. I will not take up further time in discussing the subject, but I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Bristol :

That the Bill be not now read a third time, but be referred back to Committee of the Whole House with instructions to amend the same by making provision that at every general election in Canada the day for holding the polls shall be the same day throughout Canada except in the Yukon Territory.

Mr. BENNETT.

It may properly be inquired, why, having regard to what I have said just now with respect to the difference of opinion between the two sides of the House, I make the motion in this way. My answer is that my hon. friend from Prince Edward county (Mr. Alcorn), in the amendments which he introduced into this House in this Bill and which were proposed as amendments to the Bill now before the House, pointed out a simple and easy way by which these five constituencies could be brought within the general rule. The difficulty arises, I understand, in all cases with respect to the posting of the proclamation and by adopting the means pointed out by my hon. friend for Prince Edward there should not be the slightest difficulty whatever in fixing one day for the whole of Canada.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I agree with the hon. member from Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn) that his estimate that the proclamatiou should be twenty-three days in the hands of the returning officer before nomination day is a reasonable one. If he gets it twenty-three days before nomination day there will be sufficient time except in Comox-Atlin if the returning officer happens to live in Atlin. But, does not my hon. friend see that if it requires twenty-three days before the nomination it must necessarily require twenty-three days after the nomination so as to distribute the ballot boxes and swear in the returning officers? That would make forty-six days from the time that the returning officer receives the proclamation until the poll can be held.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am obliged to confess, and I trust my hon. friend (Mr. D. Ross) will not blame me for doing so, that I do not see anything of the kind. As a matter of practice in every constituency it is known and will be known perfectly well that the election will not be by acclamatiou and that a poll will be demanded. It will neither be necessary nor desirable for the returning officer to sit down and wait for nomination day for he knows perfectly well that two candidates will be nominated and he can make arrangements accordingly As a matter of fact in my own province of Nova Scotia, long before nomination day the returning officer makes his arrangements with his deputies. In the county of Halifax, which is 140 miles long and where men have to come a distance of 120 miles in some cases, this is always done and it can be done in these ridings in British Columbia just as well. I do not think there would be the slightest difficulty in adopting the proposal of my hon. friend from Prince Edward.

Mr. D. ROSS. The hon. gentleman must see that in a district such as Yale-Cariboo the ballots must be printed at some central point after the nominations are held, and his suggestion that the returning officer might anticipate what was going to happen on nomination day does not apply to British

Columbia. We do not know until nomination day whether a socialist candidate will be nominated. They might make up their mind the day before nomination to place a candidate in the field. Then, the ballots must be printed at, say, Kamloops, the ballot boxes must be distributed from that central point and consequently the work cannot be done in a shorter time than the proclamation can be posted from any settled point.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. As far as that is concerned my hon. friend from Prince Edward was not fixing twenty-three as the minimum time, but he was fixing a period of twenty-three days as a time which would be absolutely ample in all constituencies.

Mr. D. ROSS. No, I do not think so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, it is not worth while to bandy contradictions across the floor of the House. I have said all that I have to say on that point. I think there is some difficulty to be encountered, but in so far as the Kootenay district of British Columbia is concerned, there is absolutely no difficulty at all if we are entitled to rely upon the statement of Mr. Smith Curtis who says that there is not only no necessity, but that he does not desire any postponement in that riding.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. We have been accused of doing this to get a political advantage, but so far as I am personally concerned I do not think there is much dishonour in getting beaten in an honourable way, and I would much rather have the election on the general election day and take chances. I believe if the election is held on the same day as the other elections you will have your organization better in hand. But, the district of Yale-Cariboo is 700 miles in length from the United States boundary to the Alaskan boundary and it contains 175,000 square miles, while the district of Kootenay contains about 29,000 square miles. So far as Kootenay is concerned, if Mr. Curtis Smith wants his election on the same day, I think it can be arranged, but in Yale-Cariboo and Comox-Atlin—I know the districts well—it is a different matter. It is absolutely impossible to hold the election in Yale-Cariboo on the same day unless the proclamations are issued at least 60 days before the day of polling. If His Excellency can dissolve the House and wait 60 days for an election then I am perfectly satisfied. Notwithstanding the telegram read by the leader of the opposition from Premier McBride, the fact is that the provincial government found it absolutely necessary to pass an order in council deferring the election in the provincial district of Skeena for two weeks after the general election because it was impossible to get the ballot boxes into that district. I know the leader of the opposition wants to be fair and I tell him it is absolutely impossible to hold an election in Yale-Cariboo unless 60 days elapse between the issue of the proclamation and the polling. There are nine provincial electoral districts in Yale-Cariboo and the provincial elections are arranged from nine different centres, while in the Dominion election they must be arranged from one centre for that large area. Under the provincial election law the deputy returning officer makes a declaration before any two voters who happen to be there, whereas under the Dominion election law the deputy returning officer must be sworn in before a justice of the peace and in many instances there is not a justice of the peace within 100 miles of where the poll is held. It is more difficult now than in 1904 to arrange for an election in that constituency because people have gone into Stewart lake and Chapel valley along the line of the Grand Trunk Pacific in northern British Columbia where there are no transportation facilities. It will therefore take you a much longer time than in 1904 to provide that the settlers in that remote area shall have their votes recorded.

Mr. ALCORN. I assume that the hon. member (Mr. Duncan Ross) knows of the amendment placed upon the Votes and Proceedings of the 29th of June containing the scheme set forth in Bill (No. 80) with regard to this subject. He is perhaps aware that part of that scheme is that in these five at present excepted constituencies the nomination day is advanced one week, and that therefore 14 days will elapse between the nomination and the polling.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. That is not enough.

Mr. ALCORN. If it were true, which I believe, it is not, that the ballot boxes must necessarily be distributed from one common centre for the whole electoral district, there are 14 days in which to perform that service and surely that would be sufficient. But, I believe that nowhere in the Dominion are there Dominion ballot boxes specially provided. The practice is to use the ballot boxes used in the provincial and municipal elections and therefore there is no distribution to be made except within a very restricted area. The only thing the returning officer would have to do would be to distribute his ballots, and I believe 14 days would be sufficient for that, even in as large a constituency as my hon. friend has.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. But, under the Act, the ballot box which is received by the returning officer must be sealed, must contain a copy of the election law, must contain sufficient ballots for the polling subdivision, and must be opened by the deputy returning officer in the presence of two electors. If that be so the argument of my hon. friend (Mr. Alcorn) falls to the ground.

Mr. ALCORN. My hon. friend is entirely mistaken. The ballot box is only sealed

by the deputy when he returns it to the returning officer.

Mr. TALBOT. The Magdalen islands are attached for federal purposes to the county of Gaspé and at certain seasons of the year it is next to impossible to communicate with them. The electoral district of Chicoutimi extends to the Labrador coast and in certain seasons of the year the obstacles to communication in that district are almost insurmountable. I call the attention of the leader of the opposition to the fact that it is certainly impossible to have the elections in these two districts held at the same time as in the other constituencies.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When special conditions arise at certain seasons of the year the elections can be held at a later date under section 91 of the Dominion Elections Act.

Amendment (Mr. R. L. Borden) negatived on the same division as last recorded.

Mr. SPROULE. In our judgment there are very serious objections to section 17 of this Bill. However, as there is a desire to hurry the proceedings I shall not refer to the matter further than to move, seconded by Mr. Bergeron:

That the said Bill be not now read a third time, but be referred back to the Committee of the Whole House with instructions to strike out section 17 thereof.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I have discussed this matter as fully as I wished on the second reading of the Bill but I might point out that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) seems not to have his own political party behind him in the position which he now takes. I suppose no more pronounced exponent of Conservative political views in this country can readily be found than the Ottawa 'Morning Citizen,' and I read from the Ottawa 'Morning Citizen' of the 27th of June last the following brief editorial:

In some of the recounts of the votes passed at the recent provincial election, ballots have been thrown out because of mistakes on the part of returning officers. In other cases officials who should have been better instructed have jeopardized votes by irregular markings of the voting papers. That is, to say the least, unfair. The ballot represents the will of the people and that will should rule. No mistake of an intermediary should thwart the expression of the peoples' opinion. The sins of the returning officers or those responsible should not be visited upon the voters.

I concur in every word of those sentiments and it was in that view that I framed the amendment which is in question.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Minister of Justice has set us an edifying example by reading newspaper articles when we are endeavouring to hurry through the business of the session. I do not know how much progress we shall make if other ministers follow that example. He appears to be of the opinion that in voting for this amendment we desire to vote against any fair proposal to ensure that no man's franchise shall be taken away. We do not propose anything of the kind, but we do think that section 17 as it stands, for reasons which have been abundantly pointed out in this House is likely to lead and I have no doubt will lead to results which are not desirable. I do not minimize the difficulties which have been brought to the attention of the country in the Wentworth and three or four other cases but when you can point to only five cases since 1867, a period of forty-one years, surely the grievance is not so great as to justify a remedy to which some exception at least can be taken. However, the matter has been threshed out to a wearisome extent in the House.

Mr. FISHER. I do not know where the leader of the opposition gets the idea that there have been only five cases of the kind since confederation. I know of three cases in my own county and in the last provincial election in Quebec there were over five cases, most of them proved in court.

Mr. BENNETT. Your deputy returning officers must be very stupid.

Mr. FISHER. In two of the cases they were Tories, I think in all three.

Mr. HENDERSON. I still think that this clause should be struck out of the Bill. It may be that errors will occur and that deputy returning officers may make mistakes, and in that way some candidate may be deprived of a seat to which he is properly entitled, but I consider that a very small matter indeed compared with the hundreds of thousands of electors throughout the country who are forced by means of a clause like this into voting against their consciences and therefore I cheerfully support the amendment and hope the House will throw out the clause.

Mr. GALLIHER. Under the present law cannot the same thing occur as will occur under this? Cannot the deputy returning officer make marks? Then how many instances have been brought to light in which the manner of voting has been discovered by such a mark.

Mr. HENDERSON. I know of my own knowledge that where the law permitted the manner in which a voter voted to be known as has been the case in Ontario for the last thirty years, voters' lists were taken to Toronto, were marked from the original ballots and were used again in a subsequent election which occurred in the same year and that marked list was used for the purpose of coercing votes. I know as a matter of fact that voters were coerced. One man applied to me on election day and asked if I believed they could discover how he voted. I was obliged to tell him they could, that the law permitted it and I had

no doubt in the world they did know how he voted in the previous election and would in that election. He said this was unfair, as it would compel him to vote as he did not want to. That was no doubt done repeatedly throughout Ontario with working men. I will not support any law that would take away the independence of the electorate and lead to the coercion of voters.

Mr. GALLIHER. This same question has been taken up in the United States and it has been held there in reported cases that a state law which would render a vote invalid by reason of any mark or error of a deputy returning officer would be unconstitutional.

Amendment negatived on the same division last accorded.

Mr. FOSTER moved:

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

He said: This motion explains itself and the reading of it is a sufficient argument for its adoption.

Amendment negatived on the same division last recorded.

Mr. W. ROCHE (Halifax). I was not in the House when clause 22 was debated, or I would have had the benefit of the opinion of the legal gentlemen in the House on it. I would direct attention to line 15 of section 22. From my standpoint this clause adds to all the iniquities of the old one by making out a candidate to be a criminal merely because some agent of his, without his knowledge or concurrence, did something which the candidate would have prevented him from doing had he any knowledge of it. Everybody will concede that the Act, as it is, was sufficiently stringent, and that it contained a number of severe restraints and grievous punishments which perhaps were out of all proportion to the wrong done. I notice that line fifteen provides that the actual personal expense of any candidate, his expenses for actual professional services performed, shall be held to be expenses lawfully incurred. Is there any limitation in the amendment to the Bills which can be rendered by professional gentlemen for services in an election ? Is there any limitation to these services they can perform ? Perhaps the legal gentlemen handled this question very gingerly. It seems to me that this is handing over the whole representation in the House to the legal fraternity. No layman would pretend to run an election when he can be made liable to imprisonment and fine because of the actions of an individual of which he has no cognizance. This is intended to put the whole control of the electorate in the hands of solicitors. A solicitor, who acts as agent for a candidate, can do all the things we are trying to prevent by this Bill. These angels who, we are told, are held in chains under darkness, awaiting the great day of judgment, must, I think, be given an intermission in their pains to laugh over this Bill. We are enabling a candidate to get around the penal provisions of this Act by allowing his solicitor to do everything forbidden in it. In England a candidate does not pretentd to do any of these things. His agents do certain things but his solicitor does the rest and presents a Bill for so much for his work. In England the bill is rendered by the solicitor for professional services. The price is ten pounds for every voter who votes and five pounds for every one who refrains. The angels in the bottomless pit must laugh to find us making Acts, creating offences and at the same time asserting provisions which enable them to be avoided—setting up pains and penalties for certain acts and then devising machinery by which the whole measure can be nullified.

Mr. CONMEE. I propose to say a few words——

An hon. MEMBER. The hon. gentleman has spoken already.

Mr. SPEAKER. Did the hon. gentleman speak on the amendment or on the third reading ?

Mr. CONMEE. I spoke on the third reading, but not on the amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER. Then you cannot speak now.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

EDMONTON, YUKON AND PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolutions :

1. Resolved, That the government of Canada may aid and assist the construction of a line of railway of the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company, hereinafter called the company,' from a point on the company's line of railway, or on the line of railway of the Edmonton and Slave Lake Railway Company, at or near Edmonton or Strathcona, in the province of Alberta, thence in a generally western direction, to the coal areas, situated at or near the Brazeau river and the headwaters of the McLeod river, for a distance not exceeding one hundred and fifty miles, by guaranteeing the principal and interest of the bonds, debentures, debenture stock or other securities, hereinafter called 'securities,' secured as hereinafter mentioned, of the said company, or of its successors by amalgamation

as hereinafter provided, to the extent of thirteen thousand dollars per mile for the first fifty miles of the line so aided, and for the remainder of the said line, to the amount of twenty-five thousand dollars per mile, not exceeding in all one hundred and fifty miles, the interest upon the said securities to be at the rate of three and one-half per cent per annum, payable half yearly, the principal to be payable in fifty years.

2. Resolved, That the said securities so guaranteed shall be secured by a deed or deeds of trust, by way of mortgage or charge, to a trustee or trustees, approved or by the Governor in Council, and such deed or deeds of trust shall respectively grant a first mortgage or charge upon the said line of railway so aided, and the right of way, station grounds, or other real estate and interest therein, buildings and other structures and improvements, rolling stock and equipment, plant, machinery, tools, supplies, materials and other personal properties, present and future, acquired for the purposes of the said line so aided, and in connection with operating, repairing and maintaining it, and the tolls, incomes and revenues of the company arising and to arise from the said line, and the rights, privileges, franchises and powers of the company now or hereafter held with respect to and in connection with the said line and the operation, maintenance and repair thereof.

3. Resolved, That the deed or deeds of trust shall create a mortgage, or charge, upon all other lines of railway and properties of the company, and upon all the property and franchises, tolls, incomes and revenues connected therewith, to rank thereon next after the bonds, debentures, debenture stocks or other securities theretofore issued by the company, and next after any existing deed or deeds of trust by way of mortgage or charge securing them ; Provided always that with respect to lines of railway or parts thereof now constructed and in operation, for the mileage of which no bonds, debentures, debenture stock or other securities have yet been issued, the company may issue first mortgage securities at a rate not exceeding twenty thousand dollars per mile, and may secure them by deed or deeds of trust by way of first mortgage or charge, having priority over the mortgage or charge created by the deed or deeds of trust hereinbefore mentioned.

4. Resolved, That the kind of securities to be guaranteed as aforesaid and the forms thereof, and the form and terms of the deed or deeds of trust securing them, and the times and manner of the issue of securities and the disposition of the moneys to be raised thereon, by sale, pledge or otherwise, pending the expenditure of such moneys for the purposes of the line of railway so aided, and the forms and manner of guarantee, shall be such as the Governor in Council approves of, and such terms, provisions and conditions may be included in such deed or deeds of trust as the Governor in Council deems expedient or necessary.

5. Resolved, That the said guarantee shall be signed by the Minister of Finance or such officer as is designated by the Governor in Council to sign it; and upon being so signed the government shall become liable as guarantor for the payment of the principal and interest of the securities so guaranteed according to the tenor thereof, and the said payments shall form a charge upon the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

6. Resolved, That the rates and tolls charged by the company upon any of its lines shall not in any case be higher than the rates or tolls fixed in the contract to be made between the government of Canada and the company.

7. Resolved, That any moneys paid by the government of Canada under any guarantee herein provided for, shall be held to be paid in discharge of the liability of the government and not in discharge of the liability of the company under the securities so guaranteed, or under any deed of trust securing them, and the moneys so paid shall be held to be still secured by the said securities and deed of trust, and the government shall be subrogated in and to all the rights of the holders of such securities, the interest upon or the principal of which has been paid by the government, and the government shall, with respect to all moneys so paid, be in all respects in the position of security holders with respect to whose securities default has been made in payment to the extent of the moneys paid by the government.

8. Resolved, That the guarantee of securities as herein provided, for the said line of railway shall not be given until the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company and the Canadian Northern Railway Company have amalgamated into one company under the name of the Canadian Northern Railway Company, nor until the amalgamated company, as successors by such amalgamation, has become, as maker of the securities, liable for the payment of the principal and interest of the securities so to be guaranteed with respect to such line of railway.

9. Resolved, That the decision of the Governor in Council as to the length of the mileage of the said line of railway so to be aided, shall, for the purposes hereof, be final.

10. Resolved, That the books of the company shall at all times be open for inspection for and on behalf of the government by any person named in that behalf by the Governor in Council or the Minister of Finance.—Mr. Graham.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I think the minister should outline the policy on which he grants these bonuses. He should explain why he grants bonuses to some railways and none to others, why he chooses to guarantee the bonds of certain railways instead of giving bonuses. Personally I am opposed, and have been for years, to these bonuses. It is too late in the session to discuss the matter at any length, but I would point out that when hon. gentlemen opposite were in opposition they found great fault, and justly so, with this way of proceeding. These bonuses resolutions should be brought down at such a period that we could have an opportunity to fairly investigate them and make our arguments for and against them as the case may be. I wish to put on record my protest against this way of doing business and against all bonuses to railways.

Mr. GRAHAM. These resolutions do not refer to bonuses. I am not referring at all to what has been the policy of the govern-

ment, but this position I do take. In a new country like Canada, development depends largely on transportation and transportation depends largely on railway construction. In order to develop a new country and enable those who come to it, as well as those who reside in it, to get the best return for their labours, railway facilities are necessary. We have not arrived at the point when we can have all the facilities we desire without government aid. When discussing any railway project, we have to decide whether it is better to give it so much per mile or guarantee its bonds. In the case of a company with considerable resources, my own opinion, especially in the case of trunk lines, is that it is better for the country to guarantee the bonds, because then we are not taking any risks. But in the case of the smaller lines perhaps the better way is to give them some cash aid, and they only get that after the line is constructed, on the report of the engineer. So that, if we get no railway, we pay no money. The only matter to be discussed, to my mind, in connection with this would be whether Canada has arrived at the point when we can do away with aid to railways. My own opinion is that Canada has not arrived at that point. I have endeavoured to deal with every application on the merit of that application, so far as I could get the information necessary.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Mr. Speaker, before you leave the chair I desire to say one or two words on this subject, and, perhaps, for the sake of the economizing time, I may make a few observations also with regard to the resolutions which follow. These resolutions were presented to the House seven months and seventeen days after this session was opened. The House now, within forty-eight hours of prorogation so far as we are able to learn, is invited to consider these resolutions and pass them. There has been a great deal of complaint, especially from the Liberal press of the country, and some from hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, as to the length of this session, and we have been told that the work in which we have been engaged should not have occupied a longer time than five months. Either this government has been holding back for more than two months and a half resolutions which it deemed perfectly proper, or else it is bringing down now certain resolutions which it does not really believe to be in the public interest. There is the alternative. Do hon. gentlemen opposite seriously contend, in the face of this proposal, brought down more than seven months and a half after the opening of the session, and only after repeated requests by the opposition for their early presentation, that they have to blame hon. gentlemen on this side for the delay; or are they not forced to admit that the delay during this session has been due to the inability of the government to deal with public business in a businesslike way and to bring their measures before the House in proper time? What is the answer? Were these subsidies decided upon three or four months ago? Was the government ready then to bring down these subsidies so that we might complete our work within five months after the session had begun? That is the question they will have to answer for themselves and as to which, I venture to think, they will not be able to answer satisfactorily.

What are the proposals that the government brings down? The first is a proposal to undertake bond obligations to the amount of $11,067,000. The government brings that proposal down to the House on the afternoon of Thursday, and it intends that this House shall be prorogued on Saturday afternoon or evening. That is, forty-eight hours before the time fixed for the conclusion of this session, the government bring down a proposal that the country should incur bond obligations to the extent of eleven millions and upwards. But that is not all. They bring down railway subsidies embracing revotes of subsidies for nearly 1,700 miles of road and new subsidies for nearly 2,300 miles of road—subsidies for a total of nearly 4,000 miles of railways. The combined length of all the lines of railway proposed to be subsidized under these resolutions would extend from the Atlantic to the Pacific across Canada. Therefore, this is a proposal to subsidize railways equal to a transcontinental railway. And the government asks parliament to take up that subject seriously after seven months and a half of the session has passed, and within forty-eight hours of prorogation. It is perfectly obvious that the government are not disposed to have serious discussion or consideration of this proposal—they know it is impossible. If their proposal was ready at the time when this session, according to their own views, should have come to an end, then for what reason is it that they did not present these measures to the House months ago? Look at the amount of aid involved; 3,935 miles of railway at $3,200 a mile amounts to about $13,000,000, which it is proposed to take from the public treasury and use in subsidizing various lines of railway throughout the country. But the proposal is not limited to $3,200 per mile. For if any of these railways is built at the cost exceeding $15,000 a mile, a greater subsidy is given. Looking over the aid granted to railways throughout the country during the last three years under resolutions similar to these, I find that the average amount of aid is over $5,000 a mile. If you take $20,000 a mile as the average cost of these roads—I do not think that would be an unfair or exaggerated assumption—you will find that instead of $12,592,-

000, the public treasury is pledged by these resolutions to no less than $22,566,300. This with the amount of bond obligations proposed by the resolutions now under discussion make a total of $33,500,000 and upwards, which parliament is invited to seriously consider within forty-eight hours of prorogation. And this we are invited to do without any correspondence having been brought down, without any documents being laid on the table which are of much value. It is true, the Minister of Railways has laid upon the table, or rather, has furnished to myself, and, I believe, to some other members, a memo. with regard to the bond guarantee which we are now invited to vote. But still I venture to say the House is absolutely without any information whatever which would enable it to fairly consider and determine whether these individual subsidies ought to be voted or not. I rise for the purpose of making an earnest protest. I do not think that the action of the government in leaving the introduction of these resolutions to the last moment is fair to parliament or to the country. Furthermore, I would say it is not fair even to themselves. Surely conditions are not such that these subsidies, or at least ninety-nine hundredths of them, were not resolved upon two or three months ago. If so many of them were resolved upon at that time, why were they not brought down in time for reasonable discussion? But the government have left all of these resolutions to be brought down at this time. And I protest that it is absolutely impossible for parliament, at this stage of the session, to give to these proposals the consideration which in all justice to the country and in view of the magnitude of the proposals, should be bestowed upon every one of them.

Mr. LENNOX. When I saw these resolutions on the Order Paper, although I knew we had very little time before us, I determined that I would not let them pass without criticism. I want particularly to speak in reference to the new subsidies. The other portion of the resolutions is objectionable, but not so objectionable as the new subsidies. In reference to guarantees, I can understand that there may be conditions under which it would be right to guarantee certain sums for railway enterprises. But there is no time now to consider whether such a course is or is not correct in reference to a particular matter. The amount we have already guaranteed for railways is very large. The amount we are now asked to guarantee for these railways, as has been said, is some $11,000,000. By these resolutions we are also taking over the Quebec bridge, the loss in connection with the Quebec bridge and undertaking to provide the money required for the building of a new one. We are by this resolution also revoting a large amount upon enterprises to which we were committed before. At a moderate estimate, these revotes will amount to about $10,000,000. The history of railway building in Canada I do not think justifies us in assuming that any of these railways to which we are committing ourselves will cost less than $20,000 a mile on the average. There is no justification in subsidizing a railway unless it is one of peculiar difficulty in regard to construction, and I think we can assume from the fact that the Transcontinental Railway costs us more than $60,000 a mile that these railways we are now subsidizing will cost on the average at least to the limit of our liability or $21,400 a mile. On that basis, the revotes will amount to more than $10,880,000. But I wish particularly to speak of the new subsidies. According to my calculation the lines total 2,267 miles, according to another calculation they amount to 2,235 miles.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think I did state 2,235 miles. But the Minister of Finance told me that about 35 additional miles were to be included, and my estimate was made up on the first basis and without taking into consideration the 32 miles which have since been added.

Mr. LENNOX. That would make my calculation correct. In paying $3,200 per mile up to $15,000, it amounts to $7,254,400. I assume that it will cost probably double that amount, it may cost $45,000. We pay $3,200 per mile on an expenditure of $15,000 per mile, and on any expenditure over $15,000 we pay half the cost, not exceeding in all $6,400 per mile.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. How does the hon. gentleman make up those figures, when the maximum amount is $6,400 per mile? It does not matter what it costs afterwards.

Mr. LENNOX. For a cost of $15,000 per mile we pay $3,200, above $15,000 we pay one half of what it costs, not exceeding $6,400 per mile. Now, if we pay $4,800 per mile we shall pay on these new subsidies $10,881,600, or if the limit is reached, nearly $15,000.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. I do not understand the hon. gentleman's method of computing those figures. The subsidies are paid upon the cost of the railway up to $21,400 per mile. If a railway costs $60,000, or $70,000, or $80,000, it makes no difference to the country.

Mr. LENNOX. If the hon. gentleman does not understand my figures I understand them, and I think the country will understand them. Up to $15,000 we will pay $3,200; above that we will pay half the construction until the cost reaches $6,400. I am assuming, from the history of railway construction in this country, that it will cost at least $18,200 per mile,

and if it does we will pay $4,800 per mile, and the total cost will be $10,881,600. I say that the conduct of the government cannot be justified in bringing down at this stage of the session a proposition committing the country to such an enormous expenditure. Aside from the subsidies we are revoting, we have about 2,270 miles of railway in regard to which we are committing ourselves to a probable expenditure of $6,400 per mile. I submit that it is absolutely unjustifiable. I submit that the time has now come when we should not be paying subsidies for the construction of railways. Having regard to what Canada has already done in railway construction, I say we are not justified in paying one dollar of subsidy to any railway. The proper position for the government to take is this, that the circumstances of this country are such as to lead to the unaided construction of railways wherever they are a national or a commercial necessity. Many years ago in the United States they adopted that principle, and I have no doubt that the good sense of the people of Canada will say that the time is entirely passed when we should be subsidizing railways.

Mr. LALOR. As a representative of a rural constituency, I desire to enter my protest against the huge amount now being voted for railway subsidies. I believe that the constituency I represent is opposed to these subsidies; and personally I am opposed to them. I believe the time has long gone by when we should advance such enormous sums to subsidize railway companies. If we compute the sums of money that have been granted, both by this parliament and by the legislatures of the various provinces, by way of bonuses and subsidies to railways, they will amount to enough to build those roads almost entirely, and the result is that, although the people of the country have paid for the roads, the railway companies own them. I am opposed to these bonuses. I think it was not wise on the part of the government to bring down an important question like this within forty-eight hours of prorogation, when there is no opportunity to discuss it clearly and intelligently. We are reaching a point in our expenditure when we should call a halt, and when we consider that we are to-day asked to vote about $30,000,000, I think it is more than the people of this country expect us, as their representatives, to support. I wish to express myself as strongly as I possibly can in opposition to these subsidies. I think it is an imposition upon the people, and they will not show themselves to be in favour of it when they are asked to record their votes in the coming election. There must be some reason why this huge sum is asked. It is very apparent why we are asked to vote this money. I think we all know that there is an election coming on, and that that accounts for this large amount of money that is being voted. As the representative of a rural constituency, I wish to oppose this expenditure. When we consider that we are voting, in general estimates, bounties to lead, railway subsidies and other grants, no less a sum than $227,000,000, hon. gentlemen will agree with me that it was time to stop and consider the situation. We are running expenditure mad; it is time to call a halt, and I want to express my opinion in opposition to this extravagant and unwise expenditure for railway bonuses. The Minister of Railways and Canals tells us that in a new country like this it is necessary to grant railway subsidies, but why is it necessary in the old sections of the country, especially in Ontario, which are well served with railways, to continue granting subsidies? If the railway companies feel like building roads in competition with lines already built, they should pay for these roads themselves and not ask the government of Canada to subsidize them.

Mr. TALBOT. I would like to ask the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Lalor) to be good enough to tell us how many lines of railway he has in his county?

Mr. LALOR. I think we have the Grand Trunk and Michigan Central.

Mr. TALBOT. You are doing well.

Mr. LALOR. Certainly, we are doing well.

Mr. TALBOT. In some counties we have none at all and we would like to have some.

Mr. LALOR. Is that any reason why we should grant subsidies where there is plenty of competition?

Mr. TALBOT. Will my hon. friend tell me if the railways in his county have been subsidized?

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. SPROULE. Before these resolutions are disposed of, I wish to put myself on record as being unalterably opposed to them. As far as I can judge the sentiment of the people of Canada to-day they are opposed to subsidizing railways. Expressions of opinion have been given by various bodies from time to time in the last few years and especially by the agricultural class indicating that they are opposed to subsidizing railways. It cannot be other than well known to the government that this is the feeling of the farmers to-day. They believe, as I believe, that we have reached a time in the history of the country when, if more railways are needed, we should depend on private enterprise to supply the capital to build these railways and leave those who invest their money in them to depend on the earnings for their returns. We have ample evi-

dence that the railways will be built whether we subsidize them or not, because, in several instances, we have refused to allow capitalists to come in and build roads in Canada and supply the necessary capital themselves. In view of that fact and in view of what I believe the sentiment of the people of Canada to be I am opposed to these resolutions. I am opposed to them as well because of the stage of the session at which they are brought down are submitted to this House. If there is any merit in one or more of them the date is too late and the data which should be available for our purpose is not available to enable us to analyse these propositions and to determine which are meritorious and which are not. They should be weeded out and analysed, but it is entirely too late to do this. It is committing the country to enormous undertakings without a proper analysis or the proper information that we should have before we give our assent to these resolutions. I am opposed to them as well because I fear that they are proposed to-day for one purpose more than any other and that is for the purpose of using them as bribing agencies in view of the approaching elections, enabling hon. gentlemen opposite to dangle them before the people of the country in various districts and to say: You should return the government to power again because of the assistance which they are giving to a railway through your county. Even in gratitude you ought to support the government, but if you do not support the government you are not likely to get as much assistance in the matter of construction of railways as you will if you do support the government candidate. Having regard to our knowledge of how elections have been run in the past by the present government we are justified in coming to the conclusion that these resolutions will be used to their utmost to assist the government in carrying very many constituencies. I think the government has another object in view as well. This means has been adopted by the government at the present time for the purpose of raising a large campaign fund from these subsidized corporations to enable them to run their elections. Some may not take that seriously and some may, but I say that we have had in the history of Canada cogent examples that justify us in reaching that conclusion today. We believe that we are on the eve of an election, that the government are preparing to bring on the election in the very near future, and the history of the past affords us ample justification for reaching the conclusion that this is one of the means whereby governments raise large sums of money to corrupt the electors and carry their candidates to power when the election comes on. Therefore, I say that, if for no other reason, it is not an opportune time to allow these resolutions to pass. I think the country's attention should be drawn to these facts. Why are the government guaranteeing the Canadian Northern Railway as they are doing to-day? Is there any justification for it? Have we any evidence that the people are in favour of their doing it? We have lately passed through a provincial election and the condemnation which was, over and over again, heaped upon the Whitney government by friends of the federal government in opposition to the means adopted for assisting the Canadian Northern Railway, and the fact that on platform after platform they denounced it in the strongest language, this proves one of two things—either that the Reform party were absolute hypocrites when they said that they did not believe it was justifiable to assist the Canadian Northern or they are hypocrites to-day, because they will go before the people of Canada and justify it to a larger extent than was proposed then. They will do to-day what they condemned a few weeks ago. Will they support it to-day? Of course they will, and they will go out and support it in the country notwithstanding the fact that many of them went on the platform and condemned it with regard to the assistance that was proposed to be given to the Canadian Northern Railway by the Whitney government. They are adopting the same means to-day, but they are adopting it to ten times greater extent than was proposed then. It was wrong then it cannot be right to-day. Hon. gentlemen who condemned it then cannot consistently support it now. I am opposed to it and I believe the people are opposed to it. They have put themselves on record time and time again that they are opposed to the further subsidizing of railways. There may be some justification for continuing grants that may have been given to enterprises that are now under way. But that is no justification for providing large subsidies for a number of new enterprises as set forth in these resolutions. I desire to put myself on record in opposition to this, believing, as I do, that the people of Canada are opposed to further subsidizing railways at the present time.

Mr. HENDERSON. The criticism which I shall now offer will apply to the resolutions generally, as I do not propose speaking at any other stage. The Minister of Railways has told us that the time for aiding railway enterprises has not yet passed, and, that is one of the most justifiable things the hon. gentleman has said in this House. But I disagree with him entirely as to the manner of aiding railway enterprises. It has been the practice in by-gone years for a few men to organize a railway company and then appeal to the federal government, to the local governments, and to the municipalities for aid so as to secure money enough to construct the road. As a general

thing those engaged in railway promotion never expect to invest a dollar of their own money. I believe the time is past for municipal bonuses and I also believe the time has passed for federal and provincial bonuses. We want railways in Canada, and if we are going to get them they must be aided, but that aid should be given in the form of a government guarantee. I approve of that principle, and I do not see why the government should not apply it to all these different railroads as well as to the Canadian Northern. In the recent Ontario elections the Whitney government was criticised for guaranteeing the Canadian Northern bonds. I justified that guarantee and I am prepared to justify it to-day, because I believe that the true principle of aiding railway enterprise is for the government to guarantee the bonds. Why should the people of to-day put their hands in their pockets to build a railway that is going to serve the people of fifty years hence ? I think we should leave some responsibility for those who come after us. If we guarantee the bonds and the bonds are unfortunately not redeemed by the company, then our descendants who benefit by these railways will contribute towards the expenditure, and the whole burden will not be thrown upon the shoulders of the already over-burdened people of to-day. We were told by the Liberals when in opposition that the people of Canada were being bled white at a time when the annual expenditure of the country was only $40,000,000, but what are the people of Canada going to say to these enormous expenditures being heaped one on another at a time when our annual outlay is $150,000,000. I protest against these bonuses ; I do not intend to support any of them. I think it is time the government should call a halt.

Mr. BARR. I feel it my duty, notwithstanding the desire to get through the business of the House, to enter my solemn protest against this bonusing of railways which is condemned by the farmers throughout the length and breadth of Canada. One of the strongest planks in the Liberal platform of former days was that railway bonuses should cease, but the Liberals in power have forgotten that. The 'Farmers Sun,' the most able organ of the farmers of this Dominion, has condemned railway bonusing in the strongest possible manner, and in that opinion of the 'Farmer's Sun' I cordially concur. And not only that, but it is worse still that in the dying hours of the session with prorogation in sight the government should bring down this enormous expenditure. If the government had submitted their measures months ago instead of waiting until a short time before prorogation the business of the House could have been disposed of long ago. The Ross government for years pursued a policy of delay in a similar way, but the Conservative opposition forced them to bring down their measures in proper time to allow of proper consideration. Here we are rushing millions and millions of the people's money through without due consideration. I believe, Sir, that the people of Canada will at the first opportunity retire from power the government which imposes such enormous burdens upon the people and which shows such procrastination in submitting measures to parliament.

Mr. J. D. REID. The Minister of Railways has been most unfair to this parliament in delaying until the last moment the submission of these resolutions. It is now impossible to ascertain the facts and consider the proposals, as they should be considered. It appears to be the policy of the government to grant bonuses to and to guarantee the bonds of railway companies, and that being their policy the Minister of Railways should have pressed for a grant of aid to the Ottawa and Brockville Railway which is a most important and necessary line. The capital of this Dominion has practically no direct railway communication except that which is afforded by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I believe it would be a great help to the people of the district through which this railway runs as well as to the city of Ottawa if the Grand Trunk Railway Company had direct communication with the capital. The Minister of Railways has neglected the Brockville and Ottawa line, and as to that I would not complain at all were it not that he has subsidized railways in other parts of the province of Ontario which are not so much in need of railway facilities. With that feeling and knowing that it would be of such assistance to the country and to Ottawa as the capital, I think the Minister has not been fair to us in this district in not seeing that aid was given to the railway proposed by this company. If that had been done I am satisfied they would have proceeded with the building of the road at once.

Mr. PRINGLE. We have recently come through a provincial campaign in Ontario. The Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) spoke on the platform with the leader of the opposition in the legislature, Mr. A. G. McKay, and the whole complaint was that last awful week in Toronto. What was that last awful week ? The Hon. J. P. Whitney enunciated in his platform of 1904 the principle that not one dollar of bonus should be given to any railway in the province of Ontario. He adhered to that policy rigidly ; the only complaint was that he undertook to guarantee certain bonds of the James Bay Railway to the extent of some $2,000,000. The Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) now asks this House not in the last week of the session, but in the last 48 hours to pass bonuses for millions of dollars and a guarantee of bonds for millions more. Personally I am not opposed to the guarantee of

bonds under proper conditions and proper circumstances. I believe it is the best way of assisting railways in opening and developing new territories and that history will show this country will not be called upon to pay one dollar of principal or of interest where the bonds are for a reasonable amount, and precaution is taken to see that the railway is built through a country that will likely be a good producing country. What I do complain of is the absolute hypocrisy of the party which went through Ontario condemning the Conservative party because the Conservative party guaranteed bonds to a small amount, and then asks us to-day, with 48 hours ahead of us, to grant bonuses to an extent of about $20,000,000. I have not had time nor has any hon. member to thoroughly investigate the bonuses to the different railways but I have run through some of them. In Ontario the Ross administration in its dying days granted a subsidy of $2,000 a mile to one railway which is now getting a subsidy of $6,200 a mile. The Ross government granted a land subsidy of millions of acres to another railway which is now getting a subsidy from these hon. gentlemen of $6,400 a mile. Under certain conditions it might be reasonable to grant certain bonuses. The province of Ontario in the past has done it, the Ross government left for the Conservative government a debt of five or six millions incurred in subsidies to railways. But since the advent of the Hon. J. P. Whitney to power in 1905 not one dollar has been granted in subsidies to any railway and yet the Liberals in Ontario raised the cry of that last awful week, simply because there was a guarantee of bonds which I believe was justified. I do not think it is possible for us in 48 hours to thoroughly consider these resolutions. We know we have to prorogue on Saturday and I with others feel that these resolutions should have been brought down weeks ago instead of being left to the last days of the session.

Mr. NORTHRUP. When, only a little over a month ago, hon. gentlemen opposite and their political friends throughout Ontario were making the welkin ring with their denunciations of that last awful week, to a certain extent I agreed with them. On the public platform in Ontario I said that while personally I agreed with the settlement of the mining suit and the guarantee of bonds under the circumstances and conditions under which the Whitney government had guaranteed them, I joined with hon. gentlemen of the opposite shade of politics in denouncing the Whitney government for passing such legislation in the dying days of the session. I feel that I am consistent to-day in protesting not merely as a Canadian ratepayer but as a member of this House, against the studied insult that is paid to members of this House by bringing down such important legislation in the dying days of the session. Not only is it impossible for us to give the proper consideration to these matters, but a blow is struck at the dignity of parliament itself. I venture to say there is not an hon. gentleman opposite any more than on this side who does not know that in the eyes of the great public of Canada the dignity of parliament is lowered and our influence is decreased by the fact that fourteen or fifteen hon. gentlemen who happen to occupy seats on the treasury benches can bring down such an immense grant at a time when it is impossible for private members to vote intelligently, knowing that there is a sufficient number in the House who will be ready to vote blindly for whatever they may bring down. I appeal to supporters of the government to consider their own dignity, the respect we owe to ourselves as well as to our constituents and to protest against such enormous grants being brought down when the country knows we cannot understand what we are voting for. If they protest the Prime Minister must heed them.

Mr. R. N. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place myself on record as opposed to this resolution and I believe that in doing so I am voicing the strong feeling of the constituency which I represent.

Mr. BLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with other members in condemnation of the government for their extravagance in voting such amounts of money for aid to railways in Canada. I notice the resolutions cover some ten pages of the Votes and Proceedings of to-day and if we do not protest against the action of the government we will have some member of it, possibly the Minister of Customs, in a few days saying that the opposition members allowed millions to pass without protest. That is the kind of government we have to deal with so it is necessary, even if we take a little time, to enter our protest against these extraordinary expenditures. In my own county, during the last year and a half, we have had an example of a large railway corporation constructing an important railway without the aid of a dollar from the public treasury, Dominion or local; that is the new Canadian Pacific Railway branch from Toronto to Sudbury, which is looked upon as one of the best roads in Ontario. The roadbed is perfect and it is a credit to the company. If the Canadian Pacific Railway are able to construct a line from Toronto to Sudbury without public aid, surely the other railways of Canada can construct some of these branches without money from the public treasury. Therefore without having had an opportunity to look into

these resolutions and refresh my mind as to the geography in order to ascertain where the lines are to be constructed, and not knowing the local considerations, I wish in a word or two to express my disapproval of the large vote the government is asking this afternoon.

Mr. ALEXANDER MARTIN (Queens, P.E.I.) I raise my voice, Mr. Speaker, against these railway resolutions, especially against the bonuses. Considering the heavy obligations to which the right hon. the First Minister has committed this country—the Transcontinental which is to cost between $200,000,000 and $250,000,000; the Georgian Bay canal, $100,000,000; the Hudson Bay Railway, $30,000,000 to $50,000,000; the Welland canal, something like $30,000,000—considering all these I think it is high time he should cry halt. The late Sir John Macdonald gave this country the Canadian Pacific Railway, and his memory is green and will remain green in the minds of the people for what he has done. What he did then was very costly, but the Canadian Pacific Railway has come to be one of the greatest and most successful undertakings that Canada ever ventured into. But the First Minister is coming now to the last straw which is going to break the camel's back. With the credit of this country in the markets of the old world diminished, he goes on favouring certain parts of Canada for political purposes. It is all very well to say we are building up a great country, but are we not travelling too fast? Here are estimates amounting to something like $180,000,000, yet ten years ago, when our estimates only amounted to $42,000,000, the right hon. gentleman considered them entirely too much. In 1896 he condemned railway subsidies in toto. The time had come, he said, when they should cease. Is he going to do for Canada what the late Mr. Mercier did for Quebec? I am afraid he is. When we consider the niggardliness with which he treats some provinces—my own for instance—and the lavish expenditure he proposes to make in others, I am at a loss to understand how the hon. gentleman expects this country to bear the burden. He is incurring expenditures which are staggering the country, which he cannot justify, and now he comes down at this hour of the session and asks us to swallow a host of railway subsidies without giving them at all any consideration.

Mr. EMMERSON. Could I be permitted to add a word to the testimony of hon. gentlemen opposite, though not in the same direction? I do not think that to-day in Canada the people as a rule are playing the part of Rip Van Winkle. They have had their eyes open for some time, and they realize that the conditions to-day are vastly different from what they were some years ago. There is one thing of which they are certain, and that is that the status of Canada at present is far better than it ever was during any previous year in our history. There have been two or three objections raised to these resolutions. The main one is with respect to the lateness of their introduction. Well, I have to commend the government for what it is doing. In this the government are in harmony with the ideas of the people. They are in harmony with the popular sentiment when they realize existing conditions and our future possibility. They have at last, in the interval between all these cries of scandal and motions and resolutions, which we have had from week to week, designed some say for the purpose of obstructing the business of parliament, been able to bring down, in the form of a resolution, certain propositions, which, to my mind, crystallize the best hopes and aspirations of our people. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) took one other exception, and it was that this was only one other means of bribing the people of Canada——

Mr. SPROULE. Hear, hear.

Mr. EMMERSON. But he said the right hon. leader of this House would realize that the people of Canada were opposed to anything of the kind. Sir, if that be true, how is it possible that these railway resolutions can be offered as acts of bribery? I think that my right hon. friend is too astute a statesman to propose to the people something which will not be acceptable to them. Reading these resolutions in detail, I find that the views of the west are being recognized, I realize that the views and hopes and aims of the people of central Canada are being realized. I further realize that those propositions, whether they relate to the east or the west or the centre, are acceptable to the people of Canada. Why? Because Canadian citizenship to-day realizes that we are on the threshold of great possibilities.

They realize that responsibilities rest upon them, and they want a government in power that can understand the conditions and provide for them. I have been for many years allied with the Liberal party. I was an opponent of the party of the hon. gentleman opposite when it was led by that great statesman, Sir John A. Macdonald. I want to say this in tribute to his memory—though he needs no such tribute—that he grasped the situation and provided for its possibilities and requirements. And I congratulate the right hon. leader of this government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that now, when conditions are changed, when we have made rapid strides, when we have attained a higher plane and enjoy a wider view of the possibilities of our country, he makes provision for these great interests. For that, I believe he will receive, as he merits, the approval of the citizenship of Canada. I do not wish to join hon. gentlemen opposite in holding a post mortem on the past.

But I would call the attention of the leader of the government to the fact that in the past we have aided railways, particularly in the eastern section of Canada and have spent large sums on the government system of railways. My hon. friend from Queens, P.E.I., (Mr. A. Martin), a few moments ago, condemned the incurring of liabilities in the settlement of the transportation problem. And yet, in the next breath, he complained of the disregard of the requirements of his own province in the same direction. The hon. gentleman, I am sure, realizes that Prince Edward Island has received attention, and so have the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Quebec in connection with the government system of railways. As subsidiary to the government system, this parliament has, from time to time, given aid toward the construction of railways which should be branches and feeders of that government system, and these contributions toward railway construction have benefited materially the government system. These expenditures in aid of branches of the government system were made for the purpose not only of increasing the traffic of the Intercolonial but of aiding the communities which these branch railways serve. Now, Sir, the government, having met the requirements of central Canada, as it is doing by these resolutions, should turn its eye to the conditions prevailing in eastern Canada. I shall not repeat the arguments I addressed to the House on a recent occasion, but I ask consideration of this: Is it not in the interests of the Intercolonial from a business standpoint, that the government should acquire the lines connecting with the government system, to make those lines do more perfectly their work as feeders and so increase and extend the traffic of the government system and to benefit further the communities served by these branches? Now that we have under consideration these propositions in the interests of the transportation problem of Canada, I would ask if the government has considered the desirability of acquiring these lines as feeders, thereby perfecting the government system and fulfilling the hopes of the communities served by these branch lines? I do not wish the government to confine itself to one province, but to consider every province. In Nova Scotia, there are branch lines which are recognized as peculiarly coal branches that it would be desirable that the government should acquire, as their usefulness as feeders of the government system justifies that acquirement. And, while this policy would measurably solve the transportation problems of the east, it would enable the people of the west to secure the full benefit and advantage of a government system of railways. For it is not only to the east but to the west as well that the Intercolonial is doing good——

Mr. EMMERSON.

Mr. LEFURGEY. What are you going to do with Prince Edward Island?

Mr. EMMERSON. The government is dealing generously with Prince Edward Island. Only the other night we approved a resolution authorizing the governmnet to construct a branch line there. I am sure that my hon. friend (Mr. Lefurgey) approves of that; and, if it is good policy for Prince Edward Island, it is good policy for the mainland as well.

Mr. LEFURGEY. But what about your connecting link? How are you going to make these Prince Edward Island roads feeders of the Intercolonial?

Mr. EMMERSON. One thing at a time. If the hon. member will have a little patience he will find a tunnel built and a railway running under the straits. He wants everything in a moment. But he waited for generations—at least his political party did—without taking any step in that direction. The present administration are taking steps in that direction. And they are enlarging the railway system of Canada in every way. I invite the attention of the right hon. the First Minister to the subject I have mentioned, and would respectfully ask him, on behalf of the people of the east particularly, whether the government have taken into consideration the acquirement of the branch lines connecting with the Intercolonial as feeders of the government railway system?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If there be those in this House who honestly believe that the time has come when public assistance to railway construction can be done away with, I do not share that opinion. On the contrary, our experience proves that the time, I am afraid, is very far distant in the future when we can in this country do as the United States has done, dispense with assisting by money grants the extension of our railway system to all parts of the country in which settlement has already gone. I have heard to-day voices from the province of Ontario and voices from the province of Quebec, protesting against any new subsidies towards railway construction. I venture to say that if these voices had come from those parts of Canada in the condition they were forty years ago, they would have been the first to ask for railway subsidies. But I can conceive that some people in the province of Ontario and some portions of Quebec, where you have the country gridironed with railways, may think there is no necessity for a further advance in that direction. I would like hon. gentlemen who represent those parts of Canada to remember that in the new provinces, in some parts of Ontario, in some parts of Quebec, and some other parts of the country, the conditions to-day are just as they were

forty years ago in Ontario, and if it were left to private enterprise to provide those sections with the blessings of railway transportation, it is probable that they would have to suffer a deprivation for many years to come. This policy was inaugurated many years ago, and so far as I can judge, and I think it is admitted by everybody, it has been a wise policy. It has done wonders for the country, and if the country is to-day as prosperous as it undoubtedly is, the fact is due to two causes, increased transportation and added immigration. As long therefore as immigration continues to flow in at the rate it is doing now, as long as the country settles up as rapidly as it is now being settled, I am afraid that no encouragement can be given to those who think that we can dispense with public assistance to railway transportation. We have done a good deal for the west, we are doing a good deal for the west in these resolutions. I confess that the west has been usually well taken care of. My hon. friend for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) asks if we are not going to do anything for the east. He has told us, not only this session but in preceding sessions, that the east is not as well provided for as it should be ; that at the present time there is an anomalous condition of things prevailing, that is to say, that in all parts of the country where there are feeders to trunk lines these feeders are generally taken care of and put under the management of the trunk lines ; whereas in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick the feeders are not connected with the trunk lines. I believe that in this matter, and I think every body will agree with me, if the Intercolonial were under private management, all these feeders which are now merely branch lines would have been acquired by the company and would be part of the system at this moment. But we must recognize that government management of a railway has not the elasticity which would as readily suggest of the adoption of such a policy. As long as there lacks such a union between the trunk lines and the feeders there must be an unsatisfactory condition of things to the people of the maritime provinces. On the other hand, we must recognize the fact that while the idea is a good one, it involves very serious complications and requires serious consideration. I may say to my hon. friend, since he has put the question directly to me, that we have given very serious consideration to the condition of things which he has laid before us. While this condition of things is not a novel one, and we have given to it a good deal of consideration, we have not yet been able to make up our minds that it is a policy which we should adopt. Whilst we are not prepared to say to my hon. friend that we shall adopt this policy, we realize that it is one which requires consideration, and makes it incumbent upon the government to make the fullest inquiry in order that we may be in a position to discuss the matter adequately at another session.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee on the resolutions.

Mr. BERGERON. Before this was drafted was there any arrangement made with these companies mentioned in this section?

Mr. GRAHAM. Just two companies to be known as the Canadian Northern. When they amalgamate, this guarantee of the bonds of this company takes effect, but we get a second mortgage on the entire system of the Canadian Northern Railway, including this part, which is to be part of the Canadian Northern Railway, and upon which we have a first mortgage. It is so worded as to guard that point by providing that the guarantee only becomes effective when this company and the Canadian Northern Railway are amalgamated into one new company, to be known as the Canadian Northern, each company carrying its own bonding powers into the new company.

Mr. BERGERON. If that new company is called the Canadian Northern, will there be any danger of mistakes being made?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, it will be the Canadian Northern Company.

Mr. BERGERON. But it will not be the Canadian Northern Company that exists to-day?

Mr. GRAHAM. The Canadian Northern that exists to-day will be merged into this.

Mr. HAGGART. Do I understand the Minister of Railways and Canals to say that on the new part to be constructed you take a first mortgage, and that on the part of the railway already constructed the Canadian Northern have the right of issuing securities to the amount of $20,000 a mile, which will be prior to the claim of the government, and that the government, for the sum of money which it advances on these new lines to be constructed, not only takes a first mortgage on the part to be constructed, but a second mortgage on the part constructed, and also gets the undertaking of the company for the repayment of the money?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, they become the makers of the securities of the Canadian Northern Company.

Mr. SPROULE. In regard to the company that it is proposed to guarantee, all the obligations resting against them now will remain the same as heretofore, and the government's mortgage will be a second mortgage?

Mr. GRAHAM. The government will have a first mortgage on all the lines not now constructed, but it will have a second mortgage over the entire Canadian Northern system on the lines already constructed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is not the Canadian Northern system subject to a second mortgage already?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think not.

Mr. HAGGART. I would like to know from my hon. friend what security we are going to get from the Canadian Northern, and what the pending liabilities are on this road on which we are taking a second mortgage.

Mr. GRAHAM. If there be a second mortgage on the Canadian Northern, I must say it must be on a very small portion of it. My understanding of it was that our mortgage was over the entire system. I will get all the particulars when we rise at six. The main point is that this becomes part of the Canadian Northern system and carries with it all its properties and bonding privileges. The bonding privileges of the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company were changed not long ago. On the Mountain portion of the road, by the recent Act, they have bonding power to the extent of $35,000 a mile and on the other portions of the road to the extent of $25,000 a mile.

Mr. BERGERON. Is this Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company already chartered?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Who are the gentlemen composing the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is really the same interest as the Canadian Northern. That is why we are providing that the company must become the Canadian Northern.

Mr. BERGERON. Who are the gentlemen forming the company?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mackenzie & Mann.

Mr. BARR. Have they the charter in their own name?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. I happen to know that, as a positive fact, the shareholders and directors are Mackenzie & Mann and the gentlemen connected with them in the Canadian Northern system. They have built some fifty miles from Edmonton westward already.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the minister puts forward what he calls a second mortgage as the ground upon which the government have entered into this guarantee, it would seem only right that he should give us some information as to what that security will be. My recollection is that in the province of Manitoba and, I think, extending as far east as Port Arthur, the Manitoba government guaranteed the bonds of that road, and they took as security a second mortgage upon all the system between those points that I have mentioned. So far as that is concerned, it is obvious that he cannot have a second mortgage. All I desire to know is what the particulars are.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will get that information after six o'clock.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. We should know what we are getting in the way of security. Second or third mortgages are not considered very safe, and the minister ought to be able to tell us what claims against the road are privileged before ours?

Mr. HENDERSON. Is this the road of which the Hon. William Pugsley was the promoter when the original charter was obtained?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have never heard that before.

Mr. GALLIHER. The original promoters of this road were all Edmonton men except one man in Toronto.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Is this the line that goes from Strathcona to Edmonton?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. This company was incorporated originally at the instance of the city of Edmonton and had power to build in the district surrounding Edmonton, extending from Strathcona across to Edmonton and thence westerly 50 miles or more. It was first called the Edmonton District Railway, but subsequently parliament gave power to change the name to the Edmonton Yukon and Pacific Railway and enabled it to build through to the Pacific ocean by the Yellow Head pass, or the Pine River pass, or the Peace River pass. Some years ago the charter was acquired by Mackenzie and Mann and last session it was renewed and the bonding powers increased. Under that charter they have built a bridge across the Saskatchewan river at Edmonton and they have also graded, if not completely constructed some 50 miles. The Railway Act provides that with the approval of the Governor in Council one or more railways may become amalgamated, and if they do the new company takes over all the property of the united companies and becomes liable for all their obligations, and by clause 8 of this resolution it is provided that these bonds are not to be guaranteed until that amalgamation takes place so that the Canadian Northern will become invested with all the property and become subject to all the liabilities of the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway.

Mr. BERGERON. Is the hon. gentleman speaking of the bridge already constructed over the Saskatchewan?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. Has this railway received any bonuses in any shape from the government ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Thirty-eight miles has been subsidized by the government but that 38 miles is not included in this guarantee.

Mr. HAGGART. There is no provision of that kind in your resolution.

Mr. GRAHAM. That will be carefully guarded.

Mr. BERGERON. The English version of the resolution says that the guarantee is $25,000 per mile for 100 miles, and the French version says that the guarantee is not to exceed in all $150,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. The French version is incorrect.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the resolution passes its present form I do not see how the Minister of Railways can avoid guaranteeng of the 38 miles. The hon. member for Lanark points out that 38 miles of this railroad has already been subsidized, and the Minister of Railways admits that, and not one of the descriptions in paragraph 1 of the resolution includes the 38 miles. Do I understand that to be correct ?

Mr. GRAHAM. That point has been considered. There are three routes by which the railway may be constructed and it is more than probable it will not take the route starting at the end of the 38 miles. The solicitor informs me that when we say : From a point at or near Edmonton or Strathcona it covers it amply ; making it clear that they can start at the end of the 38 mile section or at the end of another railway 21 miles north from Strathcona on the other side of the river.

Mr. HAGGART. The minister gives his assurance that the railway company will receive no endorsation of bonds for that part of it which has already been subsidized, either the bridge or the line of road.

Mr. GRAHAM. Absolutely. We have no idea of including a foot of the thirty-eight miles built. Section 9 of the Bill says :

The decision of the Governor in Council as to the length of the mileage of the said railway shall, for the purpose of this Act, be final.

It gives us absolute power to control the mileage.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is the minister certain that the thirty-eight miles constructed west of Edmonton was constructed under this charter ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Can the minister state definitely what amount will be spent by this resolution ? It does not state any specified amount, can he say it will not be more than so much ?

Mr. GRAHAM. We guarantee bonds at a certain rate, $13,000 per mile for fifty miles and $25,000 per mile for 100 miles. No money is to be expended but the government guarantees bonds at a certain rate for a certain mileage.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the obligation ?

Mr. GRAHAM. The obligation is to guarantee 50 miles at $13,000 per mile, and 100 miles at $25,000 per mile. I do not think we will ever be called upon to pay a cent.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Were bonds of the railway west of Edmonton guaranteed by the government ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think it had a subsidy of $3,200 a mile.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The minister is certain it was built under this charter ?

Mr. GRAHAM. It was built under the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific charter.

Resolution reported, read the first and second time and agreed to.

Mr. GRAHAM moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 213) respecting aid for the extension of the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

AID TO CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY.

House in committee to consider the following proposed resolution :

1. Resolved, That the government of Canada may aid and assist the construction of the lines of railway, set out below, of the Canadian Northern Railway Company, hereinafter called 'the company,' by guaranteeing the principal and interest of the bonds, debentures, debenture stock or other securities, hereinafter called 'securities,' of the said company, to the extent of thirteen thousand dollars per mile of the said lines of railway so aided, respectively, interest on the said securities to be at the rate of three and one-half per cent per annum, payable half-yearly, and the principal to be payable in fifty years.

2. Resolved, That the said securities so guaranteed shall be secured by one or more deeds of trust, by way of mortgage or charge, to a trustee or trustees, approved of by the Governor in Council, and such deed or deeds of trust shall respectively grant a first mortgage or charge upon the line or lines of railway included therein, and the rights of way, station grounds and other real estate and interests therein, buildings and other structures and improvements, rolling stock and equipment, plant, machinery, tools, supplies, materials and other personal properties present and future, acquired for the purpose of the said lines so aided, and in connection with operating, repairing and maintaining them, and the tolls, incomes and revenues of the company arising and to rise from the said lines and

the rights, privileges, franchises and powers of the company now or hereafter held with respect to and in connection with the said lines, and the operation, maintenance and repair thereof.

3. Resolved, That the said deed or deeds of trust shall also create a mortgage or charge, next after the charges existing thereon, upon all the lines and branch lines of railway of the company now in operation and upon all the property and franchises connected therewith, and upon all the tolls, incomes and revenues derived therefrom by the company, and also next after any bonds, debentures, debenture stock or other securities heretofore issued or hereafter to be issued by the company to raise the moneys required from time to time to meet the expenditures heretofore made or hereafter to be made for and in connection with the company's yard and freight terminals in Winnipeg, and the expenditures under the agreement respecting Winnipeg terminals, set out in chapter 52 of the statutes of Canada of 1907, made between the company, the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, and His Majesty the King, and after the deeds of trust, mortgages, pledges and charges heretofore given or hereafter to be given to secure them: provided always that, with respect to lines or parts thereof now constructed and in operation, for the mileage of which no bonds, debentures, debenture stock or other securities have yet been issued, the company may issue first mortgage securities at a rate not exceeding fifteen thousand dollars per mile, and may secure them by deed or deeds of trust by way of first mortgage or charge, having priority over the mortgage or charge to be created by the deed or deeds of trust hereinbefore mentioned.

4. Resolved, That the kind of securities to be guaranteed as herein provided and the forms thereof, and the form and terms of the deed or deeds of trust securing them, and the times and manner of the issue of securities and the disposition of the moneys to be raised thereon, by sale, pledge or otherwise, pending the expenditure of such moneys for the purposes of the lines of railway respectively so aided, and the forms and manner of guarantee, shall be such as the Governor in Council approves of, and such terms, provisions and conditions may be included in such deed or deeds of trust as the Governor in Council deems expedient or necessary.

5. Resolved, That the said guarantee shall be signed by the Minister of Finance or such officer as is designated by the Governor in Council to sign it, and upon being so signed the government shall become liable as guarantor for the payment of the principal and interest of the securities so guaranteed according to the tenor thereof, and the said payment shall form a charge upon the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

6. Resolved, That the rates and tolls charged by the company upon any of its lines shall not in any case be higher than the rates or tolls fixed in the contract to be made between the government of Canada and the company.

7. Resolved, That any money paid by the government of Canada, under any guarantee herein provided for shall be held to be paid in discharge of the liability of the government and not in discharge of the liability of the company under the securities guaranteed or under any deed of trust securing them, and the moneys so paid shall be held to be still secured by the said securities and deed of trust and the government shall be subrogated in and to all the rights of the holders of such securities, the interest upon or the principal of which has been paid by the government, and the government shall with respect to all moneys so paid be in all respects in the position of security holders with respect to whose securities default has been made in payment to the extent of the moneys paid by the government.

8. Resolved, That the decision of the Governor in Council as to the length of the mileage of any of the said lines of railway shall, for the purposes hereof, be final.

9. Resolved, that the books of the company shall at all times be open to inspection for and on behalf of the government by any person named in that behalf by the Governor in Council or the Minister of Finance.

10. Resolved, that the lines of railway above referred to are the following :

1. A line of railway from or from near Regina, in the province of Saskatchewan, to the westerly boundary of Manitoba, there connecting with the company's line to Brandon, not exceeding one hundred and fifty-two miles.

2. A line of railway from or from near Saskatoon, in the province of Saskatchewan, thence running in a southerly and western direction towards Calgary, not exceeding one hundred and seventy-five miles.

3. A line of railway from or from near Prince Albert, in the province of Saskatchewan, by way of North Battleford and Battleford junction, to or near to Battleford, excluding, however, the mileage between North Battleford and Battleford junction, the distance, exclusive of the last-mentioned mileage not exceeding one hundred and thirty-two miles.

4. A line of railway from the Thunder Hill line of the company's railway at or near the westery boundary of the province of Manitoba, running in a generally western direction towards Rosthern, a distance not exceeding one hundred miles.

5. An extension of the Rosthern line from the western boundary of the province of Manitoba, in a northwesterly direction, a distance not exceeding fifty miles.—Mr. Graham.

Mr. GRAHAM. Hon. gentlemen will see that I have laid on their desks certain information concerning the various lines to be guaranteed. I think something like 509 miles at $13,000 per mile. The various portions of the line which are part of the Canadian Northern system are outlined in the resolution. In general terms aid to these railways has been urged very strongly in all these sections ; in some places by the municipalities, in others by prominent citizens and in others by deputations. The question of whether the railway shall be built or not, is a very live question. We who have many great railway facilities of course do not appreciate the position in which men are placed who are many miles from a railway. Believing this to be a proper course to pursue we selected those most strongly urged

and most important and these are the results.

Mr. HAGGART. Does the minister know on how many miles of this road bonds and debentures or securities have been issued and to what extent on any portion of the road?

Mr. GRAHAM. I will have a statement of that after dinner.

Mr. HAGGART. Have you any prepared agreement or any form of agreement in which you intend to enter with the company with reference to passenger tolls and freight rates? You make provision for special rates.

Mr. GRAHAM. We put that in because we wanted to be sure. Under the general Act the tolls will come under the Railway Commission. As a layman I did not see the necessity of putting it in the Act as we do not intend to make special rates. It was put in by the solicitor.

Resolutions read the second time and agreed to.

Mr. GRAHAM moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 214) respecting certain aid for the extension of the Canadian Northern Railway.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

House went into committee to consider certain resolutions respecting the granting of subsidies in aid of the construction of the lines of railways therein mentioned.

Mr. GRAHAM. The first twenty-six of these resolutions are simply revotes. I have laid on the table a map on which is marked every line guaranteed and every line intended to be subsidized, both revotes and others. I have also laid on the table copies of the applications. These charters are all alive.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the minister satisfied himself that all these undertakings are feasible? The situation may have materially changed in the case of some of these roads since the original subsidies were voted. There may be many companies that are not going on with their lines.

Mr. GRAHAM. Unless a company makes a new application every year it is not considered. It has to give certain reasons for its application. It is possible that there are a large number not applying, but these will not be considered at all although the revotes are there; they all have to make new applications. On looking them over I think there is reason in every case why we should revote the subsidy, particularly as recently the time has not been very good for financing any railway or any other scheme.

Mr. BERGERON. How long ago were these voted? Some of them seem pretty old.

Mr. GRAHAM. I can turn up any case my hon. friend mentions and give the date when the application was made and the subsidy was granted.

Mr. BERGERON. Has the hon. minister any reason to believe that they will build within the time of this renewed subsidy?

Mr. GRAHAM. I can only give the information that was obtained in the application of each company. It is something in their favour that these subsidies were granted them before.

Mr. SPROULE. In many cases, these subsidies were asked for by companies that intended to build lines that would compete with existing lines. But, in the meantime, the charters may have been acquired by the very roads with which it was intended to compete. Can we be sure that we are not granting a renewal subsidy that will defeat the very object for which the subsidy was granted in the first place?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend's question is very pertinent. It is not easy to learn all these details in the information we receive. We have a regular form for them to fill up, and, as for the rest, we can only use our best judgment. The point is one which would come up rather on the granting of a charter, though, of course, the charter might be granted to one person and afterwards acquired by another. So far as possible, we guarded the point the hon. gentleman has referred to, but, in some cases, it will happen in spite of any information that we have.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. On one point, I do not find anything in these resolutions, but to be certain, I would like to ask if, in the Bill covering these resolutions, it is intended to repeal any of the subsidies not mentioned here as revotes. Some subsidies were revoted last year and do not expire for another year. They are not revoted by these resolutions, but I take it that they are not repealed?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is not the intention to repeal any that now exist. You might allow a subsidy to lapse, but you could not very well repeal it, because it might have been financed in good faith.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Will the minister tell us, as we come to each case, when the charter was granted, and what reason he has for renewing the subsidy?

Mr. GRAHAM. That would take all night. If the hon. gentleman will tell me what information he wants I will gladly give it.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. The hon. minister must have some ground for revoting the sub-

sidy, and that he ought to state to the committee. The reason against this course is that it will take all night. This is another condemnation of the government for bringing these resolutions before the House at this late date. These resolutions should have been before the House three or four weeks ago at least, and then we could have read up the information and been ready to discuss the matter intelligently. Gentlemen about me here suggest that they should have been down months ago. Certainly, we cannot intelligently discuss them within the time allowed us.

Mr. GRAHAM. Some of these charters have been granted by the provincial legislatures and it is difficult to get all the information.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I do not see that that makes any difference. No matter who gave the charter, the minister ought to be able to tell us why he is renewing the subsidy.

To the Kettle River Valley Railway Company, for a line of railway from a point at or near Grand Forks to a point fifty miles up the North Fork, and East or West Fork, of the North Fork Kettle river, in lieu of the subsidy granted by chapter 43 of 1906, section 1, item 39; not exceeding 50 miles.

Mr. GRAHAM. This road was discussed a great deal in the House several years ago.

Mr. BERGERON. Has the road been commenced?

Mr. GRAHAM. I understand that a portion twenty miles long is under construction. My British Columbia friends inform me that this road will be a great advantage to the province.

Mr. BERGERON. How is it that they never asked for their subsidy?

Mr. GRAHAM. This is a revote. They could start the work, but you must revote the subsidy to keep it in force.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. How long is the road ?

Mr. GRAHAM. In all, possibly two hundred miles.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. And chartered in 1901, and only twenty miles commenced.

Mr. GRAHAM. They are asking a subsidy for only fifty miles.

Mr. CROCKET. Does this carry the double subsidy?

Mr. GRAHAM. It will undoubtedly earn the double subsidy.

For a line of railway from Owen Sound in the province of Ontario to Meaford, in lieu of the subsidy granted by chapter 43 of 1906, section 1, item 18; not exceeding 30 miles.

Mr. GRAHAM. Any person who has been in that part of the country understands the necessity of having better communication with Owen Sound. This line was chartered in 1904.

Mr. BERGERON. It says 'for a line of railway.' What company?

Mr. GRAHAM. The Owen Sound and Meaford.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. How much has been built?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not know.

For a line of railway from Sharbot lake or Bathurst Station, in the province of Ontario, or between these points, via Lanark village, to Carleton Place, in lieu of the subsidy granted by chapter 43 of 1906, section 1, item 7; not exceeding 41 miles.

Mr. GRAHAM. This charter was given to the Kingston and Pembroke, which now is controlled by the Canadian Pacific Railway. It was chartered many years ago and the subsidy was renewed in 1906.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it owned by the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Mr. HARTY. They have a controlling interest.

To the Nipigon Railway Company, for the following lines of railway:—

(a) from a point at or near Nipigon Station on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway to Nipigon lake; not exceeding 30 miles.

(b) from a point on Nipigon bay of Lake Superior to a point on the west of Lake Helen on the line of the Nipigon Railway; not exceeding 3½ miles.

(c) from a point on the line of the Nipigon Railway at or near the crossing of the Fraser river to a point on Lake Jesse, by way of Cameron's Falls; not exceeding 1½ miles;

(d) from a point on the north shore of Lake Nipigon northerly; not exceeding 45 miles; the said subsidies to the said lines being granted in lieu of the subsidies granted by chapter 43 of 1906, section 1, item 10; not exceeding in all 80 miles.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is a line chartered I think, by the provincial government some years ago.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. How long is it ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Eighty miles.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. How much of it is built?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think none of it is built.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. When was the charter granted?

Mr. GRAHAM. It was a provincial charter, and I have not a memorandum of the date. It was some years ago.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. The minister might give the reason why it is not built.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is a very desirable road. I have always thought so. I discussed this charter in the provincial arena.

It will open up a good portion of the province, and we should not cut off the subsidy but renew it, to see if we can get some one to undertake a railway to open up that country.

Mr. HAGGART. The main object of the charter was to facilitate the building of the Transcontinental and to aid in getting supplies into that portion of the country.

Mr. BERGERON. When we subsidize provincial railways do they become federal railways or do they remain provincial railways ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have fairly strong views in reference to provincial charters. I am inclined to think, like the ex-leader of the Conservative party, that any steam road of any dimensions ought to come under Dominion jurisdiction. But it does not come under our jurisdiction because we give it aid.

Mr. BERGERON. If we grant it subsidies we should have something to say in its control.

Mr. GRAHAM. There is a Dominion charter for this road as well as a provincial. This is not owned by the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the object of building a railway back up there ? Years ago it was for the object of taking in supplies to build the Transcontinental, and was supposed to be useful in developing some mines and fishing. But I see that some members of the government control the fishing leases in Nipigon lake.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is one of the arguments. In fact, every road that has been chartered running north and south for a good many years, is said to be chartered to help the Grand Trunk Pacific Company. It runs through a pretty good piece of agricultural and timbered area, and I hope my hon. friend will not insist on cutting that out.

Mr. SPROULE. Who owns these charters now ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am told the Canadian Northern have control of it now.

To the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company (or to the Canada Central Railway Company with the consent of the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company, and subject to the approval of the Governor in Council), for the following lines of railway :

(a) from a point on the said line of railway, between Little Current and Sudbury, westerly towards the Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway; not exceeding 100 miles;

(b) from Little Current thence crossing the Canadian Pacific Railway, at or near Stanley, and thence to Sudbury; not exceeding 64 miles;

(c) from a point at or near Sudbury, northerly; not exceeding 30 miles;

the said subsidies being granted in lieu of the subsidies granted by chapter 43 of 1906, section 1, item 1; not exceeding in all 194 miles.

Mr. GRAHAM. This runs through the districts of Manitoulin, Algoma and Nipissing, in the counties of Grey and Bruce. What we call the Soo interests own this. It runs through a part of Ontario where a road is needed, and where everything ought to be done to get it constructed.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. How much of it is built ?

Mr. GRAHAM. There are 16½ miles built and in operation between Sudbury and Little Current. It has a Dominion charter. The Ontario charter has lapsed, and a new charter was given by the Dominion in 1900.

Mr. SPROULE. This subsidy covers the distance from Manitoulin island towards Sudbury. The people in that country were anxious to get some assistance to build a railway down the island. Is any provision made whereby any portion of this subsidy will go for that purpose ?

Mr. GRAHAM. The charter covers Manitoulin island. There were some deputations down here concerning that, I do not know what arrangement was come to. Originally the idea was to give railway facilities on the island as well as northward. This is a revote of what the company had before. They have not done much construction.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

For a line of railway from a point on the Intercolonial Railway at or near Dartmouth, in the county of Halifax, to a point at or near Deans Settlement, in the county of Halifax, in lieu in part of the subsidy granted by chapter 43 of 1906, section 1, item 5; not exceeding 80 miles.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I thought the Minister of Railways and Canals was going to give some information as to the liabilities against these railways.

Mr. GRAHAM. The liabilities I was trying to get was not against these railways, but against the Canadian Northern.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. The two roads.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will be able to give it when we come to the Bill.

To the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway Company, for a line of railway from Chaudière junction to a point at or near the international boundary, in lieu of the subsidies granted by chapter 7 of 1901, section 2, item 25, for 18 miles; not exceeding 80 miles.

Mr. MORIN. I know the country through which this road is to go, and I am not able to understand what this vote means. This road starts from the Chaudière junction,

or Chaudière curve, and will the minister say where it is going? It says 'to a point at or near the international boundary.'

Mr. GRAHAM. The point is not designated in the application. The route had to be changed. As a matter of fact, the Grand Trunk Pacific took a part of this company's line. The mileage is reduced by some 18 miles as compared with the old grant. This is a revote, and it was put in simply to a point on the international boundary. They do not seem to have given me the point. In discussing that with them they said that they wanted to go in as direct a line as they could, but they did not want to be tied up to a particular point. That is the explanation.

Mr. MORIN. Well, it is a pretty poor explanation. They can strike the boundary line at Lake Pohenegamook or they can strike it westward about 200 miles. To what place do they intend to go? The minister does not know the country as well as I do. West of Lake Pohenegamook the whole country is wooded. There is no town, village or settlement. Why should they run the road to the boundary line?

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. The idea is to make as direct a line as possible to St. John to get to an ocean port.

Mr. MORIN. That is a reply but not an answer. Mr. Costigan who got this charter knows all about the direction of the road and he wants this road to connect with a road at Connors. That road comes up the St. John river, then up the St. Francis river, then to Lake Pohenegamook and thence westward. The government has a road at Lake Pohenegamook in the Transcontinental, and what is the use of building another road from the lake to Quebec? The Quebec Central is building a road there also.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is not a new vote; the only difference is that we are reducing the mileage.

Mr. J. D. REID. When was this subsidy granted ?

Mr. GRAHAM. In 1901 I think.

Mr. J. D. REID. The charter has been hanging round for seven years with a subsidy and yet nothing has been done, while in the meantime the Transcontinental and the Quebec Central are going through the city. If the minister would change this subsidy and give it to the line between Brockville and Ottawa he would be acting more in the interests of the country.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This compaany was promoted by the Hon. Mr. Costigan and the charter was from Quebec down into the St. John valley, New Brunswick. The road was subsidized by the province of Quebec and also by the province of New Brunswick and through the efforts of Mr. Costigan a company spent a considerable sum of money grading the road in the province of New Brunswick from Connors up to the Quebec boundary. The route authorized in the charter was taken up by the Transcontinental and Mr. Costigan while he felt aggrieved did not make any kick about it. During the present session the charter has been changed so as to allow this road to take a more southerly route and get away from the Transcontinental. This is a revote of the subsidy for the line in the province of Quebec, leaving the subsidy in New Brunswick as it was voted last session.

Mr. HAGGART. It was originally intended that the road promoted by Mr. Costigan should be built up by the little St. Francis river, but the Transcontinental adopted that route and this vote is for the purpose of subsidizing a new road towards the state of Maine. What my hon. friend (Mr. Morin) objects to is that you make the objective point at the Chaudière Junction and that there are 200 miles along the boundary of the State of Maine that they can make the objective point at the other end of the line. He wants to know definitely what point the line will go to in the state of Maine and why it is to go there.

Mr. J. D. REID. This is simply a charter to be hawked around with the idea of making money for Mr. Costigan. He had a subsidy grant some years ago when he was not able to do anything about it. Mr. Costigan has no intention of building the road at all but simply to see if he can make money out of it by selling the charter. I do not object if it is for the purpose of opening up new territory where the people must have railway communication, but to charter this railway to run to any point they wish in the state of Maine is just simply to give them a chance to speculate. The Minister of Railways is not doing the country any service by granting such a subsidy as this.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Those who know the Hon. Mr. Costigan will not say that he is a man who gets railway charters for the purpose of speculating in them. Mr. Costigan has devoted a great deal of time and energy to the development of the northern part of New Brunswick and for a number of years he worked unselfishly in connection with this road. He succeeded in getting people to commence the construction of it and they have spent a good deal of money. If Mr. Costigan did not succeed in having matters go through as he had reason to believe they would, he would be in this position—so he tells me and I have no doubt at all it is true—that this company would lose a good many thous-

and dollars which they have put into the construction of the road. All Mr. Costigan wants, so he informs me, and all he would get would be to have the men who have done the work honestly in the building of the road so far as it has been constructed, paid for the work they have done.

Mr. J. D. REID. The minister states there is nothing done.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In New Brunswick they have built some of it. It is all one undertaking, the part in New Brunswick and the part in Quebec. Construction work has been commenced on the New Brunswick portion. For that the subsidy was renewed at the last session. The subsidy for the remainder has lapsed, and Mr. Costigan is seeking to have it renewed for the part that is in Quebec.

Mr. J. D. REID. I understand that the line as laid by the company has been taken by the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That has diverted it a little to the south.

Mr. J. D. REID. This gives another line.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is quite a long distance away.

Mr. J. D. REID. How much is built and in operation in New Brunswick ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is not in operation. Mr. Costigan informed me that several miles have been graded, a good many thousand dollars spent on it ; work has been done by a firm of contractors in Montreal.

Mr. J. D. REID. I have seen cases where they simply do two or three miles of grading and that holds the subsidy.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is several miles.

Mr. J. D. REID. It is a queer method to bring in a subsidy for a line which they cannot locate within 200 miles. It is absurd and ridiculous to ask for a subsidy with such an explanation as the minister has given and I am sure the people of this country do not wish to have money spent in this way.

Mr. BARKER. Is the proposition to grant a subsidy for about 80 miles easterly from Chaudière to Kamouraska ?

Mr. GRAHAM. It has been reduced to 62 miles.

Mr. BARKER. Is the line shown on the map the 62 or the 80 miles ?

Mr. GRAHAM. That map was possibly arranged with the 80 miles. I cannot say positively.

Mr. BARKER. It was stated that 45 miles had already been granted, as I understand the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Morin) the line does not appear to run anywhere near Lac Pohenegamook. Is it intended to stop 60 miles from that point, and how far is the red line on the map north or south of the Transcontinental Railway ?

Mr. MORIN. The location of this road is clearly wrong. It would be quite right to build a road from Lac Pohenegamook down to Connor's but there is no sense in building a road from Chaudière where you have the Grand Trunk Pacific, the Intercolonial and the Quebec Central. It is proposed to run from Chaudière to the state of Maine but no point is mentioned. I do not wish to object to the road being built in the least but some explanation should be given.

Mr. J. D. REID. I do not think it right to give a subsidy for a line 200 miles along the frontier. Let them have their line surveyed and then ask for this.

Mr. GRAHAM. That argument would have been all right in the committee where this was all threshed out. It was explained that the road when it got to the International boundary intended to make a connection if possible with some other road, but they did not want to name absolutely the point because they could not say where the American road would meet them.

Mr. J. D. REID. That argument was absurd. When we give a charter in the Railway Committee it does not mean that we are granting a subsidy.

Mr. GRAHAM. No.

Mr. J. D. REID. That is your argument. If the minister had told us he was granting a subsidy we would have taken care to know where the line was to run. It will be only three or four months until the next session and when they have located their line they might come to us.

Mr. BARKER. Looking at the map produced, it would appear that the Transcontinental cannot be more than a mile from this road, and it is an absurdity after building the Transcontinental to subsidize a private road from Chaudière to Kamouraska, almost alongside of it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It seems to me that those of us who are more especially interested in the development that will be brought about by this road if it is built, may be supposed to know what the result of the construction of the road will be. My hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Daniel) knows that for very many years, in fact ever since railway construction began in Canada, the people along the valley of the St. John have been pleading for the construction of a line of railway through that valley. We have extending along the St. John river from away up above Grand Falls right down to the city of St. John, one of the most fertile and best sections of country to be found in the Dominion. Years ago, when the Intercolonial Railway was projected, many thought that

that line would follow the valley of the St. John ; but for reasons I need not go into, the line was carried along the north shore of New Brunswick and the people of the St. John valley were left without a railway. Later on came up the question of the Transcontinental, and the people again had their hopes aroused. They thought that road might be built along their fertile valley, but after the surveys were made the road was located back from the river, so that after you leave Grand Falls it does not touch the St. John at any point but goes through the centre of the province. So eager are the people of the valley for the construction of this line that during the last session of the provincial legislature, the members upon both sides united in supporting the government proposal to guarantee the bonds of any railway company, which might become a part of a trunk line system, to the extent of $15,000 per mile. That idea was supported by all the members of the legislature on both sides and received general support among the people. As I understand the proposition of the gentlemen who, with Mr. Costigan, are promoting this charter and asking for this subsidy. is that they will carry their line from the Chaudière Junction near Quebec, cross the international boundary and go through the state of Maine at its northern part, where it is comparatively narrow, instead of going up around the angle of the St. Francis river in the province of New Brunswick. It will cross the northern part of the state of Maine and connect there with a road down the St. John valley and make this road a part of the St. John valley system. I do not know whether that can be carried out ; but I would say that if the line, as these gentlemen are proposing to have it constructed, is constructed to a point on the St. John in the vicinity of Grand Falls, it will give a great impetus to the construction of a line down the St. John valley. If it does not form part of such a through scheme, it will never be built because capitalists will not put their money into a local line. If built as a through scheme, it will be of enormous advantage to a country 290 miles in extent and one of the most fertile portions of Canada and which is to-day without the railway facilities enjoyed by most of the older sections of the Dominion.

Mr. BARKER. I have listened patiently to the hon. minister. He has not said one word relating to the subsidy. He has given us a description of the country down about St. John at the other end of this line, but he might as well have told us how you would run the Transcontinental through British Columbia by describing a section of it in New Brunswick. This 62 miles is to run not from St. John to this point, but from the Chaudière at Quebec easterly.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Towards the St. John river.

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. BARKER. But only as far as Kamouraska. We are speaking only of 62 miles and not of all the way to St. John river. Your line may be an admirable way to reach the St. John valley, but there is no necessity for the Dominion bonusing 62 miles of road from the Chaudière to the international boundary. Any gentleman who looks at the map will see that this line must run within two or three miles at the most from the Transcontinental, and it is not absurd to say that after building the Transcontinental, which could join with the line down to the St. John that my hon. friend speaks of, we should subsidize another line from the Chaudière running alongside the Transcontinental for 62 miles.

Mr. HAGGART. The difficulty could be got over in this way. Suppose you give a subsidy to a line from the Chaudière Junction to the state of Maine to connect with a road which connects with the St. Francis road running to Grand Falls down the St. Francis river, and then we will know the direction of this road. Instead of going around on the line of the Transcontinental, the parties evidently want to go to the state of Maine and make a short cut over to the line which they are at present constructing on the River St. Francis towards the Dominion.

For a line of railway from Tusket Wedge to a point on the Halifax Southwestern Railway at or near Riverdale station; not exceeding 8 miles.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is a branch of the main line to Sussex village owned by the Halifax and Southwestern Railway Company.

To the Halifax and Southwestern Railway Company, for a line of railway from Lunenburg to Bridgewater, via Upper Lahave; not exceeding 12 miles.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is to connect Lunenburg with Bridgewater.

To the Erie, London and Tilsonburg Railway Company, for a line of railway from Port Burwell to London, not exceeding 35 miles.

Mr. BEATTIE. Knowing that district as well as I do, I would like to give the minister a little information. There is a railway already built from Port Burwell to Tilsonburg. Is it proposed to extend this into London ? Do they propose a new line from Port Burwell to London ? Port Burwell is sixteen miles from Port Stanley and there is a road from Port Stanley to London. Should there be a line between Port Burwell and London, these two lines will not be more than eight miles apart. That district is well supplied already with railway facilities by the Grand Trunk Railway, the Canada Southern and the Wabash line. The city of London and the county of Middlesex built a railway at their own expense many years ago, and I think it is hardly fair to

grant a bonus to a line which will be an opposition line to the London and Port Stanley Railway. If a company want to build a line to parallel that, they should be compelled to do it at their own expense. It is hardly fair to the city of London and the county of Middlesex, to have that line paralleled by another line bonused by this country. I hope the minister will look into the matter. The line from Port Burwell already built has been running for years into Ingersoll. The company were not able to run it, their cars were a disgrace, and they had to turn it over to the Canadian Pacific Railway to run it for them. To make an extension from Tilsonburg into London will simply parallel the London and Port Stanley Railway.

Mr. EMMERSON. What distance from Tilsonburg to London ?

Mr. BEATTIE. Some twenty-five miles. They are not going to build a line from Port Burwell to Tilsonburg when they have one built and one which they could not maintain and had to turn over to the Canadian Pacific Railway who are now running it. I do not want to move, but I call the attention of the minister and would like him to look into this matter before granting a bonus.

Mr. GRAHAM. In raising the objection that this will give competition, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Beattie) does not agree with the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) who said that the main object of giving a subsidy was to bring competition.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister is misrepresenting me. I said that the reason assigned in many instances for these subsidies was that they would be the means of building railways that would give competition, but sometimes these subsidized roads transferred their interests, perhaps to the very same railways with which they were supposed to be competitors.

Mr. BEATTIE. If there was any necessity for this road I would not say a word. Competition is well enough, but I do not see why the Dominion should help them to build another railway to compete with one built by the people of the locality with their own money.

Mr. J. D. REID. On what ground is this subsidy granted?

Mr. GRAHAM. The representations were as follows : The charter is from Port Burwell to London, with a branch to Tilsonburg.

Mr. BEATTIE. The line is already built from Port Burwell to Tilsonburg.

Mr. GRAHAM. From Port Burwell to London, and London to Tilsonburg. But the proposed subsidy is from Port Burwell to London.

Mr. BEATTIE. Tilsonburg comes in between.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is not on the line.

Mr. BEATTIE. Then you are going to run three lines eight miles apart.

Mr. GRAHAM. The representation made to me by prominent men not connected with the road at all were that at present facilities are not afforded them to get in their coal supply which comes across the lake at that point. It is represented strongly, and the figures show, that if there was another road from Port Burwell to London with facilities for bringing coal across the lake that part of Western Ontario would save a large amount on the price of coal that must now come around by the bridge.

Mr. BEATTIE. I am sorry that these prominent gentlemen have been deceiving the minister so badly. At Port Stanley we have had a car ferry that brings coal from Conneaut, and it has been running for years, long before they thought of having a car ferry at Port Burwell. The Grand Trunk, the Père Marquette and other railways get their coal supplies in that way. The coal supply for London and district does not come by the bridge. As to building a branch railway from Port Burwell to London, the thing is a farce. Perhaps they might run a branch from Tilsonburg to London, but they are not going to build a railway to Port Burwell, a place with 25 inhabitants and no trade.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. I am surprised to hear the manner in which the hon. member for London (Mr. Beattie) speaks of running a railway from Port Burwell to London by way of Tilsonburg. This railroad is intended to run from Port Burwell through the township of Malahide, through the town of Aylmer and Belmont into London. The charter was held for an electric railroad by a party living in Aylmer. Some years ago he asked for tenders for the construction of the road. I have been over the route. The holder of the charter was not able to finance the scheme. Since I became a member of the House another corporation have come to the House and got a charter for this road and propose to build the railway. Instead of being in opposition to the Port Stanley road, it will bring more trade into London. Port Stanley and Port Burwell are eighteen miles apart on the lake shore. From London to Port Stanley is twenty miles, from Port Stanley to Port Burwell eighteen miles and—

Mr. BEATTIE. Sixteen miles, if you please.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. And completing the triangle from Port Burwell to Aylmer is thirteen miles and from Aylmer to London through Belmont would make up the distance, 35 miles. It cannot be a competing road with the other, but would make a lot

of traffic tributary to London, besides giving the people of Port Burwell another outlet. If people wish to put money into a thing of this kind, if they come from the United States or England and put their money in and develop business, surely we should not object to that. It is enterprise such as this that has built London and all the other towns of this country.

Mr. BEATTIE. I do not wish to take up the time of the committee, but I wish to say that the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. J. T. Schell) does not know what he is talking about. Aylmer is twelve miles from St. Thomas. The existing road, with which this one, I contend, would compete, was built with the money of the city of London and Middlesex county, and the debt is about $2,000,000. These people propose to build a railway in opposition to that, when the road they have built to Tilsonburg could not be run—it was a disgrace to the country, running with a baggage car and an engine. It was handed over to the Canadian Pacific Railway who took it in order to get in their coal that way. But coal in cars has been brought across Lake Erie from Conneaut to Port Stanley long before a car ferry at Port Burwell was thought of. If the minister will look into the matter I shall be satisfied. I have no objection to the road being built, but I do not think the Dominion should give it a bonus.

For a line of railway from a point on the Canadian Pacific Railway at or near Plaster rock to Riley brook; not exceeding 28 miles.

Mr. HAGGART. Does this line to Plaster Rock run cars?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. Once a week, I suppose?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Daily. The Canadian Pacific Railway are operating it and doing it very successfully.

Mr. EMMERSON. Making money.

To the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company, for a line of railway from a point near French creek to the village of Sandwich, not exceeding 41 miles; and for a line of railway from the village of Sandwich to Campbell river, not exceeding 38 miles; not exceeding in all 79 miles.

Mr. HAGGART. Does the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway ask for this?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, they are giving a subsidy.

For a line of railway from a point at or near Cowley, in Alberta, to a point on Highwood river; not exceeding 50 miles.

Mr. GRAHAM. I move to insert at the beginning of the item: 'To the Southern Central Pacific Railway.'

Mr. D. T. SCHELL.

Mr. HERRON. I wish to say to the minister that I believe there are two charters over the same ground. The charter which is in existence is almost ready to expire, it has been in existence for a number of years, and there has been no work done. Another company has made application, but it has received no charter. It is ready to begin operations just as soon as they can get assistance; perhaps they will without assistance. I think it is fair to say that if the new company is willing to build that road, it should get the same assistance, provided the old company is not going on.

Mr. GRAHAM. This being the company that had the original charter, and the other company not having a charter, we thought the proper thing to do was to give the subsidy to the company having the old charter. If they do not make progress, we will be in a position to do something when it comes up again.

Mr. HERRON. I believe the charter is just about expiring; provided it is, I hope the minister will give full consideration to this new company, because a road is very badly needed in that particular part of the country.

To the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company, for the following lines of railway:

(a) from Valcartier station to St. Catherine; not exceeding 3·8 miles;

(b) from Valcartier station towards Gosford; not exceeding 5½ miles.

(c) from the end of the 35th mile of the branch to LaTuque, on the River St. Maurice, to LaTuque falls; not exceeding 5 miles;

(d) from LaTuque falls to the mouth of the River Croche; not exceeding 5 miles;

(e) from point on LaTuque branch to the steamboat landing near LaTuque; not exceeding 1·6 miles; not exceeding in all 20·9 miles.

Mr. HAGGART. Is any portion of this road already built?

Mr. GRAHAM. These are all small branches. I am told none of them are built.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. None of these are built, but the main branch from Lake St. John road to La Tuque is built, some 25 miles, finished this spring. The main line is building these short branches. From the terminus of that line down to La Tuque none of them are built.

For a line of railway from Montreal to a point on the National Transcontinental Railway; not exceeding 200 miles.

Mr. HAGGART. How is it that you give a subsidy for the purpose of connecting the National Transcontinental Railway with the Northern Railway at Montreal when there is no subsidy to the Ontario people, who are building their own road? Why are they not as much entitled to it as the Quebec people?

Mr. GRAHAM. There is a subsidy given to a company road to be built from Port

Arthur and Fort William to Sault Ste. Marie, about the same distance as this, and this is given to a company in Montreal. It has been the policy of the government not to give aid to the Ontario government railway.

Mr. KEMP. That is what my hon. friend from Lanark refers to. He refers to the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway, the Ontario government road running north to North Bay. Is there anything in the subsidies for that road ? I understand that the Ontario government applied for a subsidy for that road.

Mr. GRAHAM. I said it was not the policy of the Dominion government to aid the line of the Ontario government.

Mr. KEMP. Why not?

Mr. GRAHAM. That will open up a large question of policy.

Mr. HAGGART. The Quebec government may do this. This is for a line of railway, not to any particular company. They may make arrangements with the Quebec government to build it. You give it to the Quebec government, and you refuse the application of the Ontario government.

Mr. GRAHAM. The Ontario government have not made any application.

Mr. HAGGART. You cannot give it to the Quebec government under this vote.

Mr. FIELDING. This application was made some years ago by the late Quebec government, and it was not thought to be a wise policy at that time to assist local governments, if they wanted to build railroads, to come to the federal government for subsidies. The conclusion was reached several years ago when the application was made by the former government of Ontario.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I might call my hon. friend's attention to section 5 by which he will see that this subsidy must be given to a company.

Mr. SPROULE. The government are prepared to give substantial subsidies to connect cities in Quebec with the Transcontinental Railway, but when we reach Ontario they are not prepared to give a dollar.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Port Arthur is in Ontario.

Mr. SPROULE. It is not a city. The city of Toronto should be connected with the Transcontinental Railway in the same way as Montreal and Quebec are to be. Here is a subsidy given to one province for two hundred miles of railway to connect a great city with the Transcontinental Railway, but when you come into the province of Ontario it can get no subsidy. There is a discrimination in favour of one province as against the other.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Look at section 62.

Mr. SPROULE. I am dealing with 49. It is enough at one time. That is the situation and that is something that will appeal to the people of Ontario as being unfair, because an application was made for a subsidy to assist in connecting the southern portion of Ontario and the city of Toronto with the Transcontinental Railway, and as far as we know, it was refused. At any rate, there was no assistance given, but in this case we give assistance towards the construction of two hundred miles of railway in the province of Quebec.

Mr. HAGGART. The Minister of Public Works drew my attention to clause 5. Does that provide that you cannot give a subsidy to a government?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It must be to a company or companies. The Governor in Council could not give a subsidy under this Act to any other than a company.

Mr. GERVAIS. I would like to know from the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) the name of the company that is to get this subsidy for building two hundred miles of railway between Montreal and the Transcontinental Railway.

Mr. GRAHAM. The name is not given here. As in a great many votes, the company is not named. My hon. friend will remember that a very large deputation from Montreal, perhaps as large a deputation, with the exception of that on the Georgian Bay canal, as any of those which have waited upon us this year, waited on the government some few weeks ago urging what, to my mind, was a very reasonable request, that there should be some provision made for connecting Montreal with the main line of the Transcontinental Railway. It was taken into consideration. Unless it be the Grand Trunk Pacific branch lines company I do not know what company would undertake this work. We do not name the company, but we will give the bonus to the company that will build this two hundred miles.

Mr. GERVAIS. No individual without the authorization of the central legislative power can build a railway in this country under the present state of legislation. The company must be organized with power given to it by this parliament or a provincial legislature to build a railway and I would like to know if it is the intention of the government to grant that subsidy to the first company which is ready to build the branch line from Montreal to the Grand Trunk Pacific. Montreal has been waiting for four years for the building of such a railroad, that is already too much. In Montreal, we have been prevented from having anything to do with the building of the Transcontinental Railway though Montreal will pay more that any other city for such construction. I am quite ready to support this vote for the building of a branch line

between Montreal and the Transcontinental Railway, but I would like to know if this subsidy is to be paid to any individual who is ready to organize a company to build the branch line or if it is to be paid to a company already organized. I would like to know if the Canada Central Railway Company or some other company I heard something about is to get this subsidy. Is it the policy of the government to pay over the subsidy to any individual or company who will first undertake and operate the construction of this branch line?

Mr. GRAHAM. The policy of the government is to give the bonus to the first company that will show us that it is ready and able to build a line connecting Montreal with the Transcontinental Railway.

Mr. GERVAIS. Have conditions been laid down under which the subsidy can be earned?

Mr. GRAHAM. There are the usual conditions. They have to make a contract with the Department of Railways and Canals which is approved by order in council. They will have to show their willingness, and, in our best judgment, their ability and we will make a contract with them to give them the subsidy for the building of that line.

Mr. GERVAIS. Then the government is not already obliged to pay the subsidy except to a company which is ready to build and operate this railway according to law?

Mr. GRAHAM. We are not committed to any person.

Mr. HAGGART. If I remember rightly the Ontario government are building their line of railway under the name of the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway Company.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, not company; they are building it under the commissioners.

Mr. BRISTOL. No, it is a company.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not a company; it is a government owned road.

To the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, for branch lines of railway from the line of the National Transcontinental Railway to Port Arthur and Fort William; not exceeding 220 miles.

Mr. MACPHERSON. This is the province of Ontario.

Mr. HAGGART. Have you an agreement with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway to build this without any subsidy?

For a line of railway from Papineauville on the Canadian Pacific Railway towards Nomingue; not exceeding 30 miles.

Mr. MAJOR. This subsidy should read: To the Little Nation River Railway Company.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Major) points out that there is a company organized but that the minister did not get the application when the subsidy was decided on.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Has it a charter?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is it a Dominion or provincial charter?

Mr. LEMIEUX. A provincial charter.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought it was not the policy of the government to subsidize provincial railways.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That's a new idea.

Mr. EMMERSON. That has been done for the last twenty years.

Resolution as amended agreed to.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of the lines subsidized from No. 27 to No. 72 both included, how many have already been constructed or partially constructed?

Mr. GRAHAM. I cannot tell without going through all these papers again.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. On the second reading of the Bill and before committee, I will expect the hon. gentleman to give definite information on that point. I would like him to lay on the table also the applications from those several railway companies or corporations for the assistance now given.

Mr. GRAHAM. I laid those on the table this morning.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. They should be on the table for at least a week or ten days so that they may be examined by any one who desires. To put them on the table half an hour before the subsidies are taken up is not sufficient.

Mr. GRAHAM. The mileage in operation and the mileage under construction will be found on the application forms.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like it stated on the second reading because it is a matter the minister should furnish to the committee without a suggestion by any member.

Mr. GRAHAM. I did suggest it, in every application.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the use of talking of an application which was placed on the table of the House only to-day when every one was busy with the work of the House, what is the use of speaking of that as information?

Mr. GRAHAM. I will look through the applications and secure the information.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is not the proposed line from Quebec to Ottawa, that is the portion from Hawkesbury to Ottawa, almost constructed?

Mr. GRAHAM. A portion of that line is graded, there are no rails on it, no part of it is completed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Was it commenced under any engagement from the government that it would be subsidized ?

Mr. GRAHAM. None whatever, so far as I know.

Mr. HAGGART. In reference to the power of the government to give a subsidy to the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway Commission, let me quote from the Act constituting that body. It says :

The said board of commissioners shall be a body corporate under the name of the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Commission—

They have all the powers of a railway company, to work the road and everything else. It is provided here that the Governor in Council 'may grant subsidies to such companies as establish to the satisfaction of the Governor General.' This is a body corporate and would come under this definition.

Mr. EMMERSON. Is it not the property of the Crown ?

Mr. HAGGART. It is a body corporate and it does not matter to whom it belongs. You could change the wording to 'body corporate' if you chose.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister might give us at a convenient time a statement showing how much of these subsidies and which of them will go to each of the three large railways in Canada.

Mr. GRAHAM. I shall try to do that. It is not sometimes easy as they are sometimes for a large company although under another name.

To the Canadian Pacific Railway Company (lessees of the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company), towards the construction and completion of a bridge over the Saskatchewan river connecting Strathcona and Edmonton, 15 per cent upon the amount expended thereon; not exceeding $100,000.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Has the minister taken any steps to make this a combination wagon and railway bridge which it readily conceded to be advisable to do with such bridges ?

Mr. GRAHAM. The government has not taken any steps in that direction, but I understand some arrangement has been made between the provincial authorities and the company to provide for traffic on this bridge.

Mr. SPROULE. I see there is provision for that in one of the Quebec bridges and it would seem to be equally good policy in Alberta.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Of course in the Northwest this government has charge of the land and the provinces have not land to sell as in the east to raise money to build bridges. At Fort Saskatchewan the government required the Canadian Northern Northern Railway to have a traffic bridge and it is a perfect boon to the place.

To the Quebec, Montreal and Southern Railway Company, towards the construction and completion of the following railway bridges:

(a) bridge across the Gentilly river, $15,000.

(b) bridge across the Becancourt river, $30,000.

(c) bridge across the Richelieu river, $30,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What are these bridges supposed to cost ? We are giving lump sums for small bridges and it seems doubtful policy.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The bridges are in the county of Nicolet which I represented at the beginning of this parliament. These are large rivers and this represents about 15 per cent of the cost of the bridges. The railway is the Quebec, Montreal and Southern, but although it is operated under that name I think the company has transferred its interest to the Delaware and Hudson which will run now from the boundary line to Quebec on the south shore, the railway nearest to the St. Lawrence. It has practically built from Montreal to Ste Philomène in the county of Lotbiniere and is going on with the construction from Ste. Philomène to Lévis It is a first-class road doing its work extremely well, and as I said this represents about 15 per cent of the cost.

Mr. HAGGART. That bridge across the Richelieu is an old friend of ours.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend is referring to the Yamaska river. This bridge is on the Richelieu.

To the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway Company, towards the construction and completion of the twenty-six railway bridges on its line of railway from Paspebiac to Gaspé, payable upon the completion of the said line of railway between the said points, $250,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX. This is in my constituency. It is a very exceptional case. For many years past the peninsula of Gaspé has been clamouring for the construction of a railway to Gaspé from New Carlisle, the terminus of the Atlantic and Lake Superior. One hundred miles is built between Metapedia and New Carlisle. In 1903 I secured a charter for this railway from New Carlisle to Gaspé Basin, about 102 miles. The new company has built 20 miles which are in operation and 20 miles further will be in operation the 1st November next. It is a very rugged section of country. They were obliged to follow the shore and cross twenty-five rivers from Paspebiac to Gaspé Basin. They obtained the ordinary subsidy, but with these twenty-six bridges they were entitled to a special subsidy. This will insure the construction of the line in about

twelve months from now. There is a tunnel also of 230 feet which they have to build.

Mr. SPROULE. This is a strange way of subsidizing bridges. We take a whole line of railway, we do not know what the bridges are going to cost, some of them may not be very costly, they may be only small bridges crossing small streams, there may be others larger, but we count up all the bridges on a line of railway 200 miles long and we give the company $250,000. We subsidize in one breath twenty-six bridges without knowing whether they are expensive or inexpensive to build. In other cases when applications are made for subsidies to build bridges, each bridge is considered on its individual merits but not so in this matter. How do we know how many of these bridges come within the principle we have laid down which justifies our subsidizing bridges at all?

Mr. LEMIEUX. There are twenty-six bridges. One was built since the line was started.

Mr. SPROULE. Was that subsidized ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Not specially, only the ordinary subsidy. If we followed the ordinary principle of allowing 15 per cent on the cost of construction, four bridges alone would take the amount mentioned in the resolution, $250,000—the bridges across the St. John river, the Grand river, the Pabos and Little river. If you take the cost of construction of those four bridges alone, the 15 per cent on that would amount to the $250,000 now granted.

On those four large bridges the Quebec government also promised a subsidy, provided they would be made suitable for vehicles to cross. That condition is attached by the Quebec government to the special subsidy they are giving. This is a section of country where railway construction is badly needed and where the company have shown good reason why the government should help them, because with the ordinary subsidy they have gone to work and built an excellent line some twenty miles long and twenty more will be built by the 1st November next, and by the 1st November the year following the whole line will be in operation.

Mr. SPROULE. I suppose this line of railway is subsidized.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The ordinary subsidy.

Mr. SPROULE. We are establishing a dangerous precedent. Every one of these railway companies will consider itself warranted in coming back to the government and saying: Treat us as you have done the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway Company. You have subsidized our railway line first, and now you should subsidize our bridges. Give us proportionately the same assistance for the erection of these bridges that you gave the other railway company. The government are establishing a bad precedent which will give trouble in the future.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Let me show my hon. friend what the company is accomplishing which entitles it to a special subsidy. This company was subsidized to build a railway from Paspebiac to Gaspé basin and thence a railway through the interior, from Gaspé basin to Causapscal in the county of Bonaventure. In order to obtain this special subsidy for bridges, it has abandoned the subsidies allowed for that line from Gaspé basin to Causapscal because the government could not grant a subsidy on that interior line plus the $250,000 for bridges. As the settled parts of the country have to be served before the wilderness, the company have abandoned the construction of the line through the interior for the time being, although their charter still holds good.

Mr. SPROULE. That does not touch the point I raised. You first subsidize the railway and then you take all the bridges in a group and subsidize them to the tune of a quarter of a million dollars. This will establish a very bad precedent. Other railway companies with equal propriety, can come and ask that the same thing be done for them.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I can assure my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) that in the whole list of railways that are subsidized especially for bridges, there is no case identical with this. There are twenty-six bridges of which at least four are very large bridges and going to cost more than a million on a line of about a hundred miles. There is not a similar case in the whole railway construction of Canada.

Mr. BARKER. When we grant a round sum per mile for a railway, does not that include the bridges ? If you pay $15,000 a mile, that is for the whole railway, bridges and everything else.

To the Interprovincial Railway Bridge Company of New Brunswick, towards the construction and completion of a railway bridge over the Restigouche river from Campbellton to Mission point, $160,000.

Mr. HAGGART. What is that bridge to cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Between $650,000 and $750,000. The Deputy Minister of Railways reports something over $650,000.

To the Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Railway Company, towards the construction and completion of a railway bridge across Burrard inlet, $200,000.

Mr. HAGGART. What will be the cost of this bridge ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think the estimate is about a million and a quarter.

On section 3—definition of the expression 'cost.'

Mr. SPROULE. This partially answers the question asked of the hon. member for East Hamilton (Mr. Barker)—if you subsidize the railway does not that include the bridges ? This says :

Unless the context otherwise requires, the expression 'cost' means the actual, necessary and reasonable cost, and shall include the amount expended upon any bridge up to and not exceeding $25,000.

So, you first subsidize the railway at $3,200 a mile, or more if the expense of construction calls for it, this subsidy including the bridges, and then you subsidize the bridges again.

Mr. GRAHAM. No doubt, special cases are made by the government to meet special conditions. Some years ago the policy seems to have been adopted of paying 15 per cent on a bridge, and that seems to be about the usual percentage paid on these large bridges. But special cases are made out year after year.

Mr. HAGGART. These other sections are without change ?

Mr. GRAHAM. They are taken word for word from the existing statute.

Mr. LAKE. What is meant by the completion of a subsidized railway ? Does it mean that the railway is absolutely completed and ready for the running of trains ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I believe that sometimes subsidies are given on 10-mile sections. The road must be completed up to a certain standard and examined by the engineer of the department. He gives his certificate that the road is so constructed and we pay on that.

Mr. LAKE. I have been asking with regard to a portion of the Canadian Northern between Erwood and the Pas Mission on which a subsidy of land is given. The Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) promised to give me the report of the engineer who visited the line. He gave me one this morning, but it is not the one I referred to. This was made in February when the railway was under a foot of snow. I would ask the minister if he cannot bring down the report of the engineer sent to inspect the line last fall.

Mr. GRAHAM. The report I gave the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lake) is the only one I know of.

Mr. LAKE. Another inspection was made. The engineer told me he had been over the line and gave me a graphic description of it. I think that was in October. No doubt he made a report, and that is what I wanted.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will look into it and see if there is another report. When I came across this one I thought it was the one the hon. gentleman wished to see.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) I propose :

That paragraph 4 be amended by adding after subsection (d) the following additional subsection as subsection (e):

Henceforth, no such subsidy shall be paid for any railway to any railway company, unless such company or companies provide for a proper and gratuitous roadway for vehicles as well as for foot-passengers on those bridges, the plans and specifications for such construction to be submitted to the Governor in Council, for approbation.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to speak at any length. I think the time has come when the government should inaugurate a new railway policy. This evening, we have voted over five hundred thousand dollars in aid to the construction of railway bridges. Why not provide that railway companies shall build those bridges in such a way as to afford a roadway for foot passengers and for vehicles? Have not those companies received large enough subsidies from the public exchequer, and consequently are we not entitled to stipulate in return those advantages in favour of the public? I do not wish to add anything further on the question, but it seems to me that it is sufficient to call the attention of the government to the matter to induce them to make the change asked for. I have no doubt that my proposal will meet with a favourable reception at the hands of the government.

Mr. GRAHAM. There are two difficulties. First, my hon. friend moves an amendment that no subsidy shall be paid for these railway bridges unless they place a gratuitous passage way for vehicles as well as foot passengers. Does not my hon. friend see that four out of five of these bridges will be where there are no roads, and possibly no foot passengers ? You would not want a roadway for vehicles where there is no roadway.

Mr. LEONARD. As soon as the bridge is built the road would be constructed to the bridge. If the company are obliged to build a passage way for vehicles, they can build it cheaper when they are building the bridge in the first place, than if they add the passage way afterwards. It will cost them twice as much to add the passageway as it would to build it with the bridge in the beginning.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am not forgetting that engineering point. What my hon. friend says about cheapness will not always work out. I had the engineers on that problem the other day, and I found that a bridge could be built with a roadway much cheaper than a roadway could be added to a railway bridge. But that difficulty does exist in some places. No doubt a roadway over a bridge would be very convenient and altogether desirable. But I make the

statement again, that in at least seventy-five per cent of the railway bridges of Canada, there would be no need for a roadway for foot passengers, because the bridges are away from a road altogether. Then there is the other objection. It is a fair and reasonable objection that the Dominion government cannot well undertake to start in providing roadways. That is purely a municipal or a provincial affair. While I would be delighted to see them on every bridge, still it is a matter with which the province alone ought to deal with the corporation.

Mr. MONK. I think my hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Léonard) has made a most important suggestion, and I had hoped that the government would adopt it. We are paying—I am speaking now principally for the province of Quebec—large subsidies for bridges for companies which, in the majority of cases, are well able to build those bridges themselves without any government assistance at all. Speaking specially of grants in the province of Quebec, I doubt very much if the percentage exists mentioned by the Postmaster General. I think the amount we are granting to villages, particularly on the south shore of the St. Lawrence, is a much larger percentage of the cost of these bridges. There is here an opportunity for the government to render a great service to people along the line of these railways. What are the objections? They are futile. The Minister of Railways says there are no roads where most of these bridges are built. The answer of my hon. friend from Laval is that as soon as that condition is performed there will be no road to these bridges. Just as soon as roadways were built on the Victoria bridge in Montreal, when that bridge was changed, a magnificent roadway was built up to it. The other objection of the minister is that we have no jurisdiction over roads in municipalities and over bridges in the provinces. That seems to me to be an objection equally futile, because whether we have jurisdiction or not, we are not assuming to exercise jurisdiction. We are imposing a condition on a grant of money, and we can impose any condition we like. There is no question of jurisdiction. A case has been pointed out to me by my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) of a subsidy granted for a bridge over the river Jacques Cartier in the province of Quebec, conditional on the company constructing a bridge for vehicular traffic. In most cases the municipalities are not in a position to build suitable bridges, in most cases the provinces are not in a position financially to come to the assistance of the municipality. These subsidies are extremely generous, and I think the government ought to accept this condition. There is another point. This afternoon, in the space of four hours, we have been granting nearly $20,000,000 of money without giving those grants the consideration they require. It seems to me to be most absurd, to pass these grants with the little consideration we are giving them, it is perfectly ridiculous. I think the time has arrived when we should adopt for our own preservation some rule by which resolutions of this kind must be brought before the House at least one month before prorogation.

Mr. FIELDING. The suggestion of the hon. gentleman is important and in a sense it would be valuable, but much more valuable if it were addressed to provincial and municipal authority. It is simply a proposal to unload on the Dominion treasury the obligations of the provincial government and the municipal authorities. There may be exceptional instances in which while constructing a bridge, we might be able at the same time to construct a highway. But if we are to lay down a principle that this government must provide highway bridges of that kind, I certainly think my hon. friend is mistaken in putting such a project before the House. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) says that the municipalities are not usually able. Well, I question whether he is justified in making that statement, I think most municipalities are able. He says that the provincial governments are not able to do this. I must dissent entirely. Our provincial governments are not so poor that they are not able to provide highways for the people of their respective provinces. They have certainly received large additions to their subsidies, and I think they are well able to perform the duties which under the circumstances, are assigned to them.

Mr. MONK. We are not in Quebec.

Mr. FIELDING. Well, while I would not undertake to make any analysis of the financial affairs of the province of Quebec, I understand that they are regarded as being in a satisfactory condition. But I am dealing now with the principle. In the case of a municipal or a provincial work it is proposed to say that this work shall be constructed at the expense of the Dominion government.

Mr. MONK. Why was that condition imposed when a subsidy was given to the Victoria bridge?

Mr. FIELDING. I cannot recall the circumstances. There may be exceptional circumstances in all these matters. But the effect of the motion of my hon. friend is to unload upon the Dominion treasury obligations which really belong to the municipal and provincial authorities. We may have done it in some cases, and it may be

open to objection, but that is no justification for laying down the principle that we are going to do it all the time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It does not seem to me that this is unloading anything on the Dominion treasury. It is unloading something upon these companies. It may be, as the Minister of Railways has said, that it would not be practicable in all cases. Certainly it is practicable in a great many other cases, as it has been carried out in the case of the Interprovincial bridge at Ottawa, Victoria bridge at Montreal and many others.

Mr. FIELDING. I think the province contributed, but I am not sure.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It may be so. I am not aware that the province contributed to the cost of the Victoria bridge at Montreal, but I think my hon. friend is quite right in saying that either one or both of the provinces contributed to the cost of the Interprovincial bridge at Ottawa. The Dominion government gave a subsidy to this bridge, but the provincial government gave a subsidy also, and a footway may have been a condition of the subsidy of one or either of the provincial governments. That is not true of the Victoria bridge, and I think it is not true in some other cases. The proposition of my hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Léonard) does not in the slightest degree impose any further demand on the Dominion treasury.

Mr. GRAHAM. Does not my hon. friend see that if you make it a provision that they must have a roadway on all these bridges the applicants will ask for more subsidy? If the Dominion gives a subsidy without making any provision for a roadway, and then imposes that condition, the company receiving the subsidy will ask for more. If you give $25,000, and afterwards put in a condition that will make the work cost $10,000 more, they will need $35,000 to enable them to construct the bridge. You will have municipal councils coming here whenever they want a bridge to be built, and you will have provincial governments also asking aid towards the construction of bridges. My hon. friend points out conditions that may arise, but there is nothing to prevent us from aiding the construction of a bridge, but to say that the Dominion government must provide a roadway on every bridge that is constructed is to suggest something that any railway man who is building bridges will tell you is not practicable.

Mr. MONK. These bridges that are going to be built in Quebec—I suppose the conditions are the same everywhere—were intended to be built whether there was a subsidy or not. My hon. friend the Postmaster General knows perfectly well that this railway, which goes from St. Lambert to Lévis, is being built by a well known American company, it is partly built now, it is under process of construction, one of the finest roads on the continent, and they intended building those bridges anyway without any doubt. They are able to do it. We come to their assistance and give them quite considerable subsidies in aid of the bridges over the rivers which the line crosses between St. Lambert and Lévis. It is a perfectly suitable condition to impose that the bridges should be built according to certain plans and to say that they must have our approval. Impose this additional condition while the bridge is being built. It scarcely adds to the cost of the bridge, and will be an immense boon to the whole population. I hope the government will see fit to adopt the amendment of my hon. friend from Laval.

Mr. FIELDING. May I illustrate what I think is the correct principle by a reference to what was done in the case of an important bridge in Prince Edward Island? The government built a bridge in Prince Edward Island as a portion of the Prince Edward Island Railway, known as the Hillsborough bridge. In that case the provincial government wanted a highway, but this government obliged the provincial authorities to pay their fair share towards that highway, and we deduct every year from the subsidy to Prince Edward Island a certain sum of money; I think it is $12,000.

Mr. MONK. How much did it cost?

Mr. FIELDING. A large sum of money.

Mr. MONK. A very large sum of money?

Mr. FIELDING. A very large sum of money. We said to the provincial government: We will build a bridge for railway purposes, because that is the proper function of the Dominion government, but we will not build a bridge for highway purposes. That is your proper function. Prince Edward Island is not as rich as Ontario or Quebec. Prince Edward Island is not too flourishing, but so fair and reasonable was that proposal that the Prince Edward Island government accepted the responsibility, and every year there is a sum deducted from their subsidy to pay the provincial obligation for providing a provincial highway. This proposal is that while we do that with Prince Edward Island we are going to oblige the Dominion government, out of its treasury, to provide highways in some other provinces.

Mr. MONK. The case of the Hillsborough bridge was quite exceptional. It was a matter of negotiation for a long time between the provincial and Dominion governments. It is questionable whether we should have gone into that expense, but, at any rate, the circumstances are altogether exceptional.

Mr. FIELDING. I will venture to say that if we should adopt my hon. friend's principle you would have the Prince Edward Island government here speedily asking for a refund of the money.

Amendment (Mr. Léonard) negatived.

Resolutions reported.

Mr. GRAHAM moved that the resolutions be read a second time and agreed to.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before that motion is put, I would like the Minister of Railways and Canals to be prepared to furnish information when we are in Committee of the Whole on the Bill as to how many of these roads would be constructed in any case if these subsidies were not allowed by parliament.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is perfectly obvious that as far as some of them are concerned this condition holds good, because they are now under construction and they have been initiated by companies which are perfectly well able to take care of them. There are others that are being constructed by railway companies, the chief officers of which have announced over and over again that the day for railway subsidies in Canada has passed, and that no further railway subsidies ought to be granted; and, in other cases, they are being carried out as part of a project, such as the Transcontinental Railway, of which they are an absolutely necessary part, and, therefore, they would and must be built without any subsidy from the government. I want my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals to be prepared to state, on the occasion to which I have referred, how many of these railway undertakings are within the category to which I have allued.

Mr. GRAHAM. I must say frankly to my hon. friend that he is asking me a question that no human being could answer. I could not now and never could answer the question how many of these roads would be built anyway, with or without the subsidy. I do not know how many of them will be built with the subsidy. Nobody knows how many will be built without the subsidy. I want to give all the information I can, but this is asking more than any person has any knowledge of.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. All I have to say in reply to my hon. friend is that if no human being can give that information, no human being ought to propose these subsidies.

Resolutions reported, read the second time and agreed to.

Mr GRAHAM moved for leave to introduce Bill (No 215) to authorize the granting of subsidies in aid of the construction of the lines of railway therein mentioned.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first and second times.

OLD AGE PENSIONS.

Consideration of amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 120) to authorize the issue of government annuities for old age.

Mr. FIELDING. The first amendment provides that nothing in the Act shall be construed as preventing corporations or employers of labour from entering into an arrangement for procuring annuities to be paid to members or persons employed by them. That seems to follow the amendment introduced in this House by the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith) which provided that fraternal organizations may enter contracts for providing annuities for their members. I think there will be no objection to this amendment.

Mr. THOMAS CHISHOLM. Would that interfere with the Foresters ?

Mr. FIELDING. It speaks of corporations or employers of labour.

Mr. THOMAS CHISHOLM. They are employers of labour.

Mr. FIELDING. They are fraternal organizations and would be able to enter into such contracts under other provisions of the Bill. There is a clause in the Bill as it left the House which provides that in the event of an annuity being procured under conditions which defrauded a creditor the creditor might take proceedings to cancel the annuity. The Senate have added : 'Provided always that no action shall be brought for the cancellation of an annuity granted under this Act after the lapse of two years from the time at which the payment complained of has been made.' That seems to be a reasonable clause. These are the more important amendments made by the Senate.

Amendments read the second time and concurred in.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENTS.

Bill (No. 212) to amend the Criminal Code and to repeal section 415 of the Railway Act —Mr. Aylesworth—read a second time and House went into committee thereon.

On section 2,

2. The French version of section 10 is amended by substituting 'dix-septième' for 'septième' in the second line, and by substituting 'sept' for 'huit' in the same line.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The criminal law of England as it stood on the 17th of September, 1792, is applicable in Ontario. By some mishap the date appears in the French

version as the 7th of September, 1892, and this clause is to correct the mistake.

On section 3,

3. The French version of paragraph (c) of section 259 is amended by inserting after 'haut' in the third line the words 'il a l'intention de porter à une personne des coups ou blessures qu'il sait être de nature à causer la mort,' and by substituting 'erreur' for 'maladresse' in the same line.

This section of the Criminal Code is a very important one, and the French version has omitted the words referred to in the amendment which appear in the English version. The word 'mistake' in the English version has been translated 'maladresse' and I am told the word 'erreur' would better signify the meaning of the English word.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it not a rather strange anomaly to see us amending the French version because of defective translation or proof reading ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. It is very important. The French version is absolutely as much law as the English, and if a man is being tried for his life in the province of Quebec it might depend upon the exact meaning of the word which is used in the French version so that if a wrong word is used it might have serious consequences.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Minister of Justice misapprehends the remark of my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule). For the very reason that it is important he pointed out that such mistakes as these in the French version should not occur. It is undoubtedly of the highest importance that the French version should be correct, and for that reason my hon. friend pointed out that greater care should be taken.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I would agree with the leader of the opposition if we were discussing the translation of a literary work, but the whole inspiration of our Criminal Code comes from the English law and when you come to translate the English law into French you meet with serious difficulties. I studied the criminal law at Laval under Mr. Justice Delorimier and in many instances he had to use the English text to give the exact meaning of the law. It is a most difficult thing and it is not surprising that here and there in the Criminal Code we should meet some expressions which do not convey the exact meaning of the original English text. We come immediately after this clause upon the word 'robbery' in English. You have the word 'robbery' and the word 'theft.' In French we have only the word 'vol.' There is in each of these English words a nuance, as we say in French, which is very difficult to express; we have to use several words to express the English meaning. It is very difficult to translate the English criminal law into French exactly.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Which makes it all the more apparent that we should have had the French version prepared and passed through parliament at the same time as the English, instead of leaving it to be prepared months afterwards against the remonstrance of gentlemen on both sides of the House. The present difficulty seems to arise largely from the course which was then adopted. Hon. gentlemen protested that the two versions should be concurrent, that they are of equal validity throughout the country and therefore that we should not have one presented and the other handed in at a later stage. However, there is no doubt about the importance of the amendment.

On section 3,

3. The French version of paragraph (c) of section 259 is amended by inserting after 'haut' in the third line the words 'il a l'intention de porter à une personne des coups ou blessures qu'il sait être de nature à causer la mort,' and by substituting 'erreur' for 'maladresse' in the same line.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The word 'vol' in this instance does not convey the meaning of 'robbery' in the English text and I would therefore move that it should read 'vol à main armée.'

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is remarkable that we should have the amendment of the section presented in an entirely defective form according to the view of the Postmaster General, after it has been prepared by the Justice Department.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have discussed it with the Minister of Justice.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It seems strange that not only the original statute but the amendment should be wrong. Are we quite sure we have it now?

Mr. LEMIEUX. 'Vol à main armée,' yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I hope so.

Mr. LENNOX. It strikes me it is all done very carelessly. Already there has been an enormous number of amendments to the revised statutes. These amendments should not have been required and this is but another illustration of the exceedingly careless way in which this work was performed.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. There is nothing extraordinary about what has taken place, if hon. gentlemen will reflect what the circumstances are. We are putting into the French language English terms of art with reference to the criminal law. There are fine shades of meaning in the words which are used in describing offences in the English law. The word in question is 'robbery.' Every lawyer who practises the English law understands the difference between robbery and theft or stealing or simple larceny. That is not so easy a difference to define in the French language. The

omission of these words has been by some accident and was called to my attention by Mr. Justice Cross who noticed in trying a case that in this very important section these four words had somehow been omitted. I do not know whose fault it was, it might have occurred through a printer's error or in the preparation of the manuscript, but it being necessary to supply the words which have been dropped the question arises what word are you to use as the French equivalent for robbery. The natural word is the word used, 'vol,' but that means theft, larceny, a trifling stealing. A man may be guilty of murder constructively, so to speak, by killing another while engaged in burglary or robbery, although he did not intend to kill. But if a man is engaged in some little theft, stealing a chicken, for instance, it would not involve such serious consequences. For that reason after discussing the matter with the Postmaster General, I suggested that an amendment should be made.

Mr. LENNOX. The minister says there is nothing extraordinary about this and there is not, having regard to our experience. We have already had numerous amendments to these revised statutes, which must be cut and hacked and slashed now to an extraordinary extent. Putting through the English version without the French is probably one of the causes for this difficulty.

On section 5,

5. Subsection 2 of section 335 is repealed, and the following is substituted therefor:

2. An offer, printed or marked by the manufacturer upon any wrapper, box or receptacle, in which goods are sold, of a premium or reward for the return of such wrapper, box or receptacle, or a recognizable part thereof, to the manufacturer, is not a trading stamp within the meaning of this part.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. This clause I think was harmless, but an amendment has been asked by some retail merchants. Under the section which prohibits the use of trading stamps there is a subsection 2 in the existing law, providing that an offer by a manufacturer is not to be a trading stamp if it is simply an offer, printed or marked on the receptacle of the goods, of a premium or reward for the return of such receptacle. The change proposed by this amendment is to introduce the words 'or a recognizable part thereof.' There was no reason why a manufacturer should not offer a reward or premium to any one who would send back a recognizable part of an empty box without having to return the whole box, which might be rather inconvenient on account of its bulk. I have been spoken to, however, by some hon. gentlemen in the House and by representatives of the Retail Merchants' Association who think it would be better not to interfere with the existing law. I do not wish to introduce anything controversial and move that the words 'or recognizable part thereof' be struck out.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 15,

Section 415 of the Railway Act is repealed.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. This is a section which imposes what is called double liability upon workmen employed on a railway in respect of disobedience to the rules of the company. It has been a good deal discussed incidentally at different times during the session, and it seems to be the general feeling that there is no reason for imposing that additional liability on workingmen employed by the railway companies.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

THE CANADIAN PATRIOTIC FUNDS ASSOCIATION.

Bill (No. 216) respecting the Canadian Patriotic Funds Association read the first and second time, and House went into committee thereon.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The Bill is simply for the purpose of enabling the members of a patriotic company living at a distance to vote by letter. The immediate object is to vote a certain sum of money out of the funds to assist Trooper Mulloy to complete his education in Oxford. Trooper Mulloy, as every one knows, lost his sight through a bullet wound received during the war in South Agrica. He returned home and partially completed his education by taking a degree at one of our universities. He wished to continue his education in order to enable him to practice a profession, and wished to go to Oxford. He was offered assistance from private sources which he refused to accept, believing that this patriotic fund might more properly be devoted to the purpose. In order to get a vote from all the members of the association who find it impossible to come to Ottawa, this Bill is being passed. It was introduced in the Senate, was passed and is now before this House.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I desire to point out in extension of the principle of the patriotic fund that the soldier from Canada who first won the Victoria Cross in South Africa, Private Richardson, who greatly distinguished himself in the war, has been ill for a long time, is unable to support his family as he would wish to do, and is in distress. I would take this opportunity of impressing upon the trustee of this patriotic fund the necessity of looking into the case of Richardson to see if something cannot be done for him. His present address is North Battleford.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. If this Bill becomes law, it will be open to the mem-

bers of this fund to consider every case on its merits.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Public Works, chargeable to capital—Marine Department—to provide for a gratuity to the mother of the late Jos. Carbonneau, in his lifetime second mate on board the Canadian goverment steamer 'Lady Grey,' who was killed while on duty, $500.

Mr. BENNETT. Is any compensation to be allowed the relatives of Captain Arthur Clark, who was killed by the explosion of a gas buoy at Parry Sound ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not remember with certainty, but I think that Captain Clark's heirs have made application for a petition of right. We maintain that the accident was due entirely to the negligence of Captain Clark and that, under the circumstances, we would not be liable.

Mr. BENNETT. He left a widowed mother who had been dependent upon him for support. I understand there is a claim before the department, and I had hoped that the minister would have done something for her.

Mr. BRODEUR. If I remember the circumstances, the accident was due to his own negligence. He left the buoys in the ice instead of putting them in a dry place, and when he went there in the spring to lay them up the accident occurred.

Mr. BENNETT. Still, he was in the employ of the government, and I see that other allowances are made—for instance, there is a compassionate allowance to the heirs of a man who was killed.

Mr. BRODEUR. He was not in the employ of the government but was under contract.

Mr. BENNETT. But the buoys were supplied by the department, and if there was anything defective in them, allowance should be made. Allowance was made for the explosion at Kingston, I believe.

Mr. BRODEUR. The explosion at Parry Sound was not due to a defect in the buoy. Captain Clark left it in the water, and it was as a result of that that the explosion occurred.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the minister grant a petition of right ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Oh, yes. I will not offer any objection so long as the Minister of Justice is agreeable.

Mr. KEMP. I think with my hon. friend from Simcoe that most accidents occur through the negligence of the men themselves, still I do not think that ought to be set up as a reason why the government should not consider a claim. I am speaking in a general way. I do not think that because an accident happens to a man while he is in the employ of the government or any one else, and it happens in consequence of his own carelessness, that that should be a reason altogether why his family should be deprived of a gratuity.

Mr. BRODEUR. There may be some difference due to the fact that he was not in the employ of the government, but he was performing a contract with the government in placing these buoys. In the fall of the year he went up there to collect these buoys, and instead of putting them in a dry place left them in the water. When he went up there to float them the accident occurred.

Mr. BENNETT. I hope the minister will reconsider the case and do something in the matter.

Mr. SPROULE. It was stated by the hon. gentleman's predecessor that there was something to be known which would account for these explosions, which they did not know. But several of them have occurred within a few years, and no reasonable explanation was given the House why they happened. I take it that this is on a par with the others.

Mr. TAYLOR. These young men may not have known that the buoys were dangerous if left out in a damp place, and that may not have been explained to them. If that was the case here, I think the government should reconsider.

Mr. BRODEUR. I did not like to take the responsibility of paying the money. The claim was a very large one, and I thought it would be better to refer the matter to the courts.

Mr. BENNETT. Make them an offer of some kind and see if they will accept it.

Mr. KEMP. Is it in the courts now ?

Mr. BRODEUR. They were told that we would grant a petition of right, and my impression is that they have made application for a petition of right. If they have, it has been granted.

Mr. KEMP. Perhaps they cannot afford to pay the costs.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I do not think that sufficient precaution was taken to inform these men, who are not accustomed to these buoys, that they were dangerous to handle. A serious accident nearly happened with a gas buoy in my district and it was only by a miracle that two or three were not killed. A man who is a thoroughly competent engineer nearly lost his arm and his eyesight. I think the minister

ought to see that men who handle these gas buoys are cautioned as to their danger.

Mr. BRODEUR. The new gas buoys that we are adopting do not offer any danger at all. In the accident that happened at Kingston, and that which happened to Captain Clark, the buoys were high pressure gas buoys. The gas was made on shore and transferred by a tender to the gas buoys, which were charged with it. It was a dangerous thing. These gas buoys had a pressure of, I think, in some cases, 150 atmospheres. But with the new system of gas buoys, what we call the Willson gas buoys, there is very little danger, because they are worked under an automatic system, that is to say, we simply take the carbide and put it in the buoy and gas is produced automatically. They have only a pressure of five atmospheres. So there is much less danger.

Lighthouse and coast service—further amount required for salaries of light-keepers, $30,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have not granted any increase of salaries to lightkeepers for a couple of years, and I thought that this amount should be voted.

Further amount required to pay for the charter of steamers keeping the channel clear at Lime Kiln crossing, Detroit river, $10,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Whose vessels are being employed, how many are employed, how much are they paid per day, and how long will they be employed ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I could not say offhand whose vessels are employed. I think one is Captain Hackett's. I do not know how much he is paid. This whole sum will be expended during the coming season.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I think Captain Hackett has not been employed within the last year, his contract was cancelled, and some other gentleman has the contract. I remember asking a question about it in the House.

Mr. BRODEUR. I may be mistaken.

Mr. BLAIN. I want to direct the minister's attention to a complaint that I have received from the town of Southampton in respect to the life saving station. My correspondent complains that the boat used in the life saving service there is in the hands of a sea captain who is away from Southampton nearly all the time. I would like the minister to investigate this matter, and see whether my information is correct.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. DANIEL. I call the attention of the minister to the fact that in the harbour of St. John the city pays for the life boat there. I think that is the only place in the whole Dominion where the life boat business is not paid for by the Department of Marine and I think that the department ought to take over the boat and pay for the up-keep of it.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think we have a station at St. John.

Mr. DANIEL. Not in St. John that I know of. I know that the city pays for the lifeboat.

Mr. BRODEUR. I will look into the matter.

Amount required to pay pensions of $300 to each of the following parties: Louis Edmond Morin, Laurent Godbout, Jean Baptiste Tremblay, Hubert Raymond, Charles Brown, Pierre Gobeil, Edmond Larochelle, Adelme Pouliot, Elzéar Desrosiers, Napoléon Rioux, L. O. B. Gautron dit Larochelle and Charles Hermie Bernier, $3,600.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the minister kindly explain this?

Mr. BRODEUR. This item is for the purpose of paying pensions to pilots below Quebec who are retired. Many years ago they got a charter from this parliament granting them certain rights.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is this to be made an annual payment?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. $300 for the rest of their lives?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, but they retire at sixty-five.

Mr. BENNETT. And each one of these men is to get $300 as long as he lives?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Are they in the service yet?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, they have been retired.

Mr. FOWLER. On account of old age?

Mr. BRODEUR. On account of old age or defective eyesight.

Mr. LENNOX. Is there a statute providing for this?

Mr. BRODEUR. There is no statute providing for this. When the pilots below Quebec, who, as I have just explained, had very extensive rights from this parliament were taken over by the department one of the conditions they put in was that they should be paid a pension when they were retired. There was a great deal of complaint on the part of the shipping federation that very old pilots were still being employed and it was against the interests of shipping that these men should be kept on. So, in order to redeem the privileges they had under this old statute we had to make this arrangement with them.

Mr. BRODER. Can you give any idea of the income they had from their service as pilots ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I suppose it would be from $700 to $1,000 a year.

For the purpose of establishing and maintaining a lightship at Point Pelee, Lake Erie, $30,000.

Mr. DANIEL. Is there a light ship now?

Mr.BRODEUR. The American government are maintaining a lightship at that point now and we think it is advisable that this light should be maintained by the Canadian government.

Mr. DANIEL. Who is going to provide the lightship ?

Mr. BRODEUR. We are going to provide it.

Mr. DANIEL. Will this amount do that?

Mr. BRODEUR. We expect so.

Mr. KEMP. Will the government withdraw their lightship ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes. This matter has been the subject of negotiation with the United States government for a number of years and we have decided to maintain the lightship there.

Amount required for the completion of Clark's harbour, dog fish reduction works (revote) $10,000.

Mr. DANIEL. Has the minister taken into consideration the necessity for establishing a dog fish reduction works on the Bay of Fundy? I do not know that we have had any debate on the dogfish question this year but we had last year and I brought to the attention of the House some facts showing that it is necessary to deal with this matter on the Bay of Fundy as well as at other places where reduction works exist. It is too late to go into the matter now but it is just as important on the Bay of Fundy as it is on any other part of the coast. The numbers of dogfish there are tremendous. Last year I spoke of a man having his trawls out and obtaining a catch of 1,700 dogfish. The remainder of his catch was all eaten with the exception of the heads.

Mr. BRODEUR. What we have done so far has been mostly of an experimental character. We have been making some experiments on the north shore of New Brunswick and on the western coast of Nova Scotia. This one is to be carried on at Cape Sable, not very far from the Bay of Fundy. This matter has already been brought to the attention of the government and if it becomes necessary to establish a reduction works on the Bay of Fundy I would be very glad to consider it favourably.

Fisheries protection service—further amount required for repairs to the cruiser 'Princess,' $20,000.

Mr. DANIEL. How much have these repairs cost altogether ? The 'Princess' is not a large vessel.

Mr. BRODEUR. The amount is required for placing new boilers on board the 'Princess.'

Mr. DANIEL. How much was expended on the 'Princess' before this ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The drafting of this item is not absolutely correct. It should have been 'Dominion steamers ; further amount required.' The amount which is going to be spent on the 'Princess' will be $20,000 for boilers.

Mr. CLEMENTS. When may we expect the final report of the Fishery Commission?

Mr. BRODEUR. It should be down now, because it was sent to the printer some time ago.

Mr. BENNETT. Is the Georgian Bay Fishery Commission at work ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. When will it finish ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is making some investigations now on Lake Erie.

Harbours and rivers—transportation facilities—Georgian bay to Montreal—survey for waterway via French and Ottawa rivers, including payments authorized notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, additional amount, $20,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What will be the total cost of this survey ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am inclined to think that this will about cover it.

Mr. BENNETT. What will be the total?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the vicinity of $600,000.

Lunenburg public building—improvements, $4,000.

Mr. BLAIN. What will be the total cost of the concrete sidewalk and was it let by contract or done by day labour?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total cost will be $1,262.50. The price was $2.50 per square yard.

Mr. BLAIN. I have information that that work was not properly done.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have had no complaints about it.

Mr. BLAIN. Does the minister know that when there is a rainstorm the cellar fills up with water?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no information about that.

Mr. BLAIN. I want the minister to inquire about that and ascertain if my information is correct. Who was the inspector of the cement sidewalk which cost so much money?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot answer tonight.

Parrsborough public building, $8,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What will be the cost of this?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Probably about $30,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Does that include the site?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. HENDERSON. As this is the first vote for this building, if the Minister of Public Works is here next session I do not want him to hold that we are bound by this vote as having authorized the government to erect this structure. We have no information and no particulars about it and cannot get them. What I say as to this building applies to all votes of a like character in these estimates for new buildings. Wherever there is a new vote I want it to be distinctly understood that parliament is not bound for the completion or erection of the structure simply because we have allowed the initial vote to pass through in a hurried moment at the last hour of the session.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will not hold my hon. friend responsible for the amount of the expenditure, but under the authority of parliament I shall feel it my duty to proceed as rapidly as possible with the construction of the building.

Mr. HENDERSON. I will not let the vote through on that understanding.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Parrsborough is a growing town with a population of 3,000 and I intend to secure a suitable building for post office, savings bank, and customs house for about $30,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. I know nothing about this building but I wish my remarks to apply generally. I do not believe parliament would have approved of any of these votes in the past if it knew that by voting a small sum we were supposed to assent to the work being carried through at a cost of hundreds of thousands of dollars. This building may not be started before parliament meets again, and I do not want the minister to say to parliament that because of these preliminary votes we have authorized him to spend ten or twenty times the amount of the vote. For my part I will not be held responsible.

Wolfville public building, $5,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What will be the total cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $20,000 or $25,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. BENNETT. Exclusive of site?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I should think $25,000 would include the site.

Fairville public building, $5,000.

Mr. DANIEL. Would the minister give some information about this vote?

Mr. PUGSLEY. As my hon. friend knows Fairville is a very important and thriving town where there are mills which employ about 2,000 working people.

Mr. DANIEL. I know all that. What will be the cost of the building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Probably it would run to $15,000.

Mr. DANIEL. Will it be brick or stone?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have no plan made yet.

Mr. FOWLER. I may say for the information of the committee that Fairville is where the Minister of Public Works made that famous speech which he neglected to repeat in the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What did my hon. friend say?

Mr. FOWLER. Read it in 'Hansard' tomorrow.

Fredericton military buildings—new cook house and men's dining room in connection with barracks, $4,000.

Mr. CROCKET. Will that amount complete?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think so.

Grand Falls public building, $5,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What will this cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Probably $15,000 or $20,000.

Hillsborough public building, $5,000.

Mr. FOWLER. What do you intend to spend here?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About $15,000.

Mr. FOWLER. What about the site ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The site is to be given free by the Albert Manufacturing Company.

Moncton armoury, $7,000.

Mr. CROCKET. What will this cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My information is that it ought not to exceed $15,000 or $20,000. If it is used for a drill hall it will cost considerably more, but if it is simply an armoury I should think $20,000 would be sufficient.

Mr. CROCKET. Have the plans been prepared?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No. It may go considerably more than that.

St. John drill hall, $50,000.

Mr. DANIEL. Where is this drill hall to be built and what will it cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is intended to erect a drill hall which will be suitable for a city of the importance of St. John.

Mr. DANIEL. Can you not give us some idea of the size?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not prepared as yet because the site has not been selected and the description of building would depend to some extent on the site chosen. There are three sites which I have in mind, one is the Shamrock ground in the north end of the city, another is a well situated lot opposite the custom house and the third is the utilization of the barracks square, now owned by the Dominion government. I am not saying anything in favour of either location. Some of those closely connected with the militia have a preference for one site and some for another.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the Militia or Public Works Department secure the site ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Public Works.

Public works—income—Quebec. Arthabaskaville—public building, $5,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What will be the total cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $20,000 or $25,000.

Grand Mere public building, $5,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What will this cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Probably about $25,000.

Joliette armoury, $6,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What will this cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About $15,000.

Knowlton public building, $15,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What will this cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About $26,000.

Lachute public building, $8,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What will be the total cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About $27,500.

Mr. BLAIN. In what county is Knowlton ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In Brome.

Lévis drill hall, $20,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What will the total cost of this be ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is a very large and important military centre; it will probably run to $75,000.

Magog public building, $10,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What will this cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $34,630.

Megantic public building, $7,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the cost of Megantic ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Probably $20,000.

Montreal, Point St. Charles—new postal station, $10,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What will this cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have not prepared plans but it will run to $75,000, I think.

Plessisville public building, $10,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What is that ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About $36,000, I think ; it is in Megantic.

Roberval public building, $5,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What will this cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is supposed about $25,000.

Shawenegan public building, $8,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What will this cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About $20,000.

Sherbrooke public building—improvements, &c., $1,800.

Mr. BLAIN. I suppose we are to understand from the minister that all these buildings are constructed after public tender ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. Are outside architects to be employed ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Our policy is to have as much of this done by our own staff as possible, but in order to get as many necessary works as possible started and to have some progress made by the winter we may have to employ some outside help.

Mr. BLAIN. Will practical men be employed as inspectors ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

St. Therése public building, $5,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What will this cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That will be a modest building costing not more than $15,000.

Three Rivers—new public building to replace buildings destroyed by fire, $50,000.

Mr. BLAIN. How does the hon. gentleman propose to get all the money to pay for these public buildings? I notice the revenue is falling off at the rate of $1,000,000 a month.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My information is that we need not have any fear on that score. But if by any accident the money is not available the work will not go on.

Mr. LENNOX. What is the total for Three Rivers ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About $75,000 or $100,000.

Westmount public buildings, $15,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We propose to spend there $60,000 to $75,000.

Glencoe public building—additional amount, $12,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This will cost from $25,000 to $28,000.

Guelph armoury—additional amount, $64,000.

Mr. LENNOX. How much is this going to cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is under contract. The cost is increased by providing for a drill hall over the gun shed. I cannot give the figures just now.

Harriston public building, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That will cost about $20,000.

Leamington public building — additional amount, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The total cost will be $25,000.

Listowel public building, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It will probably cost $25,000.

Mount Forest public building, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This will cost about the same as the Harriston building.

Markham public building — additional amount, $8,000.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the total cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About $16,000.

Mr. BLAIN. Who prepared the plans?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The department.

Mr. BLAIN. This was a factor in the recent Centre York election. I want to draw attention to the fact that the plans of the building were one of the exhibits in the election. One of the senators from that section took the plans around and showed them to the electors in Markham village as an evidence of what the government was doing for the electors of Centre York. Does the minister propose to have a Liberal supply of plans of all these buildings so that candidates will have an opportunity of pointing out to the electors what is being done?

Mr. PUGSLEY. If my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) would like to see the plans, I will have copies of the blue prints sent to him.

Mr. BLAIN. I think it was a blue print that was used in the Centre York election. I hope the minister will be careful not to allow Senators to have plans to use with the electors.

Mr. LENNOX. Will this $8,000 finish the Markham public building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No; we expect it will cost $16,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. LENNOX. This is an 'additional amount.' How much was voted before?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the main estimates, $4,000.

Mitchell public building, $5,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What will this cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We hope not more than $25,000.

Niagara Falls armoury, $10,000.

Mr. FOWLER. How much for that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Probably $35,000.

North Bay public buildings—to complete, $2,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What will that cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I gave that in detail on the main estimates. The hon. gentleman will find it in 'Hansard.'

Peterborough armoury—additional amount, $75,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the cost of the Peterborough armoury?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is $162,136.

Port Arthur armoury, $10,000

Mr. BENNETT. What will this cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It will depend a good deal on the plans we decide upon. The military men of both cities, Port Arthur and Fort William, are joining together to have the armoury in a place that will suit the people of both cities. I do not know exactly what it will cost, but we must give them a handsome building.

Mr. FOWLER. Are you going to put the building on the flat between the two cities?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the part of Port Arthur nearest to Fort William.

Park Hill public building — additional amount, $7,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What will this cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About $15,000 or $20,000. We are getting the site free from the Grand Trunk.

Mr. BERGERON. What is there for this in the main estimates?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Four thousand dollars.

Seaforth public building, $5,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What will this cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It will run about $20,000 or $25,000.

Mr. BENNETT. I understand that in all these estimates of cost the hon. minister does not include fittings and heating?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not as a rule. I like to leave myself a little margin.

Sarnia armoury, $6,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What will this cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Between $30,000 and $50,000.

Sudbury public building, $15,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What will this cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About $25,000 or $30,000. Sudbury is a very important place.

Simcoe public building—additional amount, $15,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What will be the total cost for Simcoe?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About $40,000.

Tilsonburg public building, $5,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What will this cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Probably not more than $25,000. It is a nice town and requires a nice building.

Uxbridge public building, $8,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What is that to cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It ought not to cost over $25,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What kind of a town is that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. A nice town.

Mr. BENNETT. The minister will not think so after the election.

Waterloo public building, $8,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the cost of that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Waterloo is an important town. The cost of the building will probably run about $30,000.

Walkerville public building, $8,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What will be the cost of that building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Walkerville is an important town. It will be about $25,000 or $30,000. There is a large revenue both from Waterloo and from Walkerville.

Mr. LENNOX. I may be wrong, but it seems to me that the minister's estimate in the majority of these cases is a mere guess, that he has not proceeded in a businesslike way to ascertain the cost before he puts the amount in the estimates. That is the impression his answers give me—'It is a a nice town, the building will cost so and so.' 'It is an important town,' and so on. Are these mere guesses, or have estimates been made?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does not the hon. member see that the expense one would be justified in going to depends a good deal upon the size of the town, the business, the accommodation required. For instance, Walkerville; much depends upon whether we combine the inland revenue, the customhouse and post office in one building. With respect to all these items, I have gone over them carefully, but I cannot state within $500 or $1,000 what they are going to cost. The plans have not been prepared, and I have not asked for tenders.

Mr. LENNOX. We do not wish to confine him within $500, but we do think that before we are asked to vote money the minister should have considered the question with his officials, and be able to say about how much money he is going to spend. If he says $25,000, and he wants us to understand that he means it as an estimate of $25,000, not as a mere haphazard guess, that is all right.

Mr. BLAIN. This closes the items for the province of Ontario with respect to public buildings. I want to renew my request that, when the minister advertises for tenders he will not confine the advertisements to newspapers supporting his own party. Are we to understand that when he advertises in newspapers asking for tenders, he will confine the advertisements to newspapers supporting his own party?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I can say this to my hon. friend, that when I come to consider the question I will give his suggestion all the weight which is due to a gentleman who manifests a disposition so non-partisan as the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BLAIN. I am delighted with the promise. But when he comes to a town where the newspaper is Conservative, having treble the circulation of the Reform newspaper, will he be so partisan as to put the advertisement in the Reform newspaper alone?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I should not be surprised.

Mr. BLAIN. I should not be surprised either. There is a small post office at St. Mary's to which I referred the other night, costing $30,000, and the minister spent $600 advertising in thirty-three newspapers in that section, calling for tenders, and I think that no one dollar was given to a Conservative newspaper, although the leading newspapers in that section were Conservative.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I regret that the minister has passed over the town of Tilbury, where I requested a public building for a post office and custom house combined. I certainly understood him to say that he would do something for Tilbury, but I regret to find that he has not put a vote in the estimates for that building.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman is mistaken if he understood that I promised that a public building for Tilbury would be covered in the estimates this year. What I said was that I was impressed with his request. We have a pretty large amount for Ontario, $776,300. I had to leave out a

number of public buildings, very much to my regret.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT. Some time ago I drew the minister's attention to the necessity of public buildings for some important towns in my riding, and the minister promised to take them into serious consideration and give fair-play in the matter. I find in the supplementaries that he has made large grants for public buildings in little towns one-half or one-quarter the size of the towns in my riding that are without public buildings. He does not seem to have any system in the allotment of grants for public works, but is merely guided by partisanship. I enter my protest against this method of doing public business.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was with a good deal of regret that I had to leave out some of the towns in the hon. gentleman's constituency. But he will see that I am giving a good deal for harbour and river improvements in that constituency, for instance, the dock at Gravenhurst.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT. Does he think that he is going to put up a wharf in the town of Gravenhurst with a grant of $4,000 ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That will make a good start.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT. How much do you intend to spend there ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. All that is necessary, perhaps $8,000 or $10,000.

Public Works—Manitoba Elmwood public building, $10,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the population?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About 15,000.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. According to my information the minister is not correct. A few minutes ago when the population of Westmount was in question, he stated that it was between 50,000 and 75,000. I know Westmount as well as I know Ottawa, and I know that the minister has misrepresented the population. According to the census of 1901 it had a population of 8,856, and to-day it is not more than 12,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think if there is any place that is deserving of public buildings it is Westmount. Westmount is one of the best administered cities in Canada, and the population is increasing rapidly.

Mr. FOWLER. How much ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I suppose about 20,000.

Emerson public building—additional amount, $10,000.

An hon. MEMBER. How much will this building cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $30,000 or $40,000.

Neepawa public building—additional revote, $1,500, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. BENNETT. What will that building cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is under contract. The site cost $3,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What should the building cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $28,000.

Portage la Prairie public building, $8,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What will this cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Probably about $40,000.

Mr. FOWLER. From whom did you get the land ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have not secured the land yet.

Souris public building, $5,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What will this cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I should think not more than $20,000.

Winnipeg military buildings—quarters for married non-commissioned officers and men, guard room, &c., Fort Osborne barracks—additional amount, $33,000.

Mr. FOWLER. What will these quarters cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think the probable cost will be $88,000.

Mr. FOWLER. How many will the building accommodate ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I gave that in the main estimates. I have not the memo. here to-night.

Saskatchewan and Alberta—Edmonton public building—additional amount to complete, $78,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is the public building under construction.

Mr. BERGERON. How much will it cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $285,795.67.

Estevan public building—additional amount, $11,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What will this cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Probably about $20,000.

Lethbridge armoury, $10,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What will the armoury cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think we will have to expend more than $25,000 there.

Moose Jaw public building—enlargement of, $25,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to purchase land and it will leave a small amount to begin the building.

Mr. BENNETT. What will the building cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is an addition to the public building there and will cost $20,000 or $25,000.

Mr. CROCKET. Is that the architect's estimate or the minister's guess ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is about the kind of building I intend to have erected.

Mr. BENNETT. What will the site cost at Moose Jaw ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Between $20,000 and $25,000.

Mr. BENNETT. And the building $28,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is an addition to the building ; I do not know exactly what it will cost.

Mr. FOWLER. How large is this site ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not a statement as to that.

Mr. BERGERON. Has it been bought ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have an option upon it.

Moose Jaw armoury, $10,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What will it cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About $25.000.

Maple Creek public building—additional amount, $5,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What will this cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is under contract and will cost about $32,000.

Prince Albert public building—vault, $5,000.

Mr. FOWLER. What will be the total cost of that vault ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About $5,000.

Prince Albert—Saskatchewan penitentiary—additional land, inclusive of buildings, $40,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What will be the total cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The penitentiary has not been erected yet. We are buying the property.

Mr. FOWLER. Who are you buying land from ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Quite a number of different people. When we had the main estimates up I gave a statement as to the land and everybody said that we were getting the land very cheaply.

Saskatoon public building—additional (revoe, $5,000) $30,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What will be the total cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About $90,000.

Mr. BERGERON. How much did the site cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $9,000.

Strathcona drill hall and armoury, $10,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What will this cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We hope to get it built for about $25,000.

Strathcona public building, $5,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What will the public building cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About $20 000.

Strathcona immigration building—improvements, $2,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Why should you have an immigration building there and one in Edmonton too ? You can go across the river in five minutes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, they are about five miles apart the way the road goes.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not know why there should be one in Strathcona and one in Edmonton.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is the desire of the Department of the Interior.

Wetaskiwin public building, $5,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What will this cast ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Wetaskiwin is a growing town—about $25,000.

British Columbia—Cranbrook public building—additional amount, $10,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What will be the total cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no memo. as to that.

Mr. FOWLER. Have you bought the site yet ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. What did you pay for it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $9,000.

Chilliwack public building, $5,000.
Duncan public building, $5,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What will these cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They will not exceed $20,000.

Grand Forks public building, $5,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What will this cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $25,000.

Greenwood public building, $5,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What will this cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About the same.

Ladysmith public building — additional amount, $20,000.

Mr. FOWLER. How much will this cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $1,552.

Mr. FOWLER. What did you pay for the site ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $1,500.

Revelstoke public building, $10,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What is this to cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am afraid it will run up to about $40,000.

Vancouver examining warehouse, $80,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that a new building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is for a new examining warehouse.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it to be in the new post office building or is it a separate building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to be a separate building. This vote is to buy a site which will cost about $75,000. It is a splendid site, well adapted to the purpose.

Mr. LENNOX. How much is the building to cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It will be an expensive building. Vancouver is a rapidly growing city.

Mr. LENNOX. I am not complaining about the amount; I only want to know what it is?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have not prepared the plans. I should suppose an examining warehouse suitable for Vancouver, of brick and stone, and fireproof, would cost from $300,000 to $400,000.

Vernon public building, $12,500.

Mr. BENNETT. What will this cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Total probable cost $37,500.

Mr. BENNETT. Has the minister considered the advisability of putting over each one of these buildings a stone inscribed: 'Pugsley's Princely Present'?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not thought of that yet.

Dawson post office building—vault, Dominion lands registry, $2,500.

Mr. BERGERON. I understand the population of Dawson is decreasing.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I believe it is going to be a permanent settlement.

Experimental farms, $15,000.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens). Will an experimental farm be established in Prince Edward Island?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That matter rests with the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. A. MARTIN. For two or three sessions there has been dangled before the people of Prince Edward Island in the estimates a vote for an experimental station. What progress has been made?

Mr. FOWLER.

Mr. FISHER. Good farming land is so expensive in Prince Edward Island that we have not yet been able to obtain a satisfactory site.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens). Is land more expensive in Prince Edward Island than in Moncton?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, a great deal more.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens). It speaks well for my province that land is so expensive there that the government cannot establish an experimental station. Every acre of land in my province is valuable. However that is a poor excuse and I would like to know what investigation has been made and what effort has been made to acquire a site? They have experimental stations in almost every province except Prince Edward Island and I want to know why one is not established in Prince Edward Island. It is a good advertisement for my province to say that land is very valuable there and I would like to have that advertised all over Canada. But if the minister tries he can get good land at a reasonable price.

Mr. FISHER. Dr. Saunders has made two visits to the island and examined a number of farms which seemed to be suitable, but the prices were so high that I could not see my way to buy them.

Ottawa public buildings, heating, &c., $8,000.

Mr. BERGERON. The ventilation of this building is very bad. I understand that a large amount, about $100,000 has been spent on an improved system of ventilation by which the air is brought from above, but as the windows are opened the two currents of air meet and the fresh air does not reach us on the floor of the House. Surely something should be done to improve the ventilation. There are two hundred men in this chamber, probably the best in Canada, their health is very precious, and the ventilation is intolerable. I understand that a Quebec inventor offered to provide good ventilation for a certain amount and if it was not satisfactory to restore the building to its original condition, but that as he would not disclose his method his offer was not accepted.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The matter is very important. When it was brought up before I directed the chief architect to look into it carefully and I have now asked the deputy minister to make a note of it. Of course my hon. friend will understand that it would not do for me to go to a large expense unless the chief architect recommends it would improve matters.

Mr. BERGERON. We have spent about $100,000 and it is no better than it was twenty years ago.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think it is very good, take to-night, it is very good.

Mr. BERGERON. You could wear an overcoat to-night.

Harbours and rivers—Nova Scotia, $448,610.

Mr. BENNETT. Will most of these small works be by day labour ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Where the amount is over $5,000 it will be by contract and sometimes where it is less than that amount. I cannot give the particulars in some cases as I could not proceed with the works until votes were obtained.

Mr. BLAIN. Is there any dredge at Lunenburg?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, the 'King Edward' is working there.

Mr. BLAIN. Has there been any complaint of the dredge interfering with private property?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. BLAIN. Has there been any complaint that in dredging out the harbour, the clay, stone and sand were thrown on private property?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have heard of no complaint.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the minister inquire into this?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My deputy tells me there was some complaint from a firm of the name of Smith.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. There is no reason for any complaint by W. C. Smith & Company. The dredge had made a cut past one of their wharfs and naturally some earth was thrown in towards the wharf but that can be removed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This dredging will be for the benefit of the wharf. They should be content to wait for the second cut when the clay will be taken away.

Mr. BLAIN. If the earth is thrown on private property, the minister promises it will be removed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This work is done by contract and the engineer will allow nothing to be done to injure private property.

Prince Edward Island—Souris, Knight's point—strengthening breakwater, &c., additional amount, $5,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is for improving the breakwater—rip-rapping work.

Mr. FOWLER. Does the minister know anything about an application for water rights in the Souris harbour?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not. It would be made to the Marine Department and might come to my department later. My deputy tells me there has been an application.

Mr. FOWLER. On behalf of the hon. member for that county (Mr. Hughes)?

Mr. PUGSLEY. On behalf of the company, of which I understand he is a member.

Mr. FOWLER. What was the result of that application?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is in the Marine Department for consideration.

Mr. FOWLER. Who has the final say ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In this case the Marine Department.

Mr. FOWLER. What decision did the minister himself come to? Did he recommend it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My deputy says it was reported favourably by the resident engineer, but it has not yet come before me for actual consideration.

Mr. FOWLER. I understand an application was made by the firm, of which the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Hughes) is a member, for water rights. That application was favourably recommended by the resident engineer. It came then before the Department of Public Works, and that department favourably recommended it to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, when the engineer of my department reports favourably upon it, it goes to the Marine Department. If it is recommended by the Marine Department, it comes back to me for my signature. All my department has to do is to look into the matter from the standpoint of navigation.

Mr. FOWLER. Your department, I suppose, did look into this thing from the standpoint of navigation. What was the report?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was favourable.

Mr. FOWLER. Now it is before the Department of Marine and Fisheries for final adjudication.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Does the minister know what became of the application ? Has it been considered or not?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. FOWLER. Is the minister aware that in this harbour of Souris there has been built by the hon. member for Kings (Mr. J. J. Hughes) what is called a 'block' a sort of wharf which he had connected with the railway government and on which he has erected a warehouse ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. FOWLER. And that might or might not be an obstruction to navigation?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is no wharf there to impede navigation.

Mr. FOWLER. This wharf being built just where these gentlemen applied for the water rights, it is just possible that it might be an obstruction to navigation. Was not authority asked from the Department of Public Works by the member for the erection of a wharf ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My chief engineer says an application was made.

Mr. FOWLER. What became of it—was it favourably recommended?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Favourably recommended.

Mr. FOWLER. And the result was that the member was allowed to erect his wharf and build his warehouse and attach it to the government wharf.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, I understand it could not interfere with navigation.

Mr. FOWLER. Oh, of course. The department is doing some dredging there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have been.

Mr. FOWLER. Up towards the wharf of the member? The dredge is working there now, is it not?

Mr. PUGSLEY. At Souris 'The Montague.'

Mr. FOWLER. Has it reached the wharf of the member?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The railway wharf.

Mr. FOWLER. To which this other is attached.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I understand that it is inshore.

Mr. FOWLER. Yes, but will the minister say that the dredge is not working towards the shore ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know.

Mr. FOWLER. Will he say that it is not working towards the member's wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I could not say.

Mr. FOWLER. There is a boat house there, is there not?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know.

Mr. FOWLER. Is it built on the property of the member ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not knowing whether there is a boathouse there or not, I could not say.

Mr. FOWLER. Very well.

Summerside harbour breakwater—additional revote, $19,000, $25,000.

Mr. FOWLER. How much are you going to spend there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About $133,000, that is the contract.

Mr. PUGSLEY.

New Brunswick—Beaver harbour wharf, $5,000.

Mr. FOWLER. This is new?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Is it under contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It will be. Plans are not prepared.

Campbellton deep water wharf—extension repairs, &c., additional amount, $10,000.

Mr. CROCKET. Will that complete the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think so. It is under contract.

Dorchester wharf—addition to, additional amount, $7,000.

Mr. FOWLER. What are you doing there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Building an addition to the wharf, making it suitable for large steamers. Quite a large lumber business is done there.

Harvey bank wharf, $5,000.

Mr. FOWLER. What is to be built there?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There are two sites offered, one where the wharf will cost $12,000 and one where it can be built for $6,600. I think the one at $6,600 will be sufficient.

Mr. FOWLER. You have not yet purchased the site?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Lorneville breakwater wharf, $8,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Is that under contract ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It will be.

Leonardsville, Deer island—reconstruction and extension of wharf, $4,500.

Mr. FOWLER. What is to be the total cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About $4,500.

Madawaska river—extension of dyke on east side of river at Edmundston and repairs to a portion of dyke damaged by fire in September, 1907—additional amount, $3,000.

Mr. CROCKET. Will this complete the work ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROCKET. What will be the total ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. About $13,000.

Miscou—extension of wharf, $4,000.

Mr. FOWLER. That is in Gloucester too?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROCKET. Will this $4,000 cover the cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chief engineer thinks so.

Mr. CROCKET. What is the need of that extension ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. To get a greater depth of water to accommodate larger vessels. The tendency is for larger vessels to use this wharf.

Mr. TURGEON. Large steamers come to this point from Halifax, and this is to enable them to reach the wharf.

New Mills wharf, $5,000.

Mr. CROCKET. Is that quite new ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROCKET. Will this be the total cost ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. CROCKET. What is the estimate?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Probably $15,000. The contract is not let yet.

St. John river and tributaries—construction of wharfs in tidal waters, $15,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I propose out of this to commence the construction of several wharfs which are urgently required. Among others, one at Oromocto, a high water wharf, costing about $6,000 ; one at Burton, estimated at $3,000 ; one at Sheffield, estimated at $1,500 ; one at Maugerville. One is required at Barker's, one at Scotch Town, one at Newcastle, one at Lower Gage Town, one or two on the Kennebecasis, including Rothesay. Then there are one or two urgently required in the parish of Westfield. My idea was that by the time the engineer gets the plans and specifications ready and tenders are called for, probably the amount I am asking for will enable me to begin the construction of these various wharfs the present year.

Mr. FOWLER. I would like to put in a word for a high water wharf at Brown's Flats, which is very much required.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is under consideration. In addition to the $15,000, I have an amount in the main estimates to pay one-half the cost of construction of certain other works, with the idea that the provincial government will pay one-half.

Mr. FOWLER. I notice that the minister has put in a great deal of this money for works in the upper part of the St. John.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There are a good many wharfs already built in the lower part. They are kept in pretty good repair by the provincial government.

Mr. FOWLER. That high water wharf at Brown's Flats is more urgently required than any you have mentioned.

St. John river—to make survey between Fredericton and Woodstock with a view of improving navigation, $5,000.

Mr. CROCKET. What does the minister propose to do with reference to this survey?

Mr. PUGSLEY. When the estimate is passed I shall ask the chief engineer to organize an engineering party to engage at once in the work of making a survey.

Mr. CROCKET. Is it proposed to spend $5,000 for the purpose of surveying the river channel between Fredericton and Woodstock in order to ascertain where dredging is required?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is proposed to expend that if it is necessary.

Mr. CROCKET. I want to say that I regard this appropriation as a most ridiculous one. It is absolutely unnecessary for the purpose. There are six or seven places on the St. John river between Fredericton and Woodstock where dredging is necessary. These points are just as well known to men who are familiar with the river as the villages and post offices along the river. What the people of Fredericton and York county who are interested in navigation want is not $5,000 frittered away in an unnecessary and useless survey of this kind, but they want the channel cleared and dredged. They want some work done this season. If the minister, instead of asking for $5,000, had asked for double that amount and sent a dredge up to do the work, he would have acted more in accordance with the requirements of the situation. This matter had been standing for two or three years, neglected by this government, so that the result was that the people of the St. John valley have now lost the only means of communication they had between Woodstock and Fredericton. To propose now a survey of the river between these points and organize a surveying party for the purpose is the height of absurdity. Last year I called the attention of the acting Minister of Public Works to this matter. I had ascertained myself, from well known river men, at what points dredging was necessary, and I sent a memorandum to the Department of Public Works. If the minister will write to the resident engineer of St. John, I will venture to say that he will find out by means of a letter or two just where dredging is necessary, and if he had the interests of the people of the River St. John at heart he would consider it his duty to start that work without delay instead of wasting money in such a survey as he proposes. I will give the minister a pointer, that if he wants to get any votes at all for his candidate along the St. John river in the coming election, he had better not start any more surveys in that district. The people of the St. John river have had enough of election surveys. They had a survey prior to the last election which cost thousands and thousands of dollars, which was abso-

lutely a fake survey conducted for no other purpose than deceiving the people on the eve of the election. I could quote the words of the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell), that this was a survey which could not be depended upon. He denounced it in the Liberal convention in St. John as a survey which was no survey at all, of which there was not even profiles. If the minister wishes his friend Mr. Whitehead to get any votes at all along the St. John river, he had better not try the survey business on the people there again.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If I thought I knew as much about this matter as the hon. gentleman thinks he knows, but about which he does not know anything perhaps, I would be prepared to express my opinion on the question of engineering as to what is necessary to improve navigation on the St. John river. The problem is not such an easy one as the hon. gentleman seems to think. It is a problem which requires considerable engineering skill and I would not have thought that I would have been justified in asking for an appropriation from this parliament to engage upon the work of improving the navigation of the River St. John between Fredericton and Woodstock before first having had a proper survey made to determine the cost of the work and to find out what the result would be. The hon. gentleman says you have just to go and do some dredging. There is an engineer's report in my department which says that there is one place alone at Bear island where it will be necessary to construct a wing dam which will probably cost from $20,000 to $25,000 and there are probably other places along the St. John river where the same thing would be necessary.

Mr. CROCKET. How long has that report been on file in the department in regard to Bear island ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. For some little time; I do not know how long it has been there. It is a report which has been made by a competent engineer.

Mr. CROCKET. By Mr. Shewen ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think by Mr. Shewen, who is a very competent engineer indeed.

Mr. CROCKET. And you want a survey to verify the report ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I want a survey of the whole river between Fredericton and Woodstock for the purpose of ascertaining what the work is going to cost and whether, when the work has been done it will result in the improvement of the navigation of the river. I am not going to be rushed into an expenditure even in my own province until I am satisfied by the opinion of engineers that the expenditure will be profitable and will result in the improvement of navigation.

Mr. CROCKET. How long does the minister expect this survey to continue ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. As long as is necessary.

Mr. CROCKET. Will it be completed during the present season of navigation ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Just as quickly as is reasonably possible.

Mr. CROCKET. Does the minister expect it will be completed during the present season ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I hope it will.

Mr. CARVELL. It is a great satisfaction to know as much as the hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket) does but, unfortunately, there are a few people in Canada who are not in that happy condition. This survey is the result of a joint meeting of a number of people in his own constituency, in Carleton and the board of trade of Woodstock, who are interested in the question of having steamer navigation on the River St. John. The meeting was held in Woodstock in May. I received a resolution passed at that meeting and I presume my hon. friend did the same.

Mr. CROCKET. I brought this matter up two years ago. I pointed out to the hon. member for Carleton himself that Woodstock was as much interested in this as the people of York, and asked him to support me in my demand, and not till then was the hon. gentleman heard from in the matter.

Mr. CARVELL. I admit that. I am only pointing out to my hon. friend who makes so light of the fact of a survey being undertaken why I am asking for it and I admit that I have asked the minister to make this survey. It is because a number of people interested in it passed a resolution at a formal meeting attended by a hundred people in Woodstock asking that this survey be made. These gentlemen intend to put money into a steamer if something is done to make the project feasible, they do not know all about it and they have asked for this survey. I transmitted this memorial to the Minister of Public Works and I asked that he put an amount in the supplementary estimates in order that this survey might be made. This survey will be made. I am not perhaps as optimistic as to the results of dredging this river as the hon. member for York is, but I hope that they will be such as will justify the expenditure of some money and that the work will result in the improvement of navigation.

Mr. CROCKET. With regard to what my hon. friend from Carleton has said, the answer, I think, will be found in a speech which he made in this House the other night in which he said that there were six

or seven points between Fredericton and Woodstock where dredging was required. That is the same statement that was forwarded to the department by myself last year. He said that with the exception of these points the channel would be clear and that dredging would be required only at these places. He asked that the dredging be done this season, and suggested that if that could not be done a survey might be made. That did not look as if at that time he felt very strongly that any survey was necessary.

Tracadie—works for protection of channel and lighthouse, $2,500.

Mr. FOWLER. Is that not in Gloucester county ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. What do you want done there ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is for the protection of the channel and lighthouse.

Mr. TURGEON. At Tracadie there is an exportation of lumber to the amount of from 16,000,000 to 18,000,000 feet every year. The Snowball Company themselves cut about 8,000,000 feet.

Mr. FOWLER. This is for the Snowballs?

Mr. TURGEON. The Tracadie Lumber Company do a large business and the Arsenaults and Fergusons ship from there and many others also.

Mr. FOWLER. What will be the cost and what will be the result of this work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The cost is estimated at $2,500.

Mr. EMMERSON. I was part owner in a shooting lodge near the lighthouse and I know the locality very well. The lighthouse has been changed three times in that locality by the effect of storms. The waters of the straits of Northumberland reach the Tracadie Lagoon by means of a gully and every northeast storm changes the channel and washes away the beach between the lagoon and the straits so that they have to put up protection works.

Three Rivers—deep water coal wharf, $20,000.

Mr. FOWLER. What is this for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The harbour commissioners have urged us to build a wharf for the increasing business. I hesitated somewhat about it though I was impressed with the necessity for it and when the fire occurred I thought it would be better to build it this year.

Mr. FOWLER. Is it for a private coal dealer?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, public business.

Goderich harbour — breakwater—additional amount, $228,000.

Mr. FOWLER. What did that breakwater cost altogether?

Mr. PUGSLEY. $94,000.

Goderich harbour—to pay claims of Smeeth & McGillicuddy in connection with construction of wharf, $4,205.93.

Mr. FOWLER. Was that settled by arbitration?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The work was done under the direction of Mr. Gray who is now deceased. Mr. Gray's assistant while recognizing that the work was done in the public interest did not feel he could certify because there was no wrtten order. From the notes of the late Mr. Gray it appears that the work was done in the public interest and while there was no written order it ought to be paid to the contractors. It is on his recommendation as appearing in his notes that this amount is asked for.

Juniper island wharf, $1,500.

Mr. FOWLER. What is this for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is a very great deal of traffic upon these waters and Juniper island is a distributing point. A deputation waited on me urging this work and I am informed there is a very large commercial business done there.

Mr. FOWLER. You have as much right to put a wharf there as you have to put a wharf on any little island in a small lake.

Lakefield—reconstruction of wharf, &c., $4,050.

Mr. BENNETT. Was that a government wharf before ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Little Current—improvement of northern channel in Georgian bay, $50,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is under contract, it is improving the channel.

Magnetawan river—improvement of navigation above Kearny, $3,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is quite a considerable stretch of navigation here.

Michipicoten, Lake Superior—wharf on Michipicoten river, $3,000.

Mr. BENNETT. On whose property will this be erected ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. On government property, we have not acquired the site yet.

Montreal river—wharf on Lake Temiskaming, $3,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to pay land damages from floods which will be caused by the construction of a dam at Latchford to improve navigation.

Tiffin harbour—improvements, $50,000.

Mr. BENNETT. How much will be spent altogether at Tiffin ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We think $50,000 will be all we can do this year.

Mr. BENNETT. There is $75,000 in the main estimates, so there will be $125,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, this year.

Tobermory harbour—glance booms, $3,600.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This a harbour of refuge, and this is to prevent the boats running on the rocks as they come in.

Mr. BENNETT. Is the work at Matchadash to be done out of the general vote of $300,000 for dredging in Ontario and Quebec ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Does the minister propose to dredge also in the Coldwater river ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. Has there been any investigation of the Port Credit harbour in the last few weeks.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, I gave instructions to have an investigation made.

Mr. BLAIN. I want to impress the necessity of having dredging done there this summer if possible.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I had that in mind about the dredging. The great trouble is that the government of Ontario 50 years ago created a company as was apparently the practice at that time and gave over the foreshore, the harbour and everything. The company owning the wharf has allowed it to fall into decay.

Lesser Slave river—to complete urgent provisional improvements, $5,000.

Mr. FOWLER. What are you doing here ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Improving the navigation ; there is a steamer running and a considerable amount of traffic.

Spillumcheen river—repairs to bank protection works at Enderby, $2,500.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is the ordinary bank protection work, protecting the river channel.

Dredging—Quebec and Ontario, $300,000.

Mr. BENNETT. How will this be divided as between Quebec and Ontario ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. On the close of the session I intend to take the matter up with the chief engineer and the deputy, apportioning it to the different works according to our best judgment.

Thompson river improvements, $10,000.

Mr. FOWLER. What is that ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is on the North Thompson river.

Mr. FOWLER. There are no boats there except a small boat that may go up two or three times a year with supplies for the lumber company. This is simply for the benefit of an American lumber company having a mill at Kamloops.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is to improve navigation.

Mr. FOWLER. It is to help them in driving logs. It is nothing but a private enterprise and has nothing to do with the public at all.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is difficult in a new country always to draw the line.

Mr. FOWLER. I know all about the North Thompson river, and I know that the $10,000 is simply for the benefit of that private enterprise.

Mr. BENNETT. Is the minister getting new dredge plants?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have not matured our plans yet. We are thinking that instead of buying one or more dredges, we may build two or three. We are taking the vote with the view of getting dredging plant either the one way or the other. We want additional dredges in the lower provinces and in Ontario, Quebec and British Columbia.

Mr. BENNETT. Will tenders be called for the construction?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. There is a shipbuilding plant at Collingwood. They should be given a chance to build the dredges.

Mr. FOWLER. What is this item of $3,000 for clearing waterway of obstructions of Upper Lilloet river?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is to be applied in removing from the river at its outlet the remains of an old dam, one or two piers, gravel and some boulders, with the view of facilitating the discharge from the lake, so as to mitigate the overflow of the adjoining lands and improve navigation.

Mr. BERGERON. Does the government intend erecting the monuments to the memory of the late D'Arcy McGee and George Brown?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Nothing has been done yet, but we propose to place this work under the charge of the advisory art council who have to do with the erection of a monument in memory of Lafontaine and Baldwin.

Mr. BLAIN. Have the changes been made in the item in which my hon. friend from Brantford was interested?

Mr. FIELDING. It is noted for amendment on concurrence. The memorandum is in the hands of the clerk of the House, and our attention will be called to it when the item is reached.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens). I see an item of $4,000 additional for steam communication between Prince Edward Island, Cape Breton and Newfoundland. What ports will these boats touch ?

Mr. FIELDING. The wording of the item would admit the service being made to any port in Prince Edward Island. I am not aware of any special arrangements.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queens). I would like to know whether New London and Rustico are included in this service. I wish to impress on the minister the fact that both those sections, being on the north side and without railway communication, are the most neglected parts of Prince Edward Island as regards communication.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. HENDERSON. Will the Minister of Finance tell us if there are to be any further supplementary estimates?

Mr. FIELDING. To the best of my knowledge and belief, no.

Mr. HENDERSON. Not this session?

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Mr. HENDERSON. What business will be taken up in the morning?

Mr. FIELDING. After routine business a motion will be made for Supply. I understand that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) wishes to draw attention to a matter.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1.47 a.m., Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, July 17, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

THE QUEBEC BRIDGE.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Lunenburg) presented the report of the Select Committee appointed for the purpose of investigating the conditions and guarantee under which the government of Canada paid moneys to the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company.

Mr. WILLIAM CHISHOLM (Antigonish) moved that the report be concurred in. He said: As we are within a few hours of prorogaton, it would not be fair to the House for me to make any very extended remarks on this question. However, at the risk of wearying the House, I propose to make a few observations regarding it. The question of the construction of a bridge across the River St. Lawrence is an old question—one that has agitated the people of the province of Quebec, the city of Quebec particularly, for very many years. Indeed, about the time of confederation a report was made by an eminent engineer on the feasibility of a bridge at or near Quebec. Several times afterwards the question of bridging the St. Lawrence came up, and reports were made upon it, the tenor of which was that the project was a perfectly feasible one. In 1887 the Quebec Bridge Company was incorporated, and, as is usual in such cases, its charter was renewed from time to time. The company approached the then government of Canada and also the provincial and municipal authorities with a view to obtaining aid for the construction of such bridge, and assurances were given from time to time that upon its being shown that the scheme was a feasible and proper one, the necessary assistance would be rendered. Again and again Sir Charles Tupper and Sir John A. Macdonald promised assistance if the company would show that it was really in earnest. First when the bridge company was incorporated the capital stock was $1,000,000. It is alleged that this capital stock was very small for such a large enterprise. It is true the enterprise was a large one, the construction of the greatest bridge ever undertaken, but I should have thought that the time to discuss the question of the sufficiency of the capital stock was at the time of the incorporation of the Quebec Bridge Company. I do not think, however, this is a matter with which we need to concern ourselves at present. The bridge company was incorporated in 1887 and there was subsequent legislation revising and amending the terms of the company's charter. In 1889, a subsidy of $1,000,000 was voted by the parliament of Canada, as set out in this report, for the Quebec Bridge Company. Of this $1,000,000, $374,353 was eventually disbursed to the company. The assistance given by the Quebec government was $250,000 and the city of Quebec gave a subvention of $300,000 so that really this company started out, although its paid up capital was somewhat small for such a large enterprise with assets to the extent of $1,550,000 in addition to its capital stock of $1,000,000 of subvention from the Dominion government, $300,000 from the city of Quebec and $250,000 from the province of Quebec as subventions, indicate that the scheme must then have been recognized as a wise, prudent and patriotic one, and the company capable of carrying out the scheme. The fact that the city of Quebec and the province of Quebec contributed as liberally as they did goes to show what faith they had in this enterprise. When the Quebec Bridge Company

had approached the late government the answer in every case was: Show your good faith, show your sincerity in this scheme, by contributing yourselves. Therefore that company was incorporated and the citizens of Quebec, irrespective of politics, actuated mainly by patriotic views and by the desire to have this route across the St. Lawrence which would be not only of national importance but of great local importance contributed towards the scheme. It is true they contributed in small sums in many cases but this goes to show that this was not one of the wild-cat schemes we too frequently see, but was a genuine scheme. The list of shareholders contains the names of some of the very best men of the province and city of Quebec—merchants, bank presidents, vice-presidents and directors, presidents and vice-presidents of railways, Conservatives and Liberals alike.

In 1900, the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company entered into a contract with M. P. Davis for the construction of a substructure and in 1903 entered into a contract with the Phœnix Bridge Company of Phœnixville, Pa., for the construction of the superstructure. Before the company entered into the contract for the superstructure, tenders were asked from various bridge companies in America. Tenders were called for by public advertisement throughout Canada and the United States. Quite a number of plans and offers were submitted by different companies. The determination of which was the best plan to adopt was a matter of vital importance. Inquiries were made as to the most competent engineers on the continent and the directorate of the Quebec Bridge Company after most careful consideration of the information obtained became convinced that Mr. Theodore Cooper was the most eminent and competent engineer in America. The plans were submitted to him, he examined them all and ultimately arrived at the conclusion that the best plan to adopt was that submitted by the Phœnix Bridge Company, and he so advised the directorate of the Quebec Bridge Company. It is not alleged and cannot be alleged that the Quebec Bridge Company did not take all necessary precautions to ascertain the best plan and scheme for the construction of the proposed bridge, and to have it constructed on the best terms possible. In fact it is quite sufficient to say that such men as the directors of the Quebec Bridge Company, business men of experience as they are, would of course take all precautions. There is abundant evidence that they proceeded with the greatest care with respect to the selection of a plan and getting a company to build this work, as indeed they did proceed, in all the different matters with which they had to do.

As to Mr. Cooper, the report of the Royal Commission which investigated the causes of the collapse of the bridge speaks of him in the most complimentary words. It is admitted on all sides that he is and was regarded at that time as the best authority who could be secured. The plans submitted by the Phœnix Bridge Company were prepared by Mr. Szlapka, the designing engineer for the Phœnix Bridge Company. After the plans had been prepared they were submitted to Mr. Cooper who carefully examined them. They were also submitted to a government engineer, Mr. Schreiber. It will be observed that the greatest care and caution were exercisd by the government to see that the plans were properly drawn; they were not satisfied with the opinion of their own engineer but called in a more expert and eminent scientific authority in whom they might have the fullest confidence. They therefore selected Mr. Theodore Cooper. On October 19, 1903, an agreement was entered into between the government of Canada, and the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company which provided, among other things, that the company should release any claim it had to any unpaid balance of the subsidy of $1,000,000 voted in 1899. The government of Canada agreed to guarantee the bonds of the company, not to exceed in amount $6,678,200, which amount was considered necessary to meet the liabilities of the company as at that date, and to complete the construction of the bridge.

It is alleged that at that time the government should have taken over the assets of the bridge company. In what better position would the government have been in if they had done so? The Quebec Bridge Company, it must be admitted on all sides, had constructed the work up to that date as economically and carefully as possible. It was their interest to do so. The evidence, I am sure, shows that they exercised the greatest care and had carried on the construction in the most businesslike way. Could the government have done better? I submit, it could not. I submit that for every dollar expended there was a dollar of work there. In fact, I go further and say that, according to the testimony of Mr. Parent, the bridge company had got for about one and one quarter million dollars substructure and approaches for which the government would have paid at least two million dollars. One can readily understand how that could be; the work would be conducted more economically by a company than by the government. I do not mean to say that government works are constructed extravagantly or that in all cases it is inadvisable to have work done by the government: but we must admit that often, and particularly in the case of these very large works, a company can build more economically than the government can.

Now, it is alleged that when the government undertook to guarantee the bonds of the Quebec Bridge Company, they did not take sufficient precautions in the way of

providing a competent engineer to look after their interests in the work. What happened? Immediately after the government became responsible under this agreement of 1903, it provided for the appointment of an engineer to look after the government's interests. The minority report states that an order in council was passed that such an engineer should be appointed. I believe that is true. It was not true, however, that it was on the suggestion of the Quebec Bridge Company's consulting engineer or of the bridge company, this course was not pursued, that is, that the employment of an expert bridge engineer who was to act independently on behalf of the governemnt was dispensed with. Now, that is not correct. The evidence is entirely the other way I would refer to the evidence of Mr. Parent at page 181:

Q. When the difficulty arose about the employment of an expert, by Mr. Schreiber, why did not the bridge company insist that such expert be appointed and act so that the company might benefit by the advice of that expert, without having to pay the cost of an investigation?

A. The bridge company never objected to that; on the contrary, it was favourable to the government's suggestion. I met Mr. Cooper myself in regard to that matter, in New York; Mr. Cooper objected entirely to Mr. Nichol being associated with him in the construction of the bridge.

Mr. Nichol was the engineer suggested to the government by Mr. Schreiber. So far as the bridge company was concerned they interposed not the slightest objection to the employment by the government of Mr. Nichol or any other man. But Mr. Cooper did object to any other engineer being associated with him. Mr. Parent went to New York to see Mr. Cooper and tried to persuade him that it was proper the government should have an engineer. But he objected to any one——

—he even went so far as to say hat if we insisted he would resign his position. He even came to Canada to meet Mr. Schreiber and discuss the question; the government had to choose between the resignation of Mr. Cooper and the appointment of Mr. Nichol.

You will observe therefore, that the statement of the minority report, that the bridge company's consulting engineer objected to or prevented the selection of an independent engineer is at variance with the facts. And further on:

Q. Why could Mr. Cooper object to the government employing the person it desired to employ in order to assure itself of the efficacy of the plans?—A. The reasons given by Mr. Cooper were these: If the government appoints an expert or a bridge engineer, that man might probably take upon himself to do certain things or to give instructions during the building that might clash with that which I might myself do; and as the affair is a large one I do not wish that any one but myself should interfere in the control of the entire construction. His fear was that such a man might give instructions contrary to his own. Mr. Cooper considered at the time that Mr. Hoare was all he needed and that the latter would not take upon himself to do anything without consulting him.

Now, what could the government do under these circumstances? If it persisted in taking Mr. Nichol, who, it is admitted, was not as competent, by any manner of means, who had not so high a reputation as an engineer as Mr. Cooper, they would have lost the services of the latter. Then, if the bridge had gone down as it very likely would have the government would have been accused of negligence; it would have been said that they failed to avail themsedves of the service of the most competent man and had taken a second rate man. This is clearly set forth in the evidence of Mr. Parent, who said:

Q. If the expert the government had decided to employ had found out the defects in the plans that have caused the disaster, would it not have been a good thing?—A. Here is what might have happened: Mr. Cooper pretended that there was no man who could go over his work and I think that was pretty much the opinion of eminent engineers at that time; and on the other hand, if the government had appointed Mr. Nichol, if Mr. Cooper had resigned and that the accident of the 29th August had taken place all the same, the government would have been blamed far more for having set Mr. Cooper aside, he who was considered the best of authorities—to take Mr. Nichol, who was not such; the situation would then have been worse.

Therefore, the action of the government in continuing Mr. Cooper and not selecting Mr. Nichol is quite justified by the facts. And why should not Mr. Cooper have been continued? It is true, he was the consulting engineer of the Quebec bridge company. But it is observed that the Quebec Bridge Company's interest and the government's interests were identical. If Mr. Cooper had been the Phœnix Company's engineer, it would have been a different case, for their interest and that of the government might have not always been the same. The Quebec Bridge Company's interest and the government's interest coincided, and the engineer employed was the most eminent engineer to be found in America. And this man's services were continued.

Now, I come to another point. In the agreement in the Act of 1903, it is provided that before the government guarantees the bonds of the company, the company was to procure subscriptions to $200,000 additional stock. I may say that the company had delivered bonds to the extent of $472,000 to M. P. Davis for amount due on the substructure. These bonds were sold at 60 cents to Mr. Davis himself, who was the only person then to accept them.

The discount of forty per cent, that is to say the difference between par

and the price at which the bonds were sold to Mr. Davis, the contractor for the substructure, had, according to the terms of the agreement referred to between the government and the company to be paid up by the stockholders before the government guaranteed the bonds. What happened with regard to that? It is alleged that the whole amount of $200,000 of stock was not actually paid up before the bonds were guaranteed. The way that happens is set out in the majority report, clause 7:

It was urged before the committee that contrary to the provisions of the agreement ratified by chapter 54 of the Acts 1903, the issue of the said bonds preceded the payment of the $200,000 of additional stock by reason of the fact that a cheque of M. P. Davis given in payment of subscription stock, in the sum of $94,900 was not immediately converted into cash and that there was therefore, in this respect, not a compliance by the company with section 4 of the agreement of October 19, 1903.

The company regarded this cheque as cash and so certified to the government and thereupon the government became guarantor of the bonds. The directors did not deem it advisable that the contractor should be too large a holder of this stock.

It was agreed by the Grand Trunk Railway Company that it would take up a certain amount, and it was expected that the Quebec Central Railway Company would also have taken a certain amount of this stock, and in that way the amount of stock in Mr. Davis' hands would be lessened. It was a wise precaution for the directors to endeavour to prevent the contractor having the control of the stock to be issued and paid up. When they got his cheque for $112,000 they regarded it as cash, although they did not cash it and deposit the proceeds. They expected, as I have said, the Grand Trunk Railway to take a portion and the Quebec Central another portion of these 112,000 shares. The Grand Trunk did come later on and take a portion of this stock, paid for the same and a new cheque was given by Mr. Davis for $94,900, the original cheque having been returned to him. That is to say, Mr. Davis first paid up $112,000 for the new stock by giving his cheque therefor, but the Grand Trunk took the difference later on, and Mr. Davis' stock came down to $94,900. The Quebec Central, it was expected, would take over a certain other portion of this 94,900 shares, but it happened that the Quebec Central was not in a position to do so owing to the fact that its charter did not permit it at that time to purchase stock. Later on this company did actually buy stock from the Hon. John Sharples. As soon as it became apparent that nobody else would take any portion of the 94,900 shares, the bridge company cashed the cheque of M. P. Davis. The question arises as to whether that cheque should be regarded as cash. The Quebec Bridge Company did regard it as cash. The evidence of Mr. Price and Mr. Lemoine, who are gentlemen of the highest financial standing justifies one in holding that the cheque meant cash. At any rate the company did regard it as such. It was cashed and was placed to the credit of the company. The time when it was cashed is not material. I mention these facts to show why the cheque was held so long. The stock was issued to Mr. Davis just as soon as he gave his cheque. It was merely a matter of delay in going to the bank and getting the cheque cashed.

Now objection is made that the Quebec Bridge Company disposed of their bonds at 60 cents on the dollar. Regarding that it must appear to any person that these bonds must be disposed of at the highest price they would bring on the market. Now what is the evidence regarding the wisdom of selling these bonds at 60 cents on the dollar? Take the evidence of Mr. Price. Mr. Price was a director of the old company, is a large lumber merchant and is associated in many commercial undertakings. He is also a leading Conservative in the city of Quebec and a man of high standing in that city. On page 94 he says this regarding the sale of bonds:

Q. Do you consider that a good bargain, or otherwise, made by the company from a purely business standpoint?—A. Well, when you can only get one man to buy something that nobody else will buy you are generally satisfied with your bargain.

Q. Of course you have got to take the circumstances into consideration. Taking the circumstances that existed into consideration, do you consider that the company showed good business judgment in making this deal with Mr. Davis?—A. Absolutely so, because if the substructure had been completed and the superstructure had never been completed, the bonds would be absolutely valueless.

Here is the opinion of Mr. Price, who says it was absolutely a good bargain. Then Mr. Gaspard Lemoine, who is also one of the leading men in the city of Quebec, who was formerly president and vice-president of the Lake St. John Railway and now a director of the Quebec bank, says that was a good bargain, that in his opinion the Quebec company acted wisely in disposing of the bonds at 60 cents. In fact he says they could not get that much anywhere else. To the same effect is the testimony of Mr. Thomas McDougall, who was the banker with whom the bonds were deposited by Mr. Davis for advances. He says on page 126 of the evidence:

Q. Will you as a bank manager probably dealing in these matters, tell us what you think about it?—A. Of course when we took this bond from Mr. Davis we took it as collateral security for his account which was a running account with us for the construction of the bridge. We did not go minutely into the exact value of it, Mr. Davis handed it to us and told us he had a good contract and we knew that he knew his business well.

Q. Give us your opinion as a banker, for Mr. Davis ?—A. As a banker I think he took very considerable chances on these bonds.

Q. As a banker you think he took very considerable chances in taking those bonds on his contract ?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you think that price could have been obtained in the bond market for them ?—A. Never.

To the same effect is the testimony of Mr. Scott and Mr. Dumoulin. Now as to the conduct of the affairs of the bridge company the evidence of the solicitor went to show that it was conducted on thorough business lines. The testimony to which I refer was the testimony of men whose judgment and integrity cannot be questioned and whose standing every man admits. They say that under the management of Mr. Parent the affairs of the Quebec Bridge Company were conducted in a thoroughly businesslike manner and it must be very gratifying to Mr. Parent to receive the testimony of such gentlemen as those who appeared before the committee. The opinion they gave of his management was indeed very flattering and does high credit to the integrity and ability of the president of the Quebec Bridge Company, the present chairman of the Transcontinental Railway Commission. As far as the management is concerned, I think, it must be admitted on all sides that everything was done thoroughly and well.

Now, I come to the falling of the bridge. It is true that the bridge fell but whose fault is it? It is not alleged that it was the fault of any party in so far as the actual work itself is concerned. The report of the Royal Commission is to the effect that it was due to a mistake on the part of Mr. Cooper, the consulting engineer. It is all very well to be wise after the fact but could anybody forsee that such a calamity would happen. If the government had undertaken to build that bridge would it not have proceeded in the same way? It appears now that the proper course would have been to have selected three competent engineers to direct and control the undertaking. That suggestion has been made in the report. But, if these three competent engineers are selected, have you any assurance that another accident may not occur ? Experience will be of great assistance in guiding these engineers but we have no assurance that the employment of even three of the most competent engineers, whoever they may be, will prevent an accident occurring. If the government had taken over the assets of the Quebec Bridge Company in 1903 it is reasonable to suppose that they would have done the very same thing in the matter of continuing the work that the Quebec Bridge Company did. These men who were at the head of the Quebec Bridge Company were men of eminent business ability and capacity. The accident is due to no fault of the Quebec Bridge Company. They exercised the greatest caution possible. It is alleged that Mr. Hoare did not possess the scientific skill that was necessary. Who could tell anything about Mr. Hoare's scientific skill or whether he was defective in that regard at that time? You have to take Mr. Hoare as you find him. The Quebec Bridge Company knew that he was a man of extensive experience, that he was a man recognized as possessing great professional skill. He had been for thirty years engaged in general railway and bridge work. He had been with the company since its inception and he was familiar with the development of this work. He supervised the building of the substructure. He did one of the finest pieces of work in the world. It is admitted that the substructure is one of the best pieces of work of that kind to be found anywhere in the world and the best evidence of that is found in the fact that it stood the very severe strain which was put upon it by the falling of the bridge. Mr. Hoare was recognized on all sides as a man having the necessary professional skill and as being eminently qualified for this position. But, with the caution which characterized the Quebec Bridge Company, they went farther and retained the services of Mr. Cooper, a recognized authority. Referring to Mr. Hoare, I will read from page 103 what Mr. Price says :

Q. Did you know, or do you know, that Mr. Hoare was ever connected with any great bridge construction work, apart from the ordinary bridge on the railway?—A. I do not know exactly what work he has done; I know he has had a varied experience.

Q. In the way you have spoken of?—A. Generally on bridge work, on railways and on general engineering work?

Q. But are you able to say that you do know he was connected with any large, very large, bridge construction in metal?—A. I believe he built the largest bridge for the Lake St. John, or the Great Northern at Hawkesbury, I believe a cantilever bridge.

Q. He built an iron or steel bridge I presume?—A. Yes.

Q. For the Lake St. John Railway?—A. Or the Great Northern.

The testimony of the directors is to the effect that they were perfectly satisfied that Mr. Hoare was the right man for the place —otherwise they would not have engaged him at all—and they had every reason to believe that he was fitted to assume the responsibilty because of the wide experience he had had. It is true that it is stated in the report of the Royal Commission that Mr. Hoare did not have the high technical skill which a man in that position should possess. It is very easy to say that now, but would these gentlemen have made that report previous to the collapse of the bridge at which time he was regarded as a man of excellent practical ability? Previous to the fall of the bridge nobody thought there was anything wrong, nobody thought that

the bridge was not in charge of the best engineers that it was possible to secure and nobody intimated that the business of the company was not conducted in a proper way. Now that the bridge has fallen people naturally try to find excuses and to throw the blame on somebody and in this case it is thrown on the Quebec Bridge Company with the view, perhaps, of making a little political capital against the government. But, if you look at it fairly and squarely, I submit there is nothing in the evidence or the circumstances which would justify the charge that there was any carelessness or negligence whatever on the part of the government or of the Quebec Bridge Company. I submit that under these circumstances there is nothing that the House can do except concur in the majority report. The majority report does not pass judgment on the cause of the fall of the bridge which is a matter that scientific men alone can pass upon. On this point it refers to the evidence taken before the Royal Commission where experts dealt with the question. But the minority report undertakes to throw the blame on Mr. Hoare. If there is blame to be thrown on anybody it must be thrown on Mr. Cooper, but I do not think that anybody will say that Mr. Cooper was not recognized as an authority. It is true that his judgment failed in this case, but the greatest scientists in the world make mistakes and their judgment is apt at times to be at fault. I move therefore that the majority report be concurred in.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by my hon. friend from Huntingdon (Mr. Walsh):

That the said report be not adopted, but that this House adopt in lieu thereof the draft report suggested by the minority of said special committee as the same appears in the minutes of said committee.

It is a very ungrateful task to have to address the House on a matter of such great importance as this is within a few hours of prorogation. Nevertheless, I think it my duty to give some details to the House with regard to the conclusions which the minority have arrived at with respect to these matters. It seems a fatal matter. When we voted $1,000,000 in support of this enterprise it was, if I remember rightly, at the close of the session, when we entered into the unfortunate arrangement of 1903 which was the cause of this great disaster and has brought us to this impasse it was within forty-eight hours of the closing of the session and here we are, within a few hours of the closing of this session, obliged to consider this matter in all its aspects and necessarily obliged to be extremely brief in any observations which we have to make. I feel it my duty to say that the proceedings of the committee were of a most agreeable character, the minority have no complaint to make on that score.

Mr. W. CHISHOLM.

The chairman was fair throughout and so agreeable were our relations that on the last evening, at our meeting to consider the report, although we were in a majority, we considered my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) as present by a fiction of the imagination, we assumed that his view would be contrary to our own, and although in reality we were in a majority, our report was considered rejected and it comes in as a minority report.

I cannot help thinking that this matter is a lesson to us. We ought, I think, to adopt some rule under which matters of this importance could not come before the consideration of the House at such a late hour of the session. I think that would be a protection for the government which would prevent our proceedings from being, as to my mind they are in this instance, a contempt of the rights of the people. My hon. friends on the committee, although our relations were agreeable throughout, when it came to a consideration of the conclusions of the committee, seemed to have looked upon the matter as one of scarcely any importance. Look at their report; it is a relation of facts about which there is no controversy whatever. The origin of this company, its subsidies, the agreement of 1903, are all set forth, but when you come to that dreadful accident which has cost the country 100 lives and has involved us in a loss which, in my opinion, will amount to over $7,000,000, they do not seem to think it is of more importance than would be the breaking of a window sash in the construction of a building.

Mr. TALBOT. What did the hon. member expect the majority of the committee to say about the accident?

Mr. MONK. I thought that in spite of any political tendencies they would view this matter as a great national question, a grave national disaster, something serious about which it is of no use trying to shield people who are at fault. It is better to lay the blame where it should rest and attempt to arrive at the conclusions which impose themselves. The conclusions to which the minority arrive are the conclusions to which the royal commission arrived almost in terms. Does the government find fault with the conclusions of the commission which they named to look into this matter? There is nothing in the report of the minority that you will not find in the very able, the very exhaustive report to which the government seem to have adhered and at which arrived the royal commissioners named to investigate the causes of this disaster. The commission were not charged, as we were, with this particular feature of the matter, but their commission was of so large a scope that they entered into it and arrived at precisely the same conclusion as we have arrived at as regards the

financial aspect of the question and the control of the plans of the bridge—or rather the want of control, for which the Minister of Finance is absolutely responsible, and in regard to which I shall be very glad to hear what explanations he has to give to the House. I do not mean that the Finance Minister did not make a struggle in this case, as he did in all matters relating to the Quebec bridge, but he succumbed at the last, and he is responsible for the fix in which we find ourselves at the present.

Let me refer briefly to the objects of the investigation, because I think it necessary to point that out. We were charged with the task of investigating the conditions and guarantees under which this government paid moneys to the Quebec Bridge Company, endorsed and guaranteed the bonds of that company and what was our recourse at the present moment, and we were charged also with the examination of what precautions the government took in regard to suitable and proper plans for that great structure.

One word in regard to the financial situation. My hon. friend who has opened the discussion on this question has spoken of the men who were in this company. I know most of them; they are certainly good men. I have known Mr. Sharples for a long time, and I have nothing but good to say of him. Mr. Laliberté I have known for a long time; he is a very estimable citizen; in fact, most of them are good men. They seem, in this instance, to have lent their names to an enterprise which, from its inception, viewed from a financial standpoint only, was absolutely ridiculous, perfectly absurd. Here is a company that had for its object the construction of a bridge which could not cost less than $6,000,000; that was a low estimate. What did they put into the enterprise? At most, at the time the scheme was entered into, $65,000. That was the paid-up capital of this ridiculous company, and then $20,000 of this at the very least, as mentioned in our own report, was given to the directors of the company not in accordance with the Act of incorporation of the company. Section 8 of the Act of 1887 incorporating the company defines under what circumstances stock can be given in payment, and it would not be under that section given to the directors for labours. To mention labours seems absurd; they performed no labours. In violation of that clause, out of the $65,000, we find in our report that they got $20,000, reducing the capital stock of the company, organized for an enterprise that could not cost less than $6,000,000, to the sum of $45,000. I say that they got more than $20,000. At page 27 of the printed record you will find $5,200 additional. There was some doubt about that, in regard to which my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) and my hon. friend from Huntingdon (Mr. Walsh) did not seem to be convinced. We have reported, in regard to which there is no doubt whatever, that they got $20,000 out of the $65,000. I say that it is in evidence before the committee that they got $25,200 in stock out of the $65,000. But why harp about that? In the Senate not long ago an answer was given by the Secretary of State to an inquiry made by Hon. Senator Landry, and what is the effect of that answer? It may be found under the caption of 'Payment to the Quebec Bridge Directors.' The information is authentic; there is no doubt about it; the directors of this company, these great men who are so patriotic, who have done so much for this enterprise and for their country in such a disinterested manner, have received, according to the answer given by the Hon. Mr. Scott, which answer was furnished by the Bridge Company, $49,601.01 out of a total paid-up capital stock of $65,000.

Mr. TALBOT. Will my hon. friend allow one slight correction? I know he wants to be fair; but when he states that there was only $65,000 paid up, surely he knows better than that.

Mr. MONK. I am speaking of the company at its inception. I will refer in a moment to what happened in 1903; and what happened in 1903 was a deception and a snare, just like what happened before. I say that at the period of which I am now speaking the directors, out of a capital stock of $65,000, received for themselves $49,601.01—the secretary, $16,890, and Mr. Hoare, the architect or engineer of the bridge, $45,150. The personnel of this company had $111,641.01 on a paid-up capital stock of $65,000. The financial situation resolves itself into this, that this company owes the government at the present moment $6,000,000. There is no error in that. I did not hear my hon. friend (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) in his long comments on this question, point out any error in our calculations. It is over $6,000,000 They owe the government $100,000 and more of duties. What else they owe at or around Quebec I do not know. What are their assets? Nothing. There are piers there. There are some constructions and some materials. What is the value of them? Nothing. Possibly the piers may be some use if the new board finds that they can be utilized. But I asked Mr. Holgate the question: 'What can those piers be useful for?' He said: 'I do not know; it is very doubtful if they can be of any use, because any new plan must be absolutely different from the other; but they may be of use.' I do not deny it. It is possible that they may have to be demolished. The materials can be of very little use. I say that these assets are valueless. This is an absolutely insolvent concern, and the government have recognized it to-day. But they did not recognize it in 1903, when that company came

here, having no assets whatever and a floating debt of over three-quarters of a million. That, I say, is the financial aspect. Our hon. friends in their report, have endeavoured to show that there was something of value. There is really nothing. My hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) suggests that the new board may change the location of the bridge. It is very probable that they will. From what evidence I heard, it seems to me improbable that they will decide upon the present site. We shall see when the board has reported. The government have done to-day, after all this loss has been incurred, after a hundred lives have been sacrificed, what they should have done at the very beginning; they have begun to consider plans: they never have done so before to-day. I assert that the government have never looked into the plans of this bridge company. Here we are, face to face with the construction of the greatest bridge in the world, the like of which has never been seen. We were involved to the extent that we financed the whole business, and the government—the Minister of Finance, pushed, I suppose, influenced by many forces—never saw fit to control the plans, to see what all this was going to be. That is a very strong assertion; I will endeavour to prove it. It was what the Royal Commission found. They gently hint. They do not use strong terms. I believe the time has come to speak the truth. But they say: 'The misfortune is that these plans were never studied by the government.' What happened, Mr. Speaker? You will scarcely believe the story, but it is borne out by the work of the Royal Commission and by the evidence before our own committee. We had it in the findings and the evidence of the Royal Commission, even if we had heard no witnesses at all. But we heard some, and we three have arrived at the same conclusion as the Royal Commission; we have that satisfaction at any rate. Let us speak of the plans. Would you believe it, Mr. Speaker, that in regard to this bridge, the greatest bridge in the world, Mr. Hoare, a very nice fellow, I have no doubt, but about as competent as a bridge engineer as I am, sent in to the government the specifications, which were in printed form, handed by the government to bridge constructors when we give subsidies for bridges, as we gave a great many last night. He took those specifications for the Quebec bridge, and sent them in to the government as the specifications for the Quebec bridge, with a span of 800 feet. Is that credible? Yet it is the fact. What happened? Mr. Douglas, our engineer for bridge purposes, found fault with them. He ventured to report to the government that the unit stress were too great, by which, as far as I understand the language of these gentlemen, is meant the weight was too great for these specifications. It was a note of warning; but the government took no notice of it whatever. Here was a construction, the plans of which had been devised by the construction company itself, the Phœnix Bridge Company, the government took no notice whatever of this note of warning sounded by Mr. Douglas. The bridge company has taken as its consulting engineer Mr. Cooper. Mr. Cooper is an eminent engineer. He is a man of seventy, and never but once, so far as I know, went near the construction; and the man who in reality is responsible for the preparation of these plans is Mr. Szlapka, with Mr. Deans. Who is Mr. Deans? The chief engineer of the Phœnix Bridge Company, and any man who goes on the street will know that Mr. Deans is a very rash engineer. He is a man of ability, who aims at heap construction, and his aims have been attended by sinister misfortunes in the United States.

The government could have found that out easy enough; they did not trouble to inquire. But the critical moment came; the moment when the Minister of Finance enters on the scene—I believe I know too much of the Minister of Finance to think that were he not led in the matter he would not have done as he did—the critical moment was when the plans came up for approval by the government. Mind you, Mr. Speaker, when we gave the subsidy we stipulated we should have control of the plans and should approve them; we always make such a stipulation. But further, in 1903 when we entered into this disastrous agreement we had stipulated specially in the Act passed at the end of the session, that we would have control of the plans and would supervise them. I may say to the House now that after the passage of that Act the government gave itself no heed whatever of these plans and never bothered about them at all. Parliament—as we say properly in our report—had imposed in that Act the duty upon the government of supervising the plans of this vast and unprecedented structure. But after the passage of the Act the government paid no attention to the matter. In July, 1903, when the whole of this scheme was concocted which we heard of only at the end of October, 1903, when parliament was about to prorogue, this matter came up before the government and what happened? I say it is incredible to believe the tale which is unfolded unless you read the proof of it in the evidence. Mr. Schreiber is a very good engineer—there are a great many good engineers, but when you come to look into the plans of a bridge alongside of which the Forth bridge is a small affair, you require special skill and special caution in your experts. What did Mr. Schreiber do? In July he asked the government, and he gave reasons for his request, to employ a specialist in bridge engineering to oversee these plans, and Mr. Speaker, had that been done I have no hesitation in saying—in fact I asked the question of Mr. Holgate and he gave a reply which he carefully read leads to the same conclusion—had that been done

the fatal defect in this bridge would have been detected. It was pointed out by Holgate and his associates that after this disaster the government asked a special bridge engineer in the United States to look into the matter and he pointed out the defect. Mr. Douglas, our own engineer, had hinted at it. I believe that Mr. Cooper, being one man with one head had overlooked the matter; it escaped him. No one man alone can carry out an enterprise of that kind; it is impossible. And, Sir, had that been done and had Mr. Schreiber's request been complied with we would not have had to lament and deplore this immense loss of life and money. But what happened? The tale continues to be extraordinary, it reads like a romance. I should have said that when Mr. Schreiber's request came before the government, the government of course granted it and an order in council of the 26th of July authorized Mr. Schreiber to employ a specialist. But this was objected to by parties interested. Mr. Cooper would not hear of it for he looked upon it as an insult. Here was the government of Canada financing this bridge and charged with the duty of overseeing these plans, and what insult could there be to Mr. Cooper. The correspondence is there, but I will not refer to it for I feel I am taking up to much time.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. MONK. It is such an important matter that I must refer to it with some emphasis. Mr. Cooper would not hear of another engineer being called in and he wrote to Mr. Hoare of the bridge company and he pointed out to the government that this was altogether extraordinary. Extraordinary? How? The people of Canada were furnishing the money to finance the whole enterprise; the government of Canada were charged with the supervision of the plans and they were asked to have an independent examination of these plans. What was extraordinary about that? What happened? Why, the government gave up completely and had no examination made whatever, and the plans lay there in the Department of Railways in a huge trunk, all of them approved under the circumstances I have narrated and without a special bridge engineer being called in to give his opinion on them. Well, Sir, I think that with regard to the plans the minority of the committee are right in asserting—as did the Royal Commission and as any man who reads the evidence must assert——that there was no examination of the plans of this vast structure by the authority that should have examined them. The fact remains that we financed the enterprise without controlling the plans although the government was specially charged to control them; and here again was exhibited that same lackadaisical spirit that has characterized the government all through in connection with this vast work. And the member for Antigonish (Mr. Chisholm) has conceded the point when he said: The government considered Mr. Cooper was a competent man and provided the strength of the original specifications was maintained everything was satisfactory. These are the conclusions to which we of the minority have arrived. First, as regards the finances it is a total loss; second, as regards the plans there has been no control, no effective and suitable control of these plans. The plans were approved as a formality and nothing more, and when you come to consider the vastness of this undertaking and the dangers that surrounded the building of a bridge of that size for which there is no parallel in the world, it seems to me that we are right in saying that the government did not use proper precautions in regard to the plans of the structure.

But I must hasten on to what I consider the vital matter. The past is past and there is no use shedding tears, although it is necessary to point out where the responsibility is and where the defect was. But, to-day there is a proposition which the government brings to our consideration a few hours before prorogation. Mind you, this accident happened on the 29th of August, 1907. Lest there should be any misunderstanding, I think I am faithfully speaking the opinion of both my colleagues of the minority of the committee when I say that we believe that this is not only a great national undertaking but that this is a bridge that must be built, and built at once. I do not wish to be represented in my own province as being opposed to this great undertaking. I think the bridge should be built at once. In my opinion when they named the board of very able men who constituted this Royal Commission the government should also have named at that time a board of engineers to prepare plans. We should have had those plans before parliament in January last, possibly with the contract. We should have been in a position months ago to close this matter up and to decide as to the completion of this great work. Instead of that, we are here to-day, with what, Mr. Speaker? With a proposal to indemnify the shareholders. That is what the proposal of the government amounts to. Let me define my position in that respect. Have we authority at the present moment to construct this bridge? I take the statute relating to the National Transcontinental Railway as passed in 1903, and I find in that statute that the government has not only authority but is bound by agreement with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to build another railway from Winnipeg to Moncton. I say there is authority in that statute to build not only the railway but the bridges connected with the railway. There is authority in that statute to bridge every river and every stream along the route of the railway, and consequently we have authority to bridge the St. Lawrence.

There is no doubt about that. It would take too much time to quote the law, but there is no doubt about it. Any Minister of Justice who looks at that statute of 1903 will find not only that the government has authority to raise the necessary money, but it is authorized and indeed it is bound under the agreement which is a schedule to the Act to build that railway and to build that bridge.

Therefore, I say that the moment this accident happened—for now I confine my remarks to the events since this dreadful occasion—the government could have named the commission for which it has asked a vote of $25,000 in the estimates recently passed by this House. It had authority to name a board of engineers to go to work at once. No legislation was necessary. We have the law to go on and finish the bridge, just as we have the law to finish the railway. Fault is found with the calculations of the leader of the opposition as to the cost of this railway. I find fault with them too ; I say that they are too low, the railroad will cost more than the hon. member has estimated. But we are in for it, and we must—and, of course, we will—carry out the work whatever happens. I say that the government has all the necessary authority to go on and finish the work. And what does the Minister of Railways want to do now? He wants this House to authorize the government to take up the agreement of 19th October, 1903, and pay money right and left. We are to begin by paying $265,000, the amount of the capital stock. Let me digress for a moment. The hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) said that I was mistaken as to the amount of this capital stock. We had imposed upon this company in 1903 the necessity of raising $200,000 additional stock. We would not give the guarantee otherwise. That money was to be employed in paying the discount on the bonds. But they never paid it. They sent a certificate to the Minister of Finance that the condition had been complied with. It had not been complied with ; they were $94,000 short, the amount subscribed by the contractor of the bridge who had paid in the bonds of the old company with the discount, and who paid up when the bonds were paid. out of the guaranteed amount. This was paid, I believe, in 1907. This is the story of the $200,000 additional stock. What we are asked to do now is to pay out money. The bridge lies there under the water, holding in its cruel clutches the bodies of many of those who lost their lives on that terrible day. What we are asked to do is to pay $265,000 to the shareholders. Are we obliged to pay it? There is no obligation whatever. We had reserved the right under our agreement to expropriate the enterprise when finished and a going concern. Well, it is not quite a going concern now. Not only are we to pay back the money of the shareholders, but we are to pay 5 per cent interest from the time they got their certificate of stock. For instance, the one who subscribed $94,000 got his certificate immediately—he paid up three years after. We are to pay 5 per cent from the time when the certificates were given. And 10 per cent premium besides. And what else? Who knows what are the liabilities of this company I asked the question repeatedly of witnesses who appeared before the committee : Have you any statement of the affairs of the company? There was no statement. Who knows what debts we are assuming in taking over the debts of the company—for there is a stipulation in the agreement that we must pay all the debts of the company contracted 'with the assent and approval of the government.' These are very vague words. Why, as soon as this resolution is put in operation the claims will appear as thick as the leaves in Vallambrosa. What ground is there for it? None whatever. I still have confidence, great confidence in my right hon. friend Sir Wilfrid Laurier that he will drop that resolution, for if passed it will have the effect of plunging us into a sea of liabilities of which we know nothing. But, in the first place, if that resolution passes it is admitted that we must pay nearly $400,000 to the stockholders.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. No, $265,000.

Mr. MONK. And 5 per cent for five years and 10 per cent premium—it is easily figured out. But this is a sum that we can calculate and know ; other claims will arise the amount of which nobody can know.

Mr. BERGERON. What about the city of Quebec and their bonus?

Mr. MONK. These shareholders were heroic men, but they took care to protect themselves in every way. Hon. members will find, on reading the agreement, that there was a provision for the payment of subsidies by the Quebec city and Quebec province after everybody has been paid. There is nothing in the position of these shareholders which obliges us to make such a sacrifice as is proposed. People suffer every day. When I arose in this House years ago to ask the gentlemen to give assistance to the depositors of the Ville Marie Bank under circumstances which I thought justified the giving of that assistance, my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) told me that the government was not an eleemosynary institution, that there were sufferers in business and sufferers in banks. As a result of this, the labours of this board, in which I have confidence—for I hope the company will appoint none but able men—if they find that these piers can be utilized, or some valid ground for dealing with the company in such a manner that those who have cash in the enterprise—those who have put cash in the enterprise and those only—I

shall be the last man to object. But to start at this point, without any necessity for it, upon this vast additional expenditure, I say is altogether unjustifiable. The government can go to work and build this bridge without any legislation whatever—there is no doubt about that. But, in any case, why take the action here proposed? I was speaking the other day with a very eminent engineer, one whom I would like to see employed on this work, if that could be possible, and I mentioned that it would take at least three months to prepare the plans. He scoffed at the idea and assured me that it would take a much longer time than that. In three months another session will be near at hand. Then there are tenders to be called for and contracts to be made. Why should we then pass a resolution which will involve us more and more in this disastrous and unbusiness-like way of carrying out a great national work.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Lunenburg). At this stage of the session, when prorogation is at hand, I do not desire to occupy the the time of the House for more than a few moments. There is nothing very difficult or complicated about all the matters relating to the Quebec bridge. I agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk), who has just taken his seat, that the collapse of the bridge was a national disaster. But I think it should be treated as a national disaster by hon. members in discussing the subject instead of, apparently, gloating over the country's misfortune. The hon. member (Mr. Monk) finds fault with the report of the majority in not reaching conclusions similar to the findings of the Royal Commission. I submit that the position taken by the majority of the committee was the correct one. Immediately after the collapse of the bridge in August last year, the government, very properly, appointed a Royal Commission to inquire into the disaster and all questions relating thereto. That necessarily was a technical question and could only be dealt with by men who have professional knowledge. The report of the commission was, later, placed before parliament. The majority of the committee, feeling that this was a technical question, did not think it advisable to make any finding on that subject.

Now, my hon. friend boasts that the report of the minority in this respect concurs with the report of the royal commission. Well, if that is a comforting thought to my hon. friends, they are at liberty to entertain it. But I submit that the minority of the committee appointed to investigate and look into the matter of the Quebec bridge construction, and later, of its collapse, have no more idea of the causes of the collapse than have the mummies in the tombs of the Pharaohs. I have great respect for the attainments and judgment of the hon. gentlemen who compose the minority of that committee, but I submit they have no evidence before them, and they were not competent to form any conclusion of any value when they made the report which they have made, and which is called the minority report, and upon which report the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat compliments himself and his confreres because it was similar to that of the royal commission.

Now, just a few words as to the history of this project. This project had its genesis in the city and province of Quebec. The idea of the construction of this bridge developed in the province of Quebec, and naturally and properly there were many reasons why the people of that city and province desired the construction of such a bridge. It was not then a political question, everybody, irrespective of politics, around the city of Quebec were willing to invest a few dollars in the project. When the Conservative party were in power they time and again promised assistance. At one time Mr. T. Chase Casgrain, then Attorney General of the province of Quebec, publicly stated that if the government of Sir John A. Macdonald did not implement their promises and give a subsidy to this bridge his Quebec colleagues should resign their seats. It was not until the present government came into power, however, that the enterprise received any aid. The company was organized first in 1887. The hon. gentleman complains about the amount of their capital. It was small, it is true, only $65,000 of paid-up capital, but the subscribed capital was over $200,000, and the unpaid portion of the subscribed capital was certainly an asset of the company. But, in addition to that, the province of Quebec had voted a subsidy of $250,000 and the city of Quebec a subsidy of $300,000. So at that stage, at least, the company had assets to the extent of over half a million dollars. In the year 1900 the bridge company had made such progress that they entered into a contract with Mr. M. P. Davis for the construction of the substructure. The contract involved an amount of over $1,000,000. The plans were approved of by the government, and the substructure, under that contract, was eventually completed. The affairs of the Quebec Bridge Company were then in charge of Mr. Hoare. I wish to submit to this House that the building of the substructure was probably as important and as difficult an undertaking as the construction of the superstructure. Mr. Schreiber, in his report to the government, stated that in his judgment Mr. Hoare was quite competent to be in charge of the construction of the substructure. The fact that the substructure withstood the collapse of the bridge last year was a tribute to the efficiency and competency of the work of the contractor and the oversight of Mr.

Hoare, who was then in charge of the project on behalf of the bridge company. Later, the question of the construction of the superstructure had to be dealt with by the Quebec Bridge Company, and the procedure they adopted was this: A general plan of the bridge was prepared under the supervision of Mr. Hoare. They then invited tenders from the most eminent bridge builders in America, and with the tenders they invited plans and specifications to be prepared by those tendering. The successful tenderers were the Phœnix Bridge Company, the best known and probably the most reputable bridge constructing firm in America, and their plans and specifications were accepted. At this time the Quebec Bridge Company secured the services of Mr. Cooper, of New York, as their consulting engineer. Mr. Cooper, let me say, was, in the judgment of the profession, regarded as the most eminent bridge designer and builder in America, and perhaps had no superior in the world. I just wish to dwell for a moment on this point, because it is important, because it afterwards transpired that the government, that the Quebec Bridge Company, that everybody interested relied very much on the judgment of Mr. Cooper; and having, as they believed, in their employ one of the most competent men available in the world, it was only natural that they should rely to a great extent on his judgment. I wish at this point to read what the Royal Commission say regarding Mr. Cooper:

Mr. Theodore Cooper, of New York, was the consulting engineer. In the extent of his experience and in reputation for integrity, professional judgment and acumen, Mr. Cooper had few equals on this continent, and his appointment would have been generally approved. Mr. Cooper's strict duties were to examine, correct and approve plans prepared by the contractors, and to give the engineering advice to Mr. Hoare when requested. Mr. Cooper and his chief assistant, Mr. Berret Berger, carried on a most thorough and painstaking examination of the plans. Mr. Cooper appointed both shop and erection inspectors for reasons explained in his evidence, and had these inspectors report fully and regularly to him. Mr. Cooper states that he greatly desired to build this bridge as his final work, and he gave it careful attention. His professional standing was so high that his appointment left no further anxiety about the outcome in the minds of almost everybody concerned.

That is the finding of the commission respecting Mr. Cooper's capabilities as an engineer. They summarize their finding in the beginning of their report, and they say this:

The professional record of Mr. Cooper was such that his selection for the authoritative position that he occupied was warranted, and the complete confidence that was placed in his judgment by the officials of the Dominion government, and of the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company and of the Phœnix Bridge Company was deserved.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask in all fairness, what more could be expected of the government in the circumstances? They believed that the Quebec Bridge Company had as its consulting engineer the most eminent man available in America, a man of well known professional standing, and a man of very great experience. It is true, as was stated by my hon. friend who proceeded me, that Mr. Schreiber recommended the appointment of a consulting engineer who would act on behalf of the government as well. It is true that Mr. Schreiber's suggestion received confirmation by order in council. Later it was found that Mr. Cooper objected to the appointment of an engineer to act on behalf of the government and, Mr. Schreiber, owing to the opposition of Mr. Cooper to the appointment of such an engineer, reported to the government that he had such confidence in the ability and integrity of Mr. Cooper, the interests of the government and of the Quebec Bridge Company being in common, that he felt that they might rely upon Mr. Cooper solely. Accordingly the government abandoned the idea of appointing an inspector. It is very easy to be wise after the event. Had this bridge not fallen, Mr. Cooper's reputation would have been enhanced, had the bridge not fallen, Mr. Hoare might have been known to the engineering profession in Canada as a great bridge builder, but, unfortunately, a fundamental mistake was made in the design of the bridge. I submit in all fairness, that, the design of the bridge having been supervised and approved of by Mr. Cooper and been approved of by Mr. Schreiber on behalf of the government of Canada, it is hardly fair criticism to say that the government were careless and that they did not take sufficient precautionary measures with reference to inspection.

In 1903, as I have already stated, the bridge company had completed the substructure, and the question of the commencement of the construction of the superstructure was before them. They were not in good financial circumstances and late in October of that year they addressed a communication to the Department of Railways and Canals, or probably to the government, explaining their situation and asking for financial assistance in the way of a guarantee of bonds. This request was granted upon certain conditions. An agreement was entered into and that agreement was ratified by parliament in October, 1903. That agreement contained several features, one of which was that the company were to pay up $200,000 of additional capital. The hon. gentleman who preceded me stated that a portion of that agreement was not complied with. Well, if it was not complied with at the moment at which the bonds were issued it certainly was subsequently. To say

the worst of it there may have been a postponement of the fulfilment of that condition, but it was eventually complied with. I am doubtful if it is even open to the interpretation placed upon it by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier. One hundred and nineteen thousand dollars of that subscription was made by Mr. M. P. Davis, a gentleman of well known financial standing. That would have given him a control in the company. The company desired that the railways entering at Quebec should be interested in this project and that they should become shareholders. The delivery to Mr. Davis of his $119,000 of stock was postponed in order to obtain a subscription of stock from the Grand Trunk Railway Company. Later the Grand Trunk Railway Company did subscribe for $25,000 of stock, they paid the amount and when they did pay it Mr. Davis substituted a cheque for $94,600 in place of his $119,000 cheque and subscription. When this was done the cheque was cashed. The company say that they always regarded that cheque as the equivalent of cash, and I have no doubt they were justified in so doing. Thereupon the company certified to the government that $200,000 had been subscribed and paid. I do not know that it is very important whether the company were justified in treating that cheque for $94,600 as cash or not. It eventually went into the undertaking; at least it is so reported by Mr. Bell, an auditor of the Department of Railways and Canals. Neither the interests of the government nor of the Quebec bridge, nor any other interest suffered by the postponement of the conversion of this cheque into cash. They certified to the government that the full amount was subscribed and paid and upon this certificate the government guaranteed the $6,000,000 issue of bonds. It is said that the government were not justified in doing so prior to the subscription and payment of this $200,000 of stock. In addition to that I have this to say that I am very doubtful if it were possible for the agreement to have been worked out in any other fashion than that in which it was. The Bank of Montreal later advanced moneys upon these bonds and accepted the certificate of the company. They must have had legal advice to the effect that the portion of the agreement requiring the payment of $200,000 had been fully complied with; otherwise the issue of bonds might not have been legal and there was an issue, as I say, of $6,000,000,

At one o'clock House took recess.

House resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Lunenberg). Mr. Speaker, just before one o'clock I had reached that stage in the history of the Quebec Bridge Company when they found the substructure of the bridge built, and when they found themselves considerably in debt and in need of financial assistance to proceed with the erection of the superstructure. In October, 1903, they made application to the government for financial assistance of some character or another. Up to that time they had expended $914,862 upon the bridge; they were indebted to the extent of $779,550 and they calculated that it would take $6,866,882 to liquidate their indebtedness and place them in possession of the funds necessary to complete the undertaking. An agreement was entered into and the main features of that agreement are: In the first place the company released the government from its obligation to pay the subsidy of one million dollars, a portion only of which (about $375,000) they had received and expended. The company also on its part undertook to receive from the shareholders of that company as of that date the stock issued and to substitute therefor a stock issue equal in amount to the sum actually paid upon the stock. The company also agreed to procure $200,000 of new stock. That $200,000 of stock was subscribed and was eventually paid. Whether it was technically subscribed or paid prior to the guarantee of the bonds by the government is after all not of very great importance because the $200,000 was eventually paid; it went into the treasury of the company and became a part of the common fund of the proceeds arising from the issue of the bonds which were guaranteed by the government. In consideration of these agreements on the part of the company the government agreed to guarantee the bonds of the company to the extent necessary to liquidate their indebtedness and to provide them with that amount of money which they believed would be sufficient to complete the bridge. That agreement was ratified by an Act of parliament and under that agreement the government subsequently guaranteed the bonds and the company were placed in a position to liquidate their indebtedness and to be in possession of funds, and they proceeded with the construction of the bridge. That is practically the history of the bridge until it fell in August, 1907.

To epitomize the story of the bridge in a few words and in chronological order let me say. First, the scheme received its inspiration in the city and in the province of Quebec. The city of Quebec, its citizens, and the province of Quebec were primarily interested in the construction of the bridge. In 1887, a company was organized to commence the undertaking, and I submit that was the proper way to commence the construction of such a work. Neither the provincial nor federal governments would at that time undertake it, and it was only natural that a company composed of the citizens of Quebec should be organized for the purpose. There were three parties interested: first, the province of Quebec; secondly, the city of Quebec; and thirdly, the shareholders of the company. The city of Quebec voted by way of subsidy $300,000; the province of Quebec voted $250,000 and the

company subscribed $200,000, so that the undertaking was launched with a capital either promised or subscribed of $750,000. Later, the Dominion government became interested and voted a subsidy of $1,000,000 so that the company at this stage with all the parties interested, had a fair and reasonable amount of capital at their back. Objection was made by the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) that certain stock was issued to directors on account of services rendered on behalf of the company. This is a matter I need not detain the House about because after all it is not important. The stock of the company had no value at that date; the directors rendered very valuable services, the business of the company occupied a great deal of their time and in many other ways they devoted themselves to the project. Then, we have the company undertaking the project with a capital at their disposal of about $1,600,000. In 1900, they gave a contract for the substructure to Mr. M. P. Davis, the anticipated cost of which was to be over one million dollars. The substructure was successfully built; it stood the test of the collapse of the bridge and I think no adverse comment can be made upon that portion of the enterprise. In addition to the substructure a contract for the terminals on each side of the river approaching the bridge was given also to Mr. M. P. Davis, and that contract was completed at a cost in excess of $1,000,000. Then the company invited tenders and the submission of plans for the superstructure, and the plan of the Phœnix Bridge Company appearing to be the best—was accepted. It was submitted later on to the consulting engineer of the company, Mr. Cooper, of New York, who was a bridge engineer of considerable eminence and one of the best known bridge builders in America. Mr. Cooper approved of that plan subject to some modifications. It was also approved of by the government engineer, and in 1903, a contract was actually entered into with the Phœnix Bridge Company to complete the work. It was suggested by the hon. member (Mr. Monk) that because at one stage in the history of the Quebec bridge, Mr. Schreiber, the government engineer, had recommended the appointment of an inspecting engineer and because this inspecting engineer was not appointed that therefore the government acted without consulting Mr. Schreiber. I wish to correct that statement in case there may be some misapprehension on the part of hon. gentlemen about it. It is true that Mr. Schreiber recommended the appointment of an engineer and such recommendation was confirmed by order in council. Later, on the recommendation of Mr. Schreiber himself, it was agreed that inasmuch as the interests of the government and of the Quebec Bridge Company were in common, and inasmuch as Mr. Cooper was regarded by the profession generally as the most capable man whose services they could secure, it would be sufficient if the construction of the bridge were left to the sole supervision of Mr. Cooper. The construction of the superstructure was proceeded with and everything was going well until in August, 1907, the bridge fell and instantly the critics developed over night. The critics say that there was not a sufficient system of inspection. Now Mr. Speaker, I submit that when the government of the day had secured the services of the most eminent bridge builder in America, and when as the Royal Commission have found—and they have emphatically found upon this point—the government and the Quebec Bridge Company were justified in assuming that everything as regards inspection and construction was in good hands when in the hands of Mr. Cooper, and that the complete confidence placed in Mr. Cooper by the government and by the bridge company was deserving, I say in view of all that, the criticism is most unfair.

I submit further that if that bridge were being built by a private individual, and he had the endorsement of the plans by a man so eminent and so highly regarded by his profession as Mr. Cooper, he would have done just what the Quebec Bridge Company did and what the government did. It is all very well to suggest now that there should have been a commission of engineers in charge of the construction of the bridge. Human aftersight is better than human foresight. So long as there is that limitation of the human judgment, it is only fair to say that accidents of this character are liable to happen and have happened in the past, notwithstanding every precaution that may be taken. The question to-day is, what is to be done to insure the completion of the bridge? The resolution which has been placed on the Order Paper by the Minister of Railways is to the effect that the government are to take over the stock of the company and pay the shareholders. I submit that there is nothing unreasonable about that; it is the only fair and businesslike thing to do. Immediately after the collapse of the Quebec bridge, it appeared to be the opinion of the public generally that the government should take hold of this enterprise. I think it is only fair that under the terms of the agreement of 1903 they should possess themselves of the stock of the company and proceed with the completion of the bridge. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier suggested that we were taking over liabilities, the amount of which was unknown to us. I submit that there are no liabilities which we are assuming that we do not know of. In the first place, we shall have to pay the sum of $260,000 to acquire the stock of the company plus ten per cent premium. That is definite and well-known. In the next place, we know what our loss is in the guaranteeing of the company's bonds; and I suppose it is only fair for me to state that that will in all probability be a total loss to the government of this country.

There is no possible liability, so far as I can see, in connection with the loss of life. I understand that the Phœnix Bridge Company carried with some insurance company a policy which will liquidate any loss which they may be obliged to pay by reason of the loss of life, and I understand that the Phœnix Bridge Company have up to the present time liquidated all claims for damages in that regard. Therefore the only thing left for the government to do is to acquire control of the company and to proceed with the completion of the bridge. It is a national undertaking, and nobody else can assume that responsibility. It is unfortunate that the collapse of the bridge occurred. The government took all reasonable precautions to prevent any such thing happening. I have no hesitation in expressing the opinion that it is unfortunate in a sense that the government are obliged to step in and take control of the bridge. It is an undertaking that I think could be better handled and controlled by a terminal company ; and it might be worth the consideration of the government, after they have obtained control of the company, whether they should not invite all the railway companies of Canada who have an entrance into the city of Quebec to become part owners in the bridge. In so far as the minority report so-called makes findings of fact, I make no protest against it ; any statements in it regarding the history of the enterprise appear to be properly set forth. But in so far as that report charges the government or the Department of Railways and Canals with want of care or with gross negligence,. I do not concur in—I do not desire to occupy further the time of the House upon this matter at this late hour, as I know that there is considerable business yet to do.

Mr. R. N. WALSH (Huntingdon). Mr. Speaker, I desire to detain the House for a short time in making some remarks on the minority report of the committee. The hon. member who has preceded me (Mr. A. K. Maclean) stated that the members who have presented the minority report did not apparently treat this as a national disaster, but rather as a means of making political capital against the government. With that I take direct issue. I do not think that any members of the House appreciate more fully than do the members who have presented the minority report the greatness of the disaster, not only from a monetary standpoint, but in the loss of life which was occasioned; and in view of the fact that the report of the Royal Commission which was appointed by this government stated that had there been efficient supervision this loss of life could have been prevented, I say that it is more than a national disaster, it is a national disgrace. The government of this country practically controlled the construction of that bridge, which was not only a national undertaking, but the largest undertaking of its kind in the world, and they handed it over to a company of which not a single man knew anything of bridge building. There was not a single bridge expert connected with the company, and they had a very limited capital. What is the history of that company ? It was organized in 1887, and if you will read the minutes of the company, you will find that at their meetings at that time their principal business was the appointing of committees to interview one government or another with the view of getting subsidies. Previous to this the Quebec government had contributed money for the preliminary surveys, but up to 1897 very little had been done. At that time Mr. Parent was asked to join the company, as it was thought that his influence would have some effect in procuring assistance for the bridge. In that I think they were not disappointed, and I wonder if the reason that the government are continuing the project is not on account of their promises of support made long ago. I find in the minutes of the Bridge Company that at a meeting held in September, 1897, Mr. Parent stated that he had seen Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who stated that the subsidy could not be voted at the next session owing to very grave reasons, which were privately explained ; but Sir Wilfrid wanted the company to proceed, and they would be sure to get the necessary security to finish the bridge if it is not voted next session; Sir Wilfrid would send a letter guaranteeing the subsidy for the following session. So as early as 1897 we have the government practically pledged to furnish sufficient security to carry out the work. However, in 1903 the government secured the bonds of the company. In the meantime interim bonds had been issued to Mr. Davis upon which there was a discount of some $188,000. In this agreement it was provided that there should be new stock furnished to cover that issue. Evidently the Finance Minister considered that this had been very injudicious financing, and that what had been lost in that way should be made up. Had that been done simply I could have understood it, but when this new stock of $200,000 was practically added to the capital, the government undertaking to take the bridge over and to pay 5 per cent and a premium of 10 per cent, I do not think they in any way helped the matter. It has been said that the sale of the bonds at a discount of 40 per cent was justified in a way, because Mr. Davis would not draw any interest until the substructure was completed. However, he was paid some time within two years, and I notice he drew some $29,000 in interest, which I think was a pretty fair return for the money. It has also been said that the reason the bonds were sold in that way was because there might be a loss on them.

At any rate, the government accepts the statement made that this bridge will be a paying concern. Mr. Parent had made a statement which the government evidently accepted, that, taking out operating expenses in the first and second year, they could still pay 3 per cent and leave a balance of some $56,000, so evidently Mr. Davis was not likely to lose anything. Further, in securing these interim bonds, he practically got a mortgage on the bridge after the reconstruction of the company, which gave him a first lien and practically put him in a better position. As to his cheque being held, the statement is made that this practically carried out the legislation. I wish to draw the attention of the House to the fact that the Finance Minister, in giving his evidence, said that he would not consider that was carrying out the statute. When first it was brought to his notice he wrote to the Bridge Company drawing their attention to the fact that the statute had not been lived up to. It has been said that there was no harm in that, that Mr. Davis' cheque was taken and could have been cashed at any time. It seems peculiar to me that Mr. Davis should be so complaisant, that if he had nearly $100,000 in that he should pay his money and not secure his stock and have nothing to say. I think the history of this transaction, if completely followed out, would be very interesting.

In regard to the plans, the evidence of Mr. Douglas is that the plans on which this bridge was built were the ordinary bridge specifications of 1896, that even in the department after that these specifications had been amended, but that the original plans of 1896 were used as a specification for this bridge, and that it was considered that they were entirely inadequate and that new plans should have been made. When they were submitted to Mr. Douglas he found fault with them and criticised the unit stresses. After that Mr. Douglas had nothing more to say evidently in regard to the plans. Mr. Schreiber, who was a very busy man I understand, evidently considered that he had not the time to properly look after this work, and suggested to the government that they should appoint a bridge expert, which I think was a pretty good idea. It has been stated that the Bridge Company did not object to the appointment of Mr. Nichols. I find, however, in the report of the Royal Commission, a reference to this order in council. The commissioners state :

The policy of Mr. Schreiber was not in accordance with the wishes of the Quebec Bridge Company and its association—see letters, Hoare to Cooper, July 1, 1903 (exhibit 70 I); Parent to Fitzpatrick, June 29, 1903 (exhibit 70 T); Fitzpatrick to Parent, July 118, 1903 (exhibit 73 C)—and as soon as Mr. Cooper fully understood the deputy minister's plans he protested vigorously.

From that it is quite evident that the Quebec Bridge Company were not in accord with the appointing of an expert, and some of the correspondence in regard to that is interesting. Mr. Cooper objected, it is true, to the appointment of a bridge expert, and in a letter to Mr. Cooper from Mr. Deans, the chief engineer of the Phœnix Bridge Company, there is a paragraph which I think is significant. It says :

The order in council was taken solely to save time and to have your approval of our details final and binding on the government—it simply being necessary to have Mr. Schreiber's signature as a matter of form.

That was the understanding of the chief engineer of the Phœnix Bridge Company. In a further letter of August 1, 1903, he says :

I talked with Mr. Hoare over the 'phone yesterday (the service was not very satisfactory), and also wired him two long messages, and have received his reply, stating that 'he will take up the question with parties at Ottawa, and that we should go ahead, and if anything turns up to cause trouble tell Cooper to let me know at once.' I have written him again, and urged him to stop entirely this proposed plan, and explaining that the sole purpose of the order in council was to give you the final authority to settle all details, the government approval being a mere formality.

It is evident that the construction and carrying out of the plans were all in the hands of the bridge company, the government exercising no supervision. It is true that Mr. Cooper was considered an expert authority, and the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. A. K. Maclean) read the finding of the commission, in which they speak of his ability. But he did not read the whole passage. It continues :

In considering Mr. Cooper's part in this undertaking, it should be remembered that he was an elderly man, rapidly approaching seventy, and of such infirm health that he was only rarely permitted to leave New York. Mr. Cooper assumed a position of great responsibility, and agreed to accept an inadequate salary for his services. No provision was made by the Quebec Bridge Company for a staff to assist him, nor is there any evidence to show that he asked for the appointment of such a staff.

From the evidence of Mr. Holgate, it is apparent that while Mr. Cooper was considered to be simply the consulting engineer, he was compelled to act as engineer in chief, and there was no engineer in chief on the works. The commission find directly against that system, and say distinctly that while it would not have been possible, probably, not to prevent the fall of

the bridge, it would have been quite possible had there been a man in charge who had authority to stop the work there to prevent the loss of life which occurred. The report goes on to say that the staff in charge of the bridge as a whole was inefficient and not well organized. This, I think, shows there was practically no superintendence for the government, little interest was taken in the matter, it being left wholly in the hands of the Bridge Company, and, as the report says, everything was taken, as far as the government was concerned, as merely a matter of form.

The resolution which is before the House in regard to taking over this bridge is evidently supplementing the promises made to these gentlemen who took up the stock. In regard to this $200,000 of stock, it is also interesting to note that of the directors of the Bridge Company, with the exception of Mr. Parent, there was not a man who took over $400 of stock. It is also very interesting to note that the voting of this money for their services and divided up, simply comes to a sum which supplements their subscription to make up this extra amount of $200,000. The greater part of this is made up by the railways and Mr. Davis. When Mr. Sharples was giving his evidence I asked him if he had subscribed to the undertaking previous to the government guaranteeing the bonds, and he said: No, he was not foolish enough for that. So this stock was perfectly good to these gentlemen. They were sure of 5 per cent. I believe assurances must have been given them to that effect, and that this action of the government is simply in pursuance of that promise. I believe that this matter should be left in abeyance until the government has a report from a board of engineers who will say whether this work is of any use at all or not and whether the bridge shall be built there, and make sure of all the conditions which will make the superstructure practicable, without paying money where there is no need to pay. I protest against it. If the government intend to build the bridge, they have all the necessary authority in the charter of the Transcontinental Railway. They do not need to go to the Bridge Company and beg for money which was put up to replace bad financing on the part of the company.

So far as the construction of bridges is concerned, New York maintains a board of three or four, every one of them an expert bridge builder. All construction of bridges is placed in the hands of this board. The details are all carefully gone into and everything provided for. But the government of Canada undertook the largest engineering feat in bridge building in the world simply relying on the efforts of a bridge company with little or no capital, allowed that company to select all the engineers, and even interfered with the action of their own officer when that officer sought to have greater precautions taken. Mr. Douglas was evidently too critical in his supervision of affairs, and so he had nothing further to do with them. That the company had their way in this, and that Mr. Hoare was aware of it, is shown by the letter of 27 May, 1907, which Mr. Hoare writes to Mr. Deans, the chief engineer of the Phœnix Bridge Company, in which he draws attention to the fact that the regulation of the government in regard to the plans had not been followed out. He said:

> The signature of the government engineer does not comply with the government regulations. The order in council passed some years ago only authorized certain modifications in the specifications and details from time to time if found necessary.

And he closes his letter:

> We are under very close investigation now.

Showing that there had been little or no superintendence of the work done.

I agree heartily with the minority report. I think it is in accordance with the facts. And I hope the government will not put through the resolution this year with regard to taking over this work. Before sitting down I desire to put on record in 'Hansard' the report of the minority:

1.—Financial responsibility of the Quebec Bridge Company.

The Quebec Bridge Company was incorporated in 1887, and, having regard to its undertaking to construct a bridge across the St. Lawrence at or near the city of Quebec, the cost of which would be at least $6,000,000, the company was from its inception deplorably weak financially.

2. Of its modest nominal stock capital of $1,000,000, never, until the arrangements of 1903 to be presently referred to, did the money paid in by its shareholders exceed $65,000, and even of that amount, so petty for such a vast undertaking, some $20,000 consisted not of cash found by the promoters but of the proceeds of fees voted by them to the directors and paid by the country itself for their services in that capacity.

In 1890, the province of Quebec voted to the enterprise a subsidy or aid of $250,000, and further aid of $300,000 was granted in the following year by the city of Quebec.

The parliament of Canada also voted $1,000,000 in aid of the undertaking payable as construction progressed.

The site being chosen, the substructure of the bridge progressed; but in 1903, the company had more than exhausted all its resources, its subsidies as well as its small paid up stock capital were expended, and it had a floating debt of $779,550. It was then without money or means to further prosecute its enterprise.

At this time, the Dominion had undertaken the construction of the National Transcontinental Railway whereof the Quebec bridge was

recognized as an essential and most important portion. The early completion of the bridge was not only of national concern as a matter of trade and commerce, but any delay or misadventure would be fraught with most serious responsibility to the lessees of the eastern section of the great railway of which that bridge must necessarily be a part.

In the condition of the bridge company, it was not possible to prosecute its undertaking without the aid of the Dominion, and refusal of such aid would have ensured a forfeiture and abandonment of the venture. The obvious duty of the government, therefore, was to refuse aid, to deal liberally with the promoters, and to take over the property and hold the bridge as a public work.

The president and directors of the bridge company, hopeless though their case appeared to be, succeeded in inducing the government to agree to guarantee the company's bonds up to $6,688,200, the amount required to meet its liabilities and finish the bridge.

An order in council was thereupon passed on the advice of ministers setting forth the terms and conditions of the proposed guarantee and an Act of parliament was passed to confirm the same. The Act referred to (3 Edward VII., chapter 54) was passed in the last hours of a long session, and in the course of a few days was rushed through the Senate and House of Commons with undue haste and without opportunity for deliberation and proper consideration.

10. One of the conditions enacted was that before the guarantee should be given, the company would procure the subscription and full payment in cash of $200,000 of additional stock, and apply the said money to a specific object, the restoration of $188,000 discount which had previously been allowed on an issue of the company's bonds.

11. That condition was only in part fulfilled, though the government, having accepted the written certificate of the company's officers that it had been fully carried out, guaranteed the new issue of bonds. Attention is called to the admission of the Hon. the Finance Minister in his evidence, that had this deception been known to him, he would not have authorized the execution of the guarantee.

12. The government's present liability or outlay on bonds, subsidy and special guarantee to the Bank of Montreal is $6,322,008.13 represented as follows:

Subsidy.. .. .. .

your committee had not that experience and professional skill absolutely essential to the safety and success of so vast and so exceptional an undertaking. That engineer was obliged to rely upon the advice and assistance of a consulting engineer, who, though of high reputation, is advanced in years, and had to be consulted in New York, where he lives. When the catastrophe was imminent, one of the staff was obliged to visit New York to obtain the consulting engineer's advice as to what action should be taken.

21. The government, wholly unrepresented upon the work, left the public interests absolutely in the hands of the Quebec Bridge Company, which company, in the opinion of your committee, was incompetent, and, having regard to the relations between it and the government, utterly unfitted for that position.

22. Your committee are of opinion that the government stand without much, if any, useful recourse against the Quebec Bridge Company for the sums disbursed or for which the government has rendered itself liable.

Subsidy..	$ 374,353 00
Liability on bonds with interest to April 30, 1908..	5,773,223 77
Extra amount claimed by Bank of Montreal..	174,431 13
	$6,322,008 13

23. It does not appear that proper, or any, inquiry was at any time made on behalf of the government with regard to the ability of the Phœnix Bridge Company to perform its contract, or to make good any failure or default therein, nor as to its ability to make compensation where such may be due.

24. The evidence before your committee establishes that in any future construction of this magnitude it will be advisable that plans and specifications be passed upon by a board of at least three competent engineers.

25. Your committee desire to express their opinion that the submission to parliament in the last few hours of a session of matters of such moment and complexity as were involved in the said Act of 1903 is fraught with danger to public interest, and, in their opinion, the instance herein alluded to was, under the circumstances, inexcusable.

Mr. LORENZO ROBITAILLE (Quebec County). I did not rise immediately after the last speaker, because I thought that some hon. member would maintain the government side of this question. I observe with interest the resolution of the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham). It provides for the taking over of the property, assets and franchises of the Quebec Railway and Bridge Company. Speaking in this House on April 28 last, I said :

I desire to enter my protest against the adoption of this proposed loan and ask the government to take over the works and complete them.

I am pleased to see that after the lapse of a year the government is ready now to work in the line of the suggestion I made in that speech. I criticised the lack of sufficient government control on the works and also in the finances of the company. Speaking first as to the works themselves, if we study the real cause of the action we shall find that in the commissioners' report, page 9, it is stated :

(a) The collapse of the Quebec bridge resulted from the failure of the lower chords in the anchor arm near the main pier. The failure of these chords was due to their defective design.

Now, were the plans upon which these competing companies were trying to get the contract made by the government engineer? They were not. If you read the report of the commissioners, again at page 9, you will find that they say :

The design of the chords that failed was made by Mr. P. L. Szlapka, the designing engineer of the Phœnix Bridge Company.

This design was made in 1897 and accepted in 1900. At page 14 of this report we find it stated that the Quebec Bridge Company, in 1898, applied to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council for approval of the plans and proposed site of the bridge. This application was dated January 8, 1898, and signed by Mr. Parent, and the superstructure is identical with the plan of the Phœnix Bridge Company, dated December 7, 1897. These same plans were reported on by Mr. Cooper on June 23, and at page 15 of the commissioners' report we find what Mr. Cooper says :

From the facts and considerations as stated above, I find the cantilever superstructure plan of the Phœnix Bridge Company an exceedingly creditable plan from the point of view of the general proportions, outlines and its constructve features.

I also find that it is designed in accordance with your specifications.

No wonder it was the Phœnix Bridge Company themselves who prepared the plans upon which Mr. Hoare made the specifications in asking for tenders for construction. It is not surprising then to find that the Phœnix Bridge Company were so much in accord with the specifications.

Mr. Cooper adds in his report that it is the best and cheapest plan and proposals submitted to me for examination and report.

Here I invite every hon. member to read between the lines and he will see that the tenders were never accepted formally. If you look at page 16 of the report of the Royal Commission you will find this :

No positive action was taken as to the tenders, and no one of those was formally accepted then or at a later date.

What was the result ? The result was that seeing that no other plans were submitted save that of the Phœnix Bridge Company, I mean responsible plans—because the other plans and estimates were not bona fide in their method of tendering.

If you look on page 35 of the commissioner's report you will find the same thing :

In September 1898 the bridge contracting firms were asked to submit tenders upon their own designs, to be drawn in accordance with certain specifications.

The specifications, as I said before, given by Mr. Hoare were taken from the design drafted by the Phœnix Bridge Company themselves.

Practically this meant that each bridge company was asked to spend several thousand dollars on the preparation of plans, and that in return it was given an opportunity to bid for a contract to be let by a company of weak financial standing. The result was that although the magnitude of the work placed it outside the limits of established practice, most of the tenders submitted were made from immature studies based upon insufficient data.

Supporting what I said, that on account of the Phœnix Bridge Company having the advantage in filing the plans from which Mr. Hoare took his specifications, no other responsible company would dare to put up some serious plan because it would have involved an expense of a few thousand dollars. There was only one company that had a chance to get its tender accepted.

The evidence shows that the Phœnix Bridge Company gave more time and attention to the competition than any other tenderer, but the error afterwards made by it in assuming the weight of the structure for final designs shows how faulty the estimate accompanying its original tender was. We consider that the procedure adopted in calling for tenders was not satisfactory in view of the magnitude of the work, and was not calculated to produce the most efficient results.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I have proved by the commissioner's report that there was a lack of bona fides in the method of tendering. Now what was the first hitch after that ? This company spent a few dollars for the preparation of plans which were taken from the suggestion of the Phœnix Bridge Company, and finding that they had not sufficient money, came to the government and made a request for a million dollars subsidy. This is what the report says :

But when, for the purpose of a guarantee of $6,178,200, the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals, found himself called upon to examine for approval, the plans and specifications of the bridge, he formally applied for authority to employ a specially qualified bridge engineer. Such authority was granted by order in council of January 21, 1903.

Now why was Mr. Schreiber's request made to the government ? A few years previously when a million dollars guarantee was demanded from this government, Mr. Douglas, the railway engineer of this government, was asked to submit a report upon the plans given to him by the Bridge Company. I must say in passing that it is the rule of this government never to grant a subsidy for a bridge until their engineer has previously examined the proposition. Mr. Douglas, however, not having the weight of authority that Mr. Cooper has, condemned the plan. Later on he condemned the same plans when they came back in 1903. Mr. Speaker, who is the chief engineer, found himself placed between Mr. Cooper's high reputation and his more humble assistant Mr. Douglas, because these two gentlemen did not look at the matter from the same engineering standpoint—Mr. Schreiber finding himself in this dilemna, and not knowing what responsibility he was assuming, came to a logical conclusion and said to the Governor in Council, I want an assistant to help me sift out the difficulty and see what responsibility I have taken. The Governor in Council thought that the idea was a good one, and an order in council was granted on the 21st of July. What happened then ? If you look through the evidence given at this inquiry you will find that the pivotal point on which revolved the relations between the government and the Bridge Company, has been, not the contractors of the company, but Mr. Parent the president. Mr. Parent communicated with Mr. Cooper and said to him, how is it that a man of your standing should be subordinate to a humble engineer who has no standing ? It seems but right that if we keep you as consulting engineer, we should not be embarrassed by correspondence with regard to the acceptance of certificates or approval of plans. The first tiding we knew, Mr. Cooper came up to Ottawa and said he would not play second fiddle in this matter—that is at least the information that is given us, and immediately the government found that Mr. Cooper's views were all right. Now let us see what Mr. Schreiber says in making his demand :

I would suggest that the department be authorized to employ a competent engineer to examine from time to time the detailed drawings of each part of the bridge as prepared, and to approve of or correct them as to him may seem necessary, submitting them for final acceptance to the chief engineeer of railways and canals.

Mr. Cooper strongly objected, saying, this puts me in the position of a subordinate which I cannot accept. Mr. Cooper at the same time wrote to Mr. Schreiber :

I do not see how such engineer could facilitate the progress of the work, or allow me to take any responsibile steps independently of his consent.

Exactly what I said. He found it would jeopardize his authority and naturally delay the work. Consequently he was given a free hand. Further on the Governor in Council recalled this permission of 1903, and in August, 1905, they said this :

Provided the efficiency of the structure be fully maintained to that defined in the orginal specifications attached to the company's contract.

I must say that that condition of the order in council was not fulfilled, because there was no engineer competent to say who was to determine the efficiency of the structure, and to see that it was maintained to the standard the Governor in Council stipulated.

The Governor in Council intimated that Mr. Cooper must have some one else with him acting on behalf of the government to check over his work. The order of the Governor in Council was not heeded and Mr. Cooper was the only man who was responsible for the approval of the plans and for checking the work for the government and for the bridge company. Probably it might interest our good friends on the other side to state how Mr. Cooper was engaged. He was not hired in the ordinary manner. The first thing he states before the commission in New York is that about February 25, he received a communication from the Quebec Bridge Company asking if he would be prepared to make an examination of these plans and he consented. There was no suggestion that he should become the consulting engineer for the greatest bridge in the world ; simply that he should give the company expert advice upon the plans which would be submitted.

Some months later——

He states :

—Messrs. Parent, Hoare and Barthe came to New York to see him. He stated to them what his fee would be for inspecting and passing on the plans.

They asked him then if he would act as consulting engineer, not resident engineer, but to stay in New York and advise them from time to time when they wanted his services.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Is the hon. gentleman aware that Mr. Cooper at least once if not twice asked to be relieved of his duties as superintending engineer ?

Mr. ROBITAILLE. I will come to that later. I have here Mr. Cooper's deposition, but probably the House does not desire me to answer the hon. gentleman's question at the present moment as I will come to it in the course of my speech. He said that Mr. Parent left him with the impression that the plans would be sent to him, but no definite step was taken at that time regarding his appointment as consulting engineer. Later on Mr. Cooper asked if he was limited to a certain specification because he found that the financial status of the company was not altogether satisfactory.

Mr. Cooper's opinion seemed to be that the amount of funds available was to a certain extent limited, for when asked if, at the present date, and with the advantages of several years' additional experience, he would still confirm his additional recommendation both as to the type of the structure and the merit of the design, he said: 'Yes, if under the same limitations that existed at that time as to the amount of funds apparently estimated for its construction.' That is an important point, because the structure was apparently limited to the amount of funds they had in sight as far as it was impressed on me.

I could go farther on this point but it is useless to weary the House. We are all aware of the fact that Mr. Cooper was not given the opportunity he should have had to control plans because he had to keep them within a certain limit of cost as he said before. There was no definite figure stipulated, but he knew that the financial condition of the company was weak. The company commenced the construction of a bridge that will cost about $8,000,000 with financial resources amounting to about $1,000,000.

Mr. TALBOT. Is the hon. gentleman now stating that Mr. Cooper made the plans of the bridge ?

Mr. ROBITAILLE. I do not state that Mr. Cooper made the plans but he approved and corrected them, he was responsible for them which is just the same as if he had done it himself because it was up to him to see that they were all right. I think I have proven that the whole responsibility in connection with the bridge rested on the shoulders of Mr. Cooper, that there was no supervision on the part of the government although an order in council has stipulated that there should be supervision in order to ensure efficiency in the construction of the work. The commissioners report at page 33 :

The connection of the government with the enterprise provided the means for building the bridge, and the final approval of plans rested with it, but in no way did the government exercise any check on the work itself, or any authority over the contractors. The administration of the contract and the disposition of the funds supplied by the government were left entirely in the control of the Quebec Bridge Company, subject to the approval of the estimates by the government inspector, and except that the quantities of material were checked at Phœnixville by a clerk appointed by the Department of Railways and Canals, and an officer of that department visited the bridge in connection with the checking of estimates, there was no supervision on the part of the government.

We find that the commissioners admit that Mr. Cooper was under a severe handicap. They say this :

In considering Mr. Cooper's part in this undertaking, it should be remembered that he was an elderly man, rapidly approaching seventy, and of such infirm health that he was only rarely permitted to leave New York. Mr. Cooper assumed a position of great res-

ponsibility, and agreed to accept an inadequate salary for his services.

For the reason, as it was stated to him, that he would be engaged in a consultative capacity rather than to oversee the work.

No provision was made by the Quebec Bridge Company for a staff to assist him, nor is there any evidence to show that he asked for the appointment of such a staff. He endeavoured to maintain the necessary assistants out of his own salary, which was itself too small for his personal services, and he did a great deal of detail work which could have been satisfactorily done by a junior. The result of this was that he had no time to investigate the soundness of the data and theories which were being used in the designing, and consequently allowed fundamental errors to pass by him unchallenged.

If there had been a joint engineer to control the work with Mr. Cooper in accordance with Mr. Schreiber's wishes the errors which were proven to exist by the evidence would have been detected and in all probability remedied, and if they had been remedied the bridge certainly would not have gone down. Mr. Douglas of the Department of Railways and Canals appeared before the committee and in a few minutes I will read an extract from his statement. Mr Douglas reported when the plans and specifications were submitted to him that he did not approve of the unit stresses which had been adopted, which were acted on and which were still embodied in the plan when the bridge fell. If that matter had been looked carefully into when it was pointed out I am sure that the bridge would not be down to-day. At all events the criticism of the Royal Commission on this point is clear enough. Now, in answer to my hon. friend from Queens, P.E.I., (Mr. Martin) let me point out that Mr. Cooper, because of the limited financial resources of the company, the disadvantages under which he laboured, his age, his want of facilities to look properly after this work, wrote to Mr. Parent three years before the construction of the bridge was commenced, as stated by Mr. Cooper himself before the commission in New York that he would not be able to continue the work and asked to be relieved.

ASKED TO BE RELIEVED.

Nearly three years ago, before construction work at Quebec was commenced, Mr. Cooper informed Mr. Parent that he would never be able to go to Quebec again, and asked to be relieved from his responsibilities, as he felt impossible to give the work the attention that he should, as he was under the ban of his physician.

Mr. Parent responded that they never intended to let him go until the bridge was finished, as they had confidence in him and wanted his services continued. He told Mr. Deans the same, but neither would hear of it at all as they did not know of another one who could be mutually agreed upon.

There was no government control, no joint engineer, Mr. Cooper was supposed to have the full responsibility and Mr. Cooper had said that his old age and his feeble health, caused his doctors to order that he should not leave New York. All these considerations were put aside. It may be inferred from the action of the directors that they were better pleased that Mr. Cooper should remain in New York than be on the bridge where he could check things and prove that the work was not done in a business like way. Then, the responsible head of the whole organization in Quebec was Mr. Hoare. Mr. Cooper in his disposition says:

All important changes were referred to Mr. Hoare and I suppose through him to the department.

But the department was not in a position to ascertain the correctness of these plans from an engineering point of view and so Mr. Hoare was the only one to look after them. Mr. Hoare's responsibility is recognized by the commission who in their report (page 49) says:

The company's directors did not seem to have realized the importance of the duties pertaining to Mr. Hoare's position and whilst believing that he was not competent to control the work they still gave him all the powers and emoluments of the chief engineer.

There was a letter written by Mr. Parent to Holgate when it was admitted in 1898 that Mr. Hoare had not the ability to undertake the responsibility of chief engineer but still Mr. Parent said: Never mind, we know you are not capable but you shall be chief engineer. Why was Mr. Hoare accepted under such circumstances? It seems to me that a grave responsibility rests on whoever was the main instigator of the retention of Mr. Hoare and Mr. Cooper who admitted their inability to cope with the magnitude of the work. The report goes further:

Mr. Hoare personally considered that he was in general control of the construction, and that everything was under his jurisdiction except the approval of plans; the evidence shows that he gave much personal time to the oversight of the fabrication of the material, to inspection of the erection and the preparation of the estimates; it also shows that he lacked a comprehensive grasp of the work that was being done by the inspectors, and that although his subordinates entertained the highest personal regard for him they did not look to him for advice when technical difficulties arose.

Was Mr. Parent really the man who was running the Quebec Bridge Company. Probably some hon. gentlemen may challenge that statement but if so I refer them to page 29 of the evidence given before the committee when Mr. Barthe, the secretary of the company, was examined, and Mr. Barthe knows all about the Quebec Bridge Company if any man knows. Mr. Barthe was examined by Mr. Chisholm:

Q. You are aware that the chairman had a good deal of travelling and a good deal of work to do other than what the other directors did ?—A. Certainly. He was the soul of the whole thing and he practically did all the work.

I go further and I say, that Mr. Parent was responsible for the bad as well as for the good in the management of the Quebec Bridge Company. Mr. Parent ignored Mr. Douglas's report which was subsequently proven to be correct. The hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Maclean) admitted that the unit stresses were the fundamental mistake in the design. If we admit the truth of the maxim, that to err is human, is it not strange that an undertaking of that magnitude should be left in the hands of one single man ? Mr. Douglas condemned the unit stresses, and I quote from his evidence :

Q. Are you in a position to state that this accident could have been avoided by the adoption of the unit stresses you recommended ?—A. To answer that question is a very large statement but I think—

Q. But speaking generally it would ?—A. Yes, I may say that the experiments that have been made at Phœnixville as a result of the collapse of this bridge corroborate my recommendation.

Mr. Holgate stated about the same thing but still Mr. Parent ignored Mr. Douglas's report against the first plans and he ignored the logical recommendation of a joint engineer to supervise the technical accuracy of the plans. Mr. Parent also ignored Mr. Schreiber's admission that he was not in a position to be able to take the responsibility for the approval of these plans and he ignored also the Eiffel committee's report. I may say in passing that the greatest committee of engineers in the world is what is known as the Eiffel Committee in Paris. Eiffel was a great engineer who promulgated certain theories as to stresses and the flexibility of steel and on account of his great scientific attainments the French government permitted him to exemplify his theory by erecting the Eiffel tower for a period of five years. The French government has been so impressed by the successful carrying into practice of the theories of Eiffel that they have allowed the Eiffel tower to stand. There is therefore a committee of engineers in Paris which studies every important work in the engineering world. The Eiffel committee reported that they did not see their way clear to accept the present cantilever scheme unless there was a double resting point provided, and that otherwise the bridge would be exposed to great inconveniences. Time has proven that these defects in the bridge existed and the bridge has fallen. In the presence of all these facts I say that there rests on the president of the bridge company the responsibility of wilful neglect which may probably be extended to criminal negligence ; because a man who undertook such an important position should have known his own responsibility, and if he did not he was not fit for the job.

I say that a man guilty of such carelessness or want of business ability or the ordinary precautions which anybody should take in the ordinary walks of life must in the eyes of God and man be held entirely responsible for the neglect of a duty which was entirely under his control. What was the verdict of the coroners jury at the inquest in Quebec, which was held to ascertain the cause of the death of those poor three score men who went down with the bridge ? These people were in a hurry to pack that jury with shareholders of the company, who rendered a verdict in consideration of their own interests, and went further than a coroner's jury is expected to go, in stating that all of the necessary precautions were taken by the Bridge Company to prevent the collapse. An ordinary motorman who runs down a vehicle or a human being in the streets, is immediately brought before the courts and tried for manslaughter ; but when these high and influential men cause an accident which destroys the lives of three score men, nobody even considers who is responsible. I think it is the duty of this parliament or of the courts of this country to sift this matter to the bottom and see who is responsible. This government does not know what kind of a white elephant it is getting when it agrees to take over the property of this Bridge Company under the broad wording of this resolution. The probability is that this parliament will have to pay out of the public treasury for the errors of incompetent and irresponsible people.

Another point which I wish to impress on the House is that the government had not sufficient control over the finances of the company. The want of such control resulted in loose business methods being resorted to by the company, amounting almost to misrepresentation. I read in the report :

One of the conditions engaged was that before the guarantee should be given the company would secure the subscription and full payment in cash of $200,000 of additional stock. That condition was only in part fulfilled, through the government, having accepted the written certificate of the company's officer that it had been fully carried out, guaranteed a new issue of bonds.

I must say that when the attention of the Finance Minister was called to this, he admitted in his evidence that had this deception been known to him, he would not have authorized the execution of the guarantee. The Finance Minister is a high official upon whose statement relative to finances we can rely, and he considers that the terms of the statute were not fulfilled. How was it ? We find that $2,500 of stock was acquired by Mr. Parent which was paid for not in

money, but in services rendered ; $2,500 was taken by a few of the directors in sums varying from $400 to $100; and the balance of the stock, amounting to $119,900 was taken by Mr. Davis. He signed no subscription list. If you look at the evidence on page 59 of the report, you will find that Mr. Bell, the auditor of the Department of Railways, said that he did not think that the subscription list was signed at that time. Mr. Davis gives his cheque, and it lies in the till from January 27, 1904, to February 21, 1907, a cheque that is worthless. It may be said that Mr. Davis had good financial backing ; but I would like to pay my debts in that way, by giving cheques to people who would not present them at the bank. Later we find that Mr. Hays took $25,000 worth of stock, which reduced Davis's to $94,900. The argument was used that it was desirable that Mr. Davis should control stock because he was a contractor ; and it was anticipated that the Grand Trunk and other railways would take some ; but up to the present time no responsible railways have greatly interested themselves in the bridge project, on account of the terminal arrangements that were attempted to be forced upon them. When they saw that, they simply withdrew, and never showed any enthusiasm for the project.

Mr. TALBOT. With the permission of my hon. friend, who I think wishes to be fair, I would ask : does he persist in saying that no railway corporation in Canada took any stock in that company or any interest in the construction of the bridge ?

Mr. ROBITAILLE. I did not say what the hon. gentleman states. I said that no responsible railways showed any enthusiasm for the project. Furthermore, why have the railway companies never put up a public kick against the terminal arrangements ? As I have already told the Prime Minister, it is because the president of the Bridge Campany is a Transcontinental Railway Commissioner, who has a good pull with the Railway Department and has much to do with the railway legislation of this country ; and as the railway companies have to come here from time to time for legislation, they do not want to incur the displeasure of Mr. Parent, and they thought that instead of opposing the project, it was better for them to show their disapproval by not showing any enthusiasm for it. If I were allowed to give publicly the information which I have received privately from some of the highest officials of railway companies in this Dominion, I would say more ; but I will not, because it might harm them and would not help my case. That cheque of Mr. Davis was uncertified, and was never presented at the bank for three years, but last year, when the Bill for transferring the bonds of the company to the government was before the House, I made a speech which according to the judgment of some men on the ministerial benches was somewhat erratic ; but the Finance Minister, as a practical man, took a hint from it, and thought it advisable to see if there was any foundation for some of the statements made. Mr. Bell went to Quebec in August, and he found that that cheque was there. Mr. Bell said : 'I cannot enter that in my report ; it has either to be paid or the shares will have to be given back.' What happened ? The financial stringency was in full swing, and I know the result, because I saw Mr. Davis in the Bank of Montreal, and he had a very long face, and it was only on the 2nd of February that he was in a position to say to the bridge directors : 'You can pass my cheque now ; I have funds in the bank to meet it.' They put the cheque of $94,900 in the bank, and issued a certificate of stock ; but there was no interest charged to Mr. Davis for these three years. If you look up Mr. Davis' statements, however, you will find that he charges interest for every day that the government does not pay his bills after they are handed in. Why should he be so eager to collect from the government this small amount of interest as compared with the three years' interest on $94,900. In the face of that the Finance Minister admitted himself they do not live up to the statute. Mr. Parent writes to the Finance Minister :

I hereby certify that additional stock to the extent of $200,000, has been duly subscribed to the capital stock of the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company, and paid up in full.

A cheque, until it has passed through a bank, is not considered worth more than the paper it is written on. The presumption might be that the cheque is worth something, but in fact the cheque itself is of no value ; still the bridge directors accepted it. I shall read part of a letter which I wrote to the Prime Minister last summer advising him of certain facts, and I shall allow the country to judge whether or not my statements have been justified by events. I wrote :

To the item of the Quebec bridge I especially draw your attention. As you are aware I have had occasion to communicate with you upon this important subject and as I then told you it was my intention to study the question and treat it according to its merits. During your last trip, when parliament was considering the Bill authorizing the government to lend the Quebec Bridge Company $7,000,000, I expressed my views upon the subject. Those views are known to the majority of the electors not only of my riding but also of Quebec city, who are about to awaken from their lethargy judging by the agitation made in Quebec in reference to the demand for 50 feet of land for the Ross Rifle Company under the impression that they were combating a suggestion of Mr. Parent. They are to-day aware of the enormous speculation proposed all along the cove and it would be advisable

for you to well study the question, as your government in the future may be seriously embarrassed by it, and I would be sorry to see a scandal, just when we are on the eve of a general election, which will be keenly contested. Such a scandal would mar your reputation as an honest politician and a great Canadin, a reputation that is recognized by both parties, and political history wlll be forced to attribute to you, as to the great Mercier, certain unconscious weaknesses in favour of your friends. I hope that nothing will occur that will cast upon your government discredit before the whole country.

That was on July 29, 1907, and on August 29 the bridge fell.

Mr. D. ROSS. Carried.

Mr. ROBITAILLE. I hear the representative of the Great Northern speaking.

Mr. D. ROSS. I do not think the hon. gentleman should be permitted to say such things in such a cowardly way, expecting that people will not be able to hear them.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the word cowardly is improper.

Mr. D. ROSS. I think it is myself, but I think the circumstances justify it. However, I will withdraw the word. The hon. gentleman made his statement in such a way that he did not expect me to hear it: I hear the representative of the Great Northern. I do not think the hon. gentleman should have made a statement of that kind, and I want him to explain now why he did make it.

Mr. ROBITAILLE. Since the hon. member is so generous as to withdraw the word 'cowardly,' and in order not to disturb his quietude, I will say he is not the representative of the Great Northern; is that sufficient? The Prime Minister said:

I do not understand what you are saying, but if you have any accusations to make, make them specific.

I then sent him a short affidavit, which reads, in part (translation):

In March, 1904 or 1905, an amount of more than $800,000 was paid by the Ottawa government to Mr. M. P. Davis, contractor for work done at the Quebec bridge. In August of the same year the said account, certified by the engineer in chief, E. A. Hoare,——

There we see the utility of Mr. Hoare for the Quebec Bridge Company.

—and another who is said to be an employee of his and paid as above was presented to the accountant of the Bridge Company, the deponent, in order to place his books in conformity with the said account being instructed by the secretary that it was the desire of the directors that his books should accord with this account.

A direct intimation of the wish of the company to have the books made to suit the account if there was a greater payment than his books showed the company owed to Mr. Davis.

In checking the account the accountant found an error of $165,000 overpaid to Mr. M. P. Davis, although it was certified, as follows:

1. An amount of $130,000, balance of the provincial subsidy in favour of the bridge company and transferred to the said Davis in part payment of work done upon which amount he had already cashed $30,000 paid in the beginning of June of the same year. This amount of $130,000 was not credited in the account filed by Davis to the company.

2. An amount of $35,000 which represented a draft which the bridge company had made on the said Davis to finance this draft on, being accepted, was entered to the debit account of the bridge company in Mr. Davis' books. This draft on maturity was paid by the Bridge Company and in the said account is charged to the debit of the bridge company.

In looking over Davis' accounts filed here in Ottawa we find that $35,000 is entered as paid in cash to the bridge company. When you accept a draft or give a note, it is bills payable, it is not cash. It may have been a clerical error; but whatever it was, it was sufficient to induce the Finance Minister to pay on it and not discuss the item.

This is not the only loose thing in connection with the Bridge Company. I mentioned a few moments ago that when they organized the company $50,000 was actually paid in cash, $15,000 of paid-up stock was given for services, $200,000 was supposed to be subscribed by statute, making $265,000; but still the government was content to make that company responsible for $8,000,000 and more. Now, I have some information which I give under reserve, but I think it will be interesting to this House as showing the excellent existing relations between Mr. Parent and Mr. Davis. I have been informed that on different occasions Mr. Davis, knowing how Mr. Parent likes little attentions, has bought certain jewellery for Mr. Parent's family. Furthermore, Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, the late Minister of Justice, when he went on his summer vacation at Rivière du Loup one summer, enjoyed greatly the nice team of driving horses and equipages which belong to Mr. Davis. The whole thing works in the same——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Order.

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, I direct your attention to the statement against Chief Justice Sir Charles Fitzpatrick which has just been made. Surely such statements are not allowed in this House against a gentleman occupying such a position in this country.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the statement is hardly a proper statement to make.

Mr. ROBITAILLE. My Georgian friend (Mr. Talbot) likes to hear his own voice now and again. Furthermore, I have information to the effect that in Quebec city, in a certain year, Mr. Parent obtained from this government a supply of manure from the quarantine station in Lévis, and that he used Mr. Davis's scows to transport it to his farm at St. Augustin. It is current rumour in the city of Ottawa that the house he occupies to-day is the gratuitous gift of Mr. Davis——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. What is the point of order ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Robitaille) has no right to make insinuations of that kind against any man unless he is prepared to back up his statements with evidence. He has a right to make charges but not to make insinuations.

Mr. SPEAKER. The rule applies to certain named persons.

Mr. LENNOX. This gentleman does not come within the class of persons referred to in the rule.

Mr. ROBITAILLE. I will accept the ruling of the chair——

Mr. FOSTER. I do not understand that the ruling of the chair is that any except certain privileged persons shall not be mentioned in this House. It is a mere matter of the convenience or necessity, or taste of the member who makes use of the name ; but there is no point of order involved. No member of this House must go away with the idea that Mr. Speaker can arbitrarily rule a man down.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My contention is, subject to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, that no member of this House has the right to make insinuations against any man. If he has charges to make, let him make them. But to make insinuations of that kind with 'It is rumoured,' 'I am informed,' 'I have heard,' is absolutely out of order.

Mr. SPROULE. That is very strange doctrine to preach in this House. Any member of this House is himself the judge of the propriety of the way in which he shall speak of any person to whom the rules do not apply. He is within his privileges, and there is no rule that I know of under which he can be called to order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The only rule applicable to such a question is Rule No. 19, which says :

No member shall speak disrespectfully of His Majesty, nor of any of the Royal Family; nor of the Governor or person administering the government of Canada; nor use offensive words against either House——

And so on. As this rule does not apply there is nothing in the rules or practice providing that what the hon. gentleman is saying is out of order.

Mr. GALLIHER. Is there not a rule under which there must be some relevancy in discussion ? Are not members required to discuss the subject before the chair ?

Mr. SPEAKER. That is quite another point. If that rule be invoked, I believe the statement of the hon. member (Mr. Robitaille) is not relevant.

Mr. ROBITAILLE. To satisfy the scruples of hon. members, I will not go further on that line. I will give positive facts. Probably it would interest the members of this House to consider for a moment : Who is this Mr. Parent ? He was a very poor man in Quebec not many years ago ; to-day he has a three thousand-dollar piano, and his house is fitted accordingly. He became mayor of the city of Quebec at a time when the finances of the city were in good shape. To-day, Quebec is one of the most heavily taxed cities in the Dominion. He became Minister of Crown Lands of the province of Quebec, and in ten years sold a larger area of public lands than had been sold in the province of Ontario in thirty years.

Mr. SPEAKER. Of course, the hon. member (Mr. Robitaille) will observe that the point of order was taken of relevancy. The hon. member's present observations are hardly relevant.

Mr. ROBITAILLE. Then, let us consider this point : What is the effect of Mr. Parent's friendship with Mr. Davis ? A part of it can be summarized in this form :

Discount on bonds, $188,721.

Unpaid shares (unaccepted cheque), $119,-900.

Excess on bill as established by affidavit, $165,000.

Certifying of Davis' bills by engineer incompetent and uncontrolled.

Obtaining the contract for 150 miles of construction on the Transcontinental, Quebec to New Brunswick.

It is useless to say that every one knows how estimates are made. No one can make an estimate exact to the dollar. I have done some contracting work myself, and I have seen cases where the estimate has been made at $7,500 for a certain piece of railway work, two-thirds of a mile, when we did it for $3,000 odd. We know that contractors work at less than cost and yet, somehow, they make piles of money.

It is useless to say what effect all this has upon Parent's standing in the district of Quebec, this acceptance of little favours which can be used for electoral purposes. If I were good friends with Mr. Davis I would go round with my bag. But I understand the other man would have it. Well, we shall have a chance to meet him.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the bridge is down. Some tell us that we should not cry over

spilt milk. What is to be done for the future? If the government desires to stand in a logical and honest position before this country, its duty is to appoint a committee of independent engineers to study the most advisable site for the future bridge. In this resolution there ought to be a sum of $25,000 or $30,000 appropriated to defray the expenses. This committee of experts should make comparative estimates between the present bridge site and railway terminals in the city of Quebec and the site and terminals if the bridge is built by the island of Orleans.

I may say that several prominent engineers who have no political influence admit that the latter plan is the most practicable for the development, not only of Quebec city, but also of that portion of Montmorency county which is known as the Island of Orleans. If the government is going to pursue the present plans for terminal facilities they will have to do it on ground artificially made. When these estimates have been made up, let them be reported to parliament with the plans suggested, not leaving every tenderer to make his own plans. Further, I would suggest that there should be a committee to superintend and control the work during the whole period of construction. When plans are finally adopted, call for tenders. I claim that the latter suggestion should receive some attention from the government; as to the rest, they can do as they see fit.

Mr. W. A. GALLIHER (Kootenay). I shall take up little time in discussing this matter. I shall not follow the wanderings of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Robitaille), nor do more than refer to the questionable taste he has exhibited in reading private correspondence and in attacking the private character of individuals. If he is satisfied that is his mission in parliament and his duty to his constituents, then I am not going to question it. He certainly has not confined himself to matters within the purview of the resolution under which this report was brought down and is now before the House. He has gone beyond it to the extent of discussing matters entirely irrelevant and extraneous to it. Furthermore, he has made statements that are not at all facts, but have no other source than his imagination. The hon. gentleman made a speech in this House some time ago, and I had the pleasure of examining him in this committee on that subject, and as a sample of the weight that may be attached to many of his statements I will read one of his answers to my question. In his speech he stated that by reason of certain affiliations and associations of some of the officers of the Quebec Bridge Company, we might expect all sorts of calamities to occur. He hedged on that when it was brought to him directly, and said that he did not say that as a matter of fact. Then I asked him:

Then your speech has really no relation whatever except in the sense that such and such things might happen?—A. Yes.

Q. Now to your knowledge, or so far as you know, they never did occur?—A. Yes, that is why I was asking the government to take the thing under its control, because I was foreshadowing the result.

The hon. gentleman's speeches in this House on that occasion and on this occasion are largely imaginings. Now he tries to convey to this House the idea that one of the reasons why this bridge collapsed was because of the weak financial standing of the company, in other words, they were not strong enough to put such a project through as was necessary for the purpose. I would point out to the hon. gentleman that such is not the case. The Royal Commission, when they went into that matter, found that the financial status of the company had nothing whatever to do with the accident to the bridge. On that point I will read their finding from paragraph (e):

The failure cannot be attributed directly to any cause other than errors in judgment on the part of these two engineers.

(f) These errors of judgment cannot be attributed either to lack of common professional knowledge, to neglect of duty, or to a desire to economize.

If you refer to the appendix to the report of the Royal Commission where they deal with the financial situation, you will find that the conclusion they arrived at was that in no respect whatever had the financial condition of the company anything to do with the lamentable accident that occurred. My hon. friend from Quebec county has also made this an occasion to vent his spleen upon the Hon. Mr. Parent. Now, whatever information may have been furnished to the hon. gentleman for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), and whatever the object of that information may have been upon which he felt bound, rightly so I admit, to move in this House for an order of reference that these matters be inquired into, whatever be the object of that information, and whether it was furnished by the hon. member who has just taken his seat or some outside party, I do not know. Evidently, if it was furnished by the hon. member who has just taken his seat, one of his objects at all events was if possible to procure evidence that would discredit in some way the Hon. Mr. Parent. Now, I am not here as sponsor for Mr. Parent or any other man. But having had this matter under consideration, being one of the commissioners who sat on this inquiry, when I hear these statements made regarding that hon. gentleman as chairman of the Quebec Bridge Company, I would refer hon. members to the evidence of the co-directors of Mr. Parent on that company, Mr. Price, Mr. Sharples and Mr. Dumoulin, and others who were examined before us, and they will

see what confidence is reposed in Mr. Parent by his associates. These are the only two points in the hon. gentleman's remarks that I propose to deal with. I am sure that when he reads his remarks and the insinuations and imaginings that he has caused to be spread on 'Hansard,' he will find a great difficulty in understanding really what he has been talking about for the past hour.

The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) in speaking upon this report, seemed to think that the report of the committee as presented was not full enough, and had not dealt with the matter with sufficient completeness. There were, under the order of reference, three matters which the committee were asked to take into consideration. The first matter was to investigate 'the conditions and guarantees under which this government paid moneys to the Quebec Bridge Company, and indorsed or guaranteed the bonds of the said company.' That, we have set out in the report brought down to-day by the committee. We have not gone into detail or made comments upon it but we have taken the essential parts of the evidence that has been produced in connection with it so that they may be read to the House and the country. In that respect I think we have complied fully with the first branch of this inquiry. The third branch of the inquiry is in regard to, 'what security the government at present possess for the sums already received by and guarantees given to the company.'

As to that my hon. friends who have joined in the minority report differ from those of my colleagues who have joined with the chairman in the report of the committee. There may be an honest difference of opinion as to what the value of these securities is. We, in our judgment, have set out what in our opinion the security is that is held by the government for the money they have expended, so that it becomes a matter of opinion as to what the actual value of this security is. We know what the cost of the substructure, the terminals, the connections with these terminals and the roadbed that has been built was and we know that all these are in existence to-day. We know that there is a quantity of structural material delivered on the ground. All these things are assets that are available and will be available to the government in taking this work over. With regard to the second portion of the inquiry as to what measures were adopted by the government to ensure the preparation of suitable plans of construction and the proper execution of the same,' very little, if any evidence, was adduced before the committee that was not adduced before the Royal Commission. A considerable part of the inquiry in that particular necessarily had reference to matters of a technical nature which no member of the committee is really able to cope with in an intelligent manner, or with sufficient intelligence to enable him to speak authoritatively on the subject. The Royal Commission made their findings upon that point and we refer to them in the report that we present to the House. We say that inasmuch as a portion of the inquiry was of a technical nature and has been dealt with by men competent to deal with it we deem it inadvisable to express any opinion upon that point. So that I think we cannot be charged by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) with not having brought down a full report within the purview of the resolution under which we were acting. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier also mentioned the fact that we had made no reference whatever in this report to the deplorable loss of life. I do not know exactly what reason my friend had for making that remark but I am sure that he will not accuse any other hon. gentleman on that committee with feeling any less keenly the regret which every one must have felt at the deplorable loss of life that took place in that accident. We all deplore the fact. But, I do not think it will do any good now to refer to it. I do not think that was within the purview of the committee. We might, of course, have mentioned it, but I cannot see what would have been accomplished by our having done so. My hon. friend rather plumed himself on the fact that he and his colleagues had come to the same conclusions as had the members of the Royal Commission. I have no objection to my hon friend's statement in that connection, but I would point out that if they came to the same conclusions and justify their conclusions by saying that they agreed with those of the Royal Commission some of the conclusions which were embodied in the report of the Royal Commission that my hon. friend refers to might very well in fairness have been placed in the minority report. My hon. friend sought to convey the impression that the Phœnix Bridge Company were trying to build this bridge as lightly and as cheaply as possible; in other words, that they were skimping their work. That is what I would infer from the expressions made use of by the hon. gentleman. I would refer the hon. gentleman and the House to paragraph L of the report of the Royal Commission which says:

> The work done by the Phœnix Bridge Company in making the detail drawings and in planning and carrying out the erection, and by the Phœnix Iron Company in fabricating the material was good, and the steel used was of good quality. The serious defects were fundamental errors in design.

If my hon. friend agrees with the findings of the Royal Commissioners does not this statement convey to his mind, as it conveys to my mind, the impression that in so far as the material furnished by the Phœnix Bridge Company, the construction under the direction of the Phœnix Bridge

Company and the materials manufactured by the Phœnix Iron Company were concerned, they were good. The statement or inference of the hon. gentleman that the work was being skimped, that it was not being done as thoroughly as it ought to have been, or that the material supplied was lighter than it should have been, in the face of this paragraph from the report of the Royal Commission, falls to the ground.

Mr. BARKER. Do they not say the design of the bridge was bad, and was it not the design the government were to approve of?

Mr. GALLIHER. They said the error was in the design, but I was pointing out that my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier conveyed the impression that the Phœnix Bridge Company were not supplying proper material and were trying to work upon a cheap scale, and I was proving to him by the report of the Royal Commission, with which he says he agrees, that such is not the case. There is a section of this report of the Royal Commission which has reference to Mr. Cooper himself and which I fail to find included in the minority report. The report of the Royal Commission says:

The professional record of Mr. Cooper was such that his selection for the authoritative position that he occupied was warranted and the complete confidence that was placed in his judgment by the officials of the Dominion government the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company and the Phœnix Bridge Company was deserved.

There is a high tribute to Mr. Cooper, and if as my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) says the minority report contains practically all the findings in the report of the commission, in all fairness that should have been included. The evidence deduced before this committee shows that the directors of the Quebec Bridge Company were capable business men; men of varied experience in business life. It appears also that the affairs of the company were conducted honestly and economically and that the sole aim in view of the company was the building of one of the greatest bridges in the world. The evidence, and the finding of the Royal Commission go to show that it was the desire of the Phœnix Bridge Company and the desire of the iron works to supply the best material, and further, that it was the desire of Mr. Cooper to make the Quebec bridge the crowning work of his life as an engineer. The desire of all parties concerned was centred in bringing to a successful conclusion the completion of this great bridge over the St. Lawrence river at Quebec. As to the manner in which the bridge company conducted its business I would refer to the report of Mr. Bell, who was sent from the Railway Department to audit the accounts. He says:

After careful examination of every voucher since the 19th October, 1903, I find nothing which had not been properly authorized and which might not be considered as legitimate expenditure of a joint stock company.

That report of the auditor puts it beyond all question that the affairs of the Quebec Bridge Company—whatever their financial standing may have been—were managed economically and in the best interests of the company and of the country. As to the certificate that was given to the government I shall not refer to it further than to quote some evidence that was taken before the commission. At page 71 of the report Mr. Bell says:

Q. Do I understand you to say that the proceeds of the $200,000 of the new stock was used for the purposes of the company? Is that what you say?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. But they were not used for the purposes of fulfilling the agreement which required that the money should be used to pay off the discount on the interim bonds?—A. The Act, as I stated in my report, was not strictly complied with in that respect.

Q. You stated that in your report?—A. I stated that in my report; the Act was not strictly complied with.

Q. It was not complied with at all?—A. In that respect it was not complied with at all.

Q. There is no limit. You say 'strictly complied with'?—A. I mean speaking of the whole Act. It is admitted that particular part was not complied with, but the $200,000 was subsequently used and paid out, and if that had not been there the $200,000 would have been taken out of bond account for the same purpose; so that one replaced the other. The net result in the end is the same. That is, if the Act had been strictly complied with the company would have been in exactly the same position to-day.

Q. The company used the $6,800,000 guaranteed bonds to raise money for their purposes. If they had got the cash from Mr. Davis and applied it there would have been so much less necessary from the bonds at the moment?—A. At the moment, but they would have had later to take from bond account a similar amount to meet the accounts which were paid by the money secured from the stock.

Therefore, although it is true that the Act was not strictly complied with in that respect yet the result in the end was the same. The reasons have been already given and commented on as to why this cheque was not immediately cashed, but as Mr. Bell deposes the net result in the end was the same as if it had been cashed in the first instance. One other point I wish to draw attention to, and that is with reference to the appointment of a commission of engineers. When Mr. Holgate was giving evidence before our committee, Mr. Monk questioned him as to his views on how a structure of this kind should be initiated, and he gave it as his view that there should be a commission of engineers who would go into all the details of design and of drawing plans. The questions and the answers being general in their nature I wanted to know if he was speaking with reference to what he

would have done in the first instance before it was known an accident would occur, and Mr. Holgate frankly acknowledged that he was speaking simply in the light of facts and information he had acquired during the investigation. Therefore, on the principle that hind sight is better than foresight, Mr. Holgate would not go so far as to say that if in the first instance he had been undertaking this work he would have done what, in the light of the knowledge he afterwards obtained, he would consider necessary. He gave it to be understood that if he were undertaking this work in the first instance he would not say that a commission of engineers should have been appointed. I do not desire to detain the House at any greater length.

Mr. GEORGE PARENT (Montmorency). Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to speak at any length on this matter, on account of the lateness of the hour; but I wish to make a few remarks in answer to the hon. member for Quebec county (Mr. Robitaille). I notice that when that hon. member speaks under oath he speaks very differently from what he does when he speaks in the House of Commons. That hon. member a few days ago was called before the committee appointed to investigate this Quebec bridge matter and was asked by the hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Galliher) certain questions in regard to a speech which he made in this House last session. I wish to read this evidence in order that the House and the country may know that when the hon. member for Quebec county speaks under oath he speaks in a different way altogether from what he does in the House of Commons. I remember well the words that the hon. member uttered last session, when he made statements that at the time we were not in a position to answer; and that is the reason why we thought it proper to bring him before the committee in order that he might have the opportunity of repeating those statements under oath. I will not read the whole of his evidence but simply the more striking portions of it. One statement made by the hon. member for Quebec county in his speech in the House last session was that the premier of the province of Quebec, at the time the subsidies were granted for the Quebec bridge, happened to be the president of the Transcontinental Railway Commission. The hon. member is supposed to have certain instruction if not education; but he did not know that the president of the bridge company was not at the time the subsidies were granted the actual president of the Transcontinental Railway Commission. The following is his evidence before the committee in regard to another statement:

Q. Do you know when that subsidy was obtained?—A. No.

Q. Now, a little further on in the same speech you stated (reads): 'In 1901, after having secured this subsidy, a company was formed called the Quebec Terminal and Railway Company. Associated with Mr. Parent were Hon. John Sharples, E. Taschereau and Gaspard Lemoine.' Do you know as a matter of fact that Mr. Parent was ever a member of that terminal company?—A. I must say, in passing, that there are a few statements in that speech that were not correctly taken by the stenographers. In reading it up this summer I found, for example, that certain figures do not corroborate certain statements. I corrected some of these with the original that I had when I gave them out, and I think personally that Hon. Mr. Parent's name was not mentioned in the House by me at the time. I read from the statute-book the names of the parties who had registered themselves when they asked for letters patent. Mr. Parent's was not, if I remember right, but there was Mr. Edmond Taschereau, who is a notary in Mr. Parent's office.

Anybody who has the slightest knowledge of legal matters in the province of Quebec knows that a notary is altogether different from a lawyer; but when the hon. member for Quebec county speaks of Mr. Edmond Taschereau as if he were a lawyer, he shows how much he knows about matters of that kind. As to the personal attacks made upon persons who are dear to me, I will not refer to them; the hon. member's condemnation will come later. He has given us only an exhibition of the last kick of a dying ass.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. PARENT. I withdraw the expression, Mr. Speaker. I intended to say a few words on this subject, but as it has been so fully discussed, I do not think it is necessary for me to go further into the affairs of the bridge company. I wish to refer to one statement in the minority report to the effect that the Quebec Bridge Company was not in a proper financial condition, that it had too small a capital, to undertake such a work. If there is anybody who ought to know something about that, it is the people of the city of Quebec themselves; and both sides of politics in that city took one view of the question, and everybody there is perfectly satisfied with what has been done by the company and the government. On this point, instead of attempting to make any argument myself, I will read an appreciation contained in the only Tory English paper that we have in the city of Quebec. This is taken from the Quebec 'Chronicle' of December 14, 1907:

The company was taunted with the smallness of its capital in comparison with the magnitude of the work to be achieved, and was represented as a gang of exploiters, whose only object was to make a good thing out of the government. Now in order to properly value the justice of these accusations it will be well to recall the circumstances previous to and at the time of the company's organization. The want of a bridge over the St. Lawrence had long been felt, and, as the years

progressed, became stronger and stronger. There was a bridge over the St. Lawrence at Montreal, it is true, but that bridge was, and still is, the means of conveying Canadian produce to American seaports to the manifest detriment of our own ports and shipping. When the Conservatives held power, Sir Charles Tupper came down to Quebec and promised the government's support towards the construction of a bridge, but he made it a condition that the Quebecers should show the genuineness of the interest they professed to feel by initiating the enterprise, and investing capital in it. Either there was a misunderstanding about this condition, or the Quebec men of means in those days were unwilling to comply with it and the project dropped. As time went on the need for the bridge became more apparent; the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company were opening out a new and immensely fertile region in the Hinterland of the province; the wheat fields of the Northwest had grown to such an extent that the government of the day considered it necessary to provide another outlet for their products, in such a manner as to find a vent for them in Canadian, and not American seaports. Then the government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier did practically what that of Sir Charles Tupper had done. It promised effectual co-operation in the building of the bridge, but it was still co-operation only. Then, mindful of what had happened in the past, Quebec gentlemen formed the present bridge company, lest the opportunity should again be lost. It is probable that they were inspired by motives of self interest as well as of patriotism, but they can scarcely be blamed for that, had they not acted as they did, the bridge would not have been commenced.

As for the smallness of the capital invested, it must be remembered in the first place that there are no multi-millionaires here, and in the second place that the company was required as the necessary impetus to set the work going, and not to carry it on to its completion. Nobody expected that a company could be formed in Quebec that would build the bridge out of its own resources, and scanty subsidies from the Dominion, provincial and municipal governments. This was well understood from the outset, and it was well understood also that the work being one of national importance the government would sooner or later intervene, and practically, if not actually provide for its completion itself. What was required was an initiative taken by Quebecers, and that was afforded by the company that is now blamed for doing so, and reproached for the small amount invested. But, if it had not come forward, what then?

I quote this to show the sentiment prevailing in Quebec. In conclusion I would say that the people of Quebec feel, and I as a member from the district of Quebec feel that we should be thankful to the government, thankful to the ministers who have helped towards building this bridge which will result in making Quebec a great city and in giving to the harbour of Quebec the place it should have under the sun of our Dominion.

House divided on amendment Mr. Monk.

YEAS :

Messieurs

Alcorn,
Avery,
Barker,
Barr,
Beattie,
Bergeron,
Blain,
Borden (Carleton),
Boyce,
Brabazon,
Bristol,
Broder,
Chisholm (Huron),
Christie,
Clare,
Crocket,
Daniel,
Foster,
Fowler,
Haggart,
Henderson,
Herron,
Hughes (Victoria),
Jackson (Elgin),
Kemp,
Lake,
Lancaster,
Lefurgey,
Lennox,
Leonard,
McLaren,
Maclean (York S.),
McCarthy (Calgary),
Monk,
Morin,
Northrup,
Owen,
Perley,
Porter,
Pringle,
Reid (Grenville),
Robitaille,
Roche (Marquette),
Sproule,
Staples,
Taylor,
Tisdale,
Walsh (Huntingdon),
White,
Wilson (Lennox & Addington),
Worthington,
Wright (Muskoka)—52.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Archambault,
Aylesworth,
Borden (Sir Frederick),
Bourbonnais,
Brodeur,
Brown,
Bureau,
Caldwell,
Calvert,
Carney,
Caron,
Cash,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Clarke,
Copp,
Cyr,
Delisle,
Demers,
Desjardins,
Dubeau,
Dugas,
Dyment,
Emmerson,
Ethier,
Fielding,
Finlay,
Finlayson,
Fisher,
Galliher,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,
Gervais,
Girard,
Gordon,
Graham,
Harty,
Hughes (Kings, P.E.I.),
Logan,
Loggie,
Macdonald,
Maclean (Lunenburg),
Macpherson,
McCarthy (Simcoe),
McCool,
McIntyre (Perth),
McIntyre (Strathcona),
McKenzie,
McLean (Huron),
McLean (York, C.),
McLennan,
Marcile (Bagot),
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Martin (Montreal, St. Mary's),
Martin (Wellington),
Mayrand,
Michaud,
Miller,
Oliver,
Pardee,
Parmelee,
Paterson,
Parent,
Pickup,
Power,
Proulx,
Pugsley,
Reid (Restigouche),
Roche (Halifax),
Ross (Cape Breton),
Ross (Rimouski),
Ross (Yale-Cariboo),
Rousseau,
Savoie,
Schell (Glengarry),
Schell (Oxford),

Hunt,
Jackson (Selkirk),
Johnston,
Kennedy,
Knowles,
Lachance,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),
Lanctot (Richelieu),
Lapointe,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Laurier (L'Assomption),
Lavergne,
LeBlanc,
Lemieux,
Sinclair,
Smith (Oxford),
Stewart,
Talbot,
Telford,
Templeman,
Tobin,
Tolmie,
Turcotte,
Verville,
Walsh (Montreal, St. Anne),
Watson,
Wright (Renfrew),
Zimmerman.—103.

PAIRS :

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Burrows,	Wilmot,
Turriff,	Seagram,
Law,	Osler,
Sloan,	Bennett,
Carvell,	Ward,
Conmée,	Elson,
Crawford,	Ganong,
Devlin,	McLean (Queens, P.E.I.),
German,	Martin (Queens, P.E.I.),
Grant,	Cockshutt,
Greenway,	Armstrong,
Guthrie,	Smith (Wentworth),
Hall,	Marshall,
McColl,	Lalor,
Smith (Nanaimo),	Clements,
Boyer,	Forget,
Sifton,	Macdonell,
Black,	Ames,
Beland,	Paquet,
Fortier,	Lewis,
Ratz,	Thompson,
McCraney,	Schaffner,
Turgeon.	Stanfield.

Amendment negatived.

Motion agreed to on division.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. FOWLER. I desire to ask the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) if he intends to answer certain questions I put upon the Order Paper with regard to the Intercolonial Railway ? I refer to questions 1 and 2. I desire to ask the same question of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) with regard to question 8.

Mr. GRAHAM. I understand that questions will be called to-night or to-morrow. I have the answers to question No. 1 here, but I am not quite sure about the other.

Mr. FOWLER. Could you give the answers now ?

Mr. GRAHAM. It would not be in order to give it now. Questions will be called before prorogation.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Have the orders of the day been called ? If not, on the

calling of the orders of the day, I would like to ask the Minister of Finance whether it is the intention of the government to facilitate the passage of the Senate Bill relating to the water carriage of goods. This is on the Order Paper under 'Public Bills and Orders'. There is a strong demand in favour of the measure—almost unanimous support I believe. I would like to know the intention of the government.

Mr. FIELDING. There is that Bill and also another Bill from the Senate, the two being in the same position. In answers to the hon. member's suggestion, I may say that, some time to-morrow, or to-night if time will allow, we shall be glad to have them called up.

SALE OF INDIAN LANDS—TELEGRAM FROM MR. SIFTON.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have received from Mr. Sifton the following telegram:

Winnipeg, Manitoba, July 16, 1908.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier,
Ottawa.

Please read following to House: Mr. Boyce's statement that improprieties exist in sale Indian lands unfounded, statement that application put in under name different from real applicant at my suggestion or request or with my knowledge absolutely untrue. I do not know that Mr. Philp has or ever had any interest, did not know Messrs. Wilson and Reesor had acquired these lands until a year after sale took place, sale made by officials in ordinary way and under ordinary rules given so far as I know, no privilege whatever to purchasers except what were open to any applicant, I unqualifiedly deny the existence of any improprieties or irregularity whatever.

CLIFFORD SIFTON.

QUEBEC BRIDGE AND RAILWAY COMPANY.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolutions :

Resolved, That it is expedient to authorize the government of Canada pursuant to the agreement between it and the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company, dated the 19th day of October, 1903, and set out in the schedule to chapter 54 of the statutes of 1903, to exercise the right to take over the whole of the undertaking, assets, property, and franchises of the Quebec Railway and Bridge Company, upon the terms and conditions set forth in the said agreement and the said Act, and that the moneys required to pay therefor be appropriated for that purpose out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

Motion agreed to and House went into committee on the resolution.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the estimated amount of the expenditure ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I thought that, as it is so near six o'clock, the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) would prefer to have the resolution reported and the discussion of these points take place on the Bill. The estimate for the construction of the bridge, of course cannot be given, until we have the report of the board of engineers.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have no objection to reserving the discussion until the committee stage of the Bill.

Resolution reported, read the second time and agreed to.

Mr. GRAHAM moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 217) respecting the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SALE OF ORDNANCE LANDS.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following resolutions :

1. Resolved, That it is expedient to confirm the following orders in council, that is to say:

(a) An order in council dated the sixteenth day of May, 1904, authorizing the sale to the corporation of the city of Toronto of certain ordnance property in that city, consisting of the whole of the military property lying between and including the old fort and the exhibition;

(b) An order in council, dated the sixth day of December, 1905, authorizing the sale to the city of Montreal of the ordnance property in the St. Lawrence river, opposite the said city, known as St. Helen's Island: and

(c) An order in council, dated the twenty-seventh day of July, 1907, authorizing the conveyance to the city of Montreal of a portion of the ordnance property in that city known as Lafontaine park, and to authorize the sale and disposal of the said ordnance property in the manner and subject to the conditions by the said orders in council, respectively, provided and subject to such further and other conditions as may be imposed by His Majesty and accepted by the corporation of the city of Toronto and by the city of Montreal, as the case may be.

2. Resolved, That the purchase moneys received from the corporations of the city of Toronto and the city of Montreal for the said ordnance properties may be used and applied and are hereby appropriated to and for the purposes, of the purchase of sites and construction of building thereon for military schools of instruction in connection with the permanent force in those cities, respectively.

On section 2,

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Is it the intention to make any stipulation for the maintenance of the old fort in Toronto when it comes into possession of the city?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Do I understand that the government sells to the city of Montreal, St. Helen's Island for so much?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. And the city of Montreal, as compensation, deeds to the government part of Lafontaine park?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Not exactly. In the Bill which I shall introduce, the orders in council referred to in this resolution are printed in full. But in the order in council relating to the matter to which the hon. gentleman refers, the two matters are kept separate. The fact is that St. Helen's Island was under lease to the city for certain purposes. The city wished to acquire it, and the government agreed to sell it for a certain sum of money after it had been appraised. The city had been occupying the whole of Lafontaine Park for many years, and having improved half of it, the city wished to acquire Lafontaine Park and the department agreed that the half which the city had improved should be deeded to the city, and that the city should give up any claim it had on the other half so that the department might have the use of the other half for the purposes of drill. At the same time, it is understood that when it is not occupied by the department for parades the city shall have the use of the other half.

Mr. BERGERON. I suppose that this will be left a great deal to the discretion of the hon. gentleman and the city of Montreal when the time comes. He knows that there were objections on the part of many citizens to giving up any part of Lafontaine Park.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There is no intention to construct military buildings on that half of the park, but merely to use it for the purposes of military parades.

Mr. HAGGART. What do you do with the proceeds of the sales?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is provided for in the Bill. The money is to be expended in the purchase of sites in Toronto and Montreal.

Mr. KEMP. What is the purchase price of the site in each city?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. $200,000 in each case.

Resolutions reported, read the second time and agreed to.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 218) to authorize the sale or other disposal of certain ordnance lands in the cities of Toronto and Montreal.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first and second time, and House went into committee thereon.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I wish to say to the committee that in introducing my resolution I omitted to state that His Excellency had been apprised of the subject matter of the resolution, and recommended it for consideration.

On section 2,

Mr. KEMP. I would like to inquire from the minister if he has received any representations from any one in Toronto in respect to the street car service running through these grounds?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. When the arrangement was made with the city of Toronto, the papers in connection with them were laid on the table two or three years ago, it was stipulated on the part of the government that the old fort and the old burying ground should be preserved by the city, that is the condition on which the property is handed over to the city. It is to be used for park purposes exclusively.

Mr. HAGGART. Why do you not reserve a part for the purpose of the public buildings that you intend to put up in Toronto?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The city of Toronto was anxious to have this land. They have had seventy-five acres of it for many years, and they had a lease before that, and had practically become the users; so they thought it desirable that they should become the owners. We have got a fairly good price for it and we have purchased, or the city has purchased for us, a farm at the very low rate of $20,000 and that farm is to be transferred to the government as soon as this legislation goes through, and the balance of the money will be used for the purpose of constructing buildings for the military school at Toronto.

Mr. KEMP. I asked the minister if he had received representations with reference to the street cars going through it?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We have stipulated with the city that the fort should be maintained and restored, and of course if the street cars were to go through it or injure it in any way that would not be an observance of the conditions. I think there was a further order in council with reference to this very matter which said that nothing of the kind, no railway of any kind could be carried through the Fort without the consent of the people of Toronto; it must first be permitted by by-law of the city.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

EDMONTON, YUKON AND PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Bill (No. 213) respecting aid for the extension of the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway—Mr. Graham—read a second time, and House went into committee thereon.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is the Bill exactly in the same terms as the resolution?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN.

Mr. GRAHAM. Exactly.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY.

Bill (No. 214) respecting certain aid for the extension of the Canadian Northern Railway.—Mr. Graham—read the second time and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is this in the same form as the resolution?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, exactly.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY—SEED GRAIN.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House again go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) promised to lay detailed information on the table of the House in reference to the buying and distribution of seed grain in the west. I have not noticed that it had been brought down.

WOOLLEN INDUSTRY AND THE TARIFF.

Mr. FOSTER. There is a notice in the papers of a petition forwarded to the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) by the Canadian Manufacturers' Association setting forth, in a memorandum, the state of the woollen industry in Canada and it was stated that the Prime Minister had made a reply. I would like to ask the Prime Minister whether or not he would think it well to lay on the table to-morrow the petition so that it may be within the information of the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will do so to-morrow.

MR. CONGDON'S ACCOUNTS.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) received any information from the Yukon as to the question he asked by telegram in reference to Mr. Congdon's accounts as administrator and whether any audit had been made by the Yukon Council?

Mr. OLIVER. I got a reply. I will try and bring it in the morning as I do not have it with me now.

FINANCIAL REVIEW.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Mr. Speaker, before the House goes into Committee of Supply, I want to make a few remarks with reference to the financial condition, as it appears, and the outlook on the basis of that condition. It has been usual of late years for the opposition to

make a summing up of the matter, presenting the figures and, to a certain extent, embodying their own position with regard to it which custom will not be departed from on the present occasion. It seems to me that it is particularly timely at this period to review some of the more recent events and transactions in relation to Canadian finances and to present in concise form the condition of things as it appears at the present time. The government have been in power now for about twelve years. It is an old story to make mention of the principles they professed and the policies they propounded before they came into power. That has been gone over in successive years until I think there remains not very much more necessity for mentioning it in a review of this kind.

The three principal points in connection with the finances of Canada are: the taxation collected from the country, the expenditures which are made, and the increase or otherwise of the public debt resulting therefrom. The House knows that the Liberal party before 1896 professed to be in favour of low taxation, declared that the taxation at that time imposed was excessive, and promised that when they got into power it would be their privilege and duty to reduce it. To-day the matter stands something like this; that the per capita taxation of 1896, $5.46 per head, was in 1908 raised to $11.70 per head. The total taxation of 1896, amounting to $27,700,000 was raised in the last year to $73,000,000, an increase of $45,200,000, or 163 per cent increase in volume of taxation. The student of the history of taxation would find that $252,000,000 in taxes has been paid during the administration of these gentlemen more than if the level of the taxation exacted in 1896 had been maintained, and that in the eleven years and three quarters of the administration under review $544,000,000 have been taken from the people in taxation, an average of about $48,000,000 yearly, and that each day there is collected in Canada a little over $200,000 as against a daily collection of $76,000 in 1896. There are not many more than six millions of tax payers in 1908 as compared with about five millions in 1896; so that the increase in rate, in volume and in yearly amount of taxation has been increased far away and above the increase of population.

Coming next to expenditures, we find that the party which when in opposition were opposed to the expenditure of that time as being alarmingly excessive, have raised the per capita expenditure of the country from $8.14 in 1896 to $18 in 1908, and the amount of the expenditure from $41,700,000 in 1896 to $112,000,000 in 1908, an increase of 70½ millions in that period, being an increase of 165 per cent. It is interesting to know that in that period of eleven years and three quarters $833,000,000 have been expended by this government of economy, which amounts to $71,000,000 yearly, and that the average daily expenditures of the country are $303,571 as against $114,000 in 1896. Although this has been the history of the expenditure of the country during that period, when we approach the year 1908-1909 we find that the expenditure authorized and contemplated is far and away the greatest of any year in the history of Canada. The following table shows the estimates of 1907-1908 and the estimates of 1908-1909 in parallel columns:

	1907-8.		1908-9.	
Supplementary	$ 2,105,105		$ 5,329,633	
Main	103,689,519		119,237,091	
Main supplementary	11,018,605		10,665,657	
Other items	100,000		2,850,000	
Bounties (estimated)	2,500,000		2,875,000	
		$ 121,413,229		$ 140,957,381
Excess, 1908-9		$19,544,152		
Subsidies—				
Bridges	15,000		800,000	
Railways	5,000,000		22,566,300	
		5,015,000		23,566,300
Loans—				
Quebec Bridge		6,678,200		
Montreal Harbour		3,000,000		
C.N. Ry. guaranteed bonds				11,067,000
Total		$ 136,106,429		$ 174,586,681
Excess, 1908-9 over 1907-8		$38,480,252		

This is extremely illustrative when we take into account the condition of financial affairs in Canada and throughout the world at the present time as compared with the expenditures for 1907-1908. Where you would naturally look for prudence and economy and if anything a curtailment of expenditures, you find a very large and significant increase. There is no indication in this of any appreciation by either the Finance Min-

ister or the government of the condition of the country or the financial conditions prevailing in the world. If they have any appreciation of those conditions they have not met them as most prudent men in business, banking, commercial or other positions always are ready and think it prudent to do. But the expenditure as outlined for the present year has a feature in it which is somewhat different from the feature of last year as I find by looking over the items of estimates, particularly of the supplementaries. These are what you might call pregnant estimates. A very large portion of them are for the beginnings of works which in the very hurried and altogether inadequate examination that could be given as the estimates were passing the House, promised to run into very large figures before the works for which these are the initiative votes shall have been carried to completion.

There is also this year the item of railway subsidies amounting to some twenty-three to twenty-five millions of dollars which of course extends over a period of years and calls for large sums if we take it for granted that these are bona fide enterprises and will be carried out. Looking over these proposed expenditures and indeed over the expenditures of this government for the last five or six years, there seems to be no species of expenditure which is barred from public help; to expend seems to be the great object of each department and there seems to be no discriminating sense as to what are proper objects for the expenditure of Dominion moneys and what should be avoided. The limited examination which was made in the Marine and Fisheries Department, and which I believe if made in almost any other department of the government would be equally indicative of the general tenor of the expenditures, has shown I think to the satisfaction of everybody who has read that report and the evidence, that there was, according to the commissioners, an utter lack of care and prudence and business foresight, and in fact of directive power and of conscience in the expenditures which were made. During the second commission we have had the fact brought out that over $200,000 were actually thrown away within the last two or three years in the Marine and Fisheries Department alone on account of the patronage list purchases within the knowledge of the deputy and the officers which were larger than they should have been had the patronage list not ruled and had business foresight and discrimination been exercised. Instances were brought of articles which cost to manufacture $400 or $500 being sold to the government for between $4,000 and $5,000 on the excuse that a patent was concerned, but the validity of that excuse fell when the commissioner, Judge Cassels, pointed out that no government was justified in paying more than a reasonable profit and that they had the legal remedy in their own hands with

Mr. FOSTER.

reference to patents which were granted by the Dominion. What one noticed in these expenditures is the utter lack of plan, of uniform development of the different resources and capabilities of the country and the extremely experimental and haphazard way in which expenditures are gone about. When one comes to look into it, the key to the situation is found in this that in not one case out of ten is the expenditure begun because of and consequent upon an examination as to whether the public interest requires the expenditure. The expenditure is begun because of party and political pressure, and the desire on the one hand to get money to expend within the member's locality and on the other hand to help the supporting member by that species of patronage. I am convinced that every year millions of dollars would be saved to this country if expenditures were made upon the basis which I first mentioned rather than upon the second which is the basis generally acted upon. But one of the most reprehensible troubles that we find in the passing of votes and initiating expenditures and undertaking works in this country is what I hope I am not too strongly naming as the absolutely false presentation of the expenditure made, either through carelessness or worse, by the department or the minister in charge of the measure. It is getting to be almost the invariable rule that you cannot place any reasonable reliance upon the estimate which a minister will give you with reference to the completion of a work undertaken by a vote of parliament and the granting of money for the initial proceeding. I shall mention only two instances of this, one on a small scale and the other upon a very large scale. First we have the Royal Mint. It was at first opposed by the Minister of Finance and argued out of the House. It was then made an election cry in British Columbia and 'Maxwell and the Mint' was pasted up through the constituency because of Mr. Maxwell's receiving an assurance from the Prime Minister, after the Minister of Finance had decided it was not necessary to build a mint, that a mint would be built in Vancouver or Victoria, I forget which, Committed in that way the Finance Minister had to eat the leek and bring down the proposition. The statement made at that time was that the mint would cost us an outside figure of $350,000.

And, although there was some opposition, the House concluded that if a mint could be had for that amount it would pass the vote; and it did pass it on these statements. The mint, when it is finished, will have cost very close to $650,000, which is $300,000, or nearly that, above the estimate. That is an example which might be multiplied hundreds and hundreds of times, showing under-estimates of the same extent, or at least a great extent in what may be called the smaller transactions. But what I wish to take up

now is the large transaction of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. That was a very large undertaking for the people of this country, an important undertaking. And in presenting the scheme the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance were on their honour and under the responsibilty of their high offices which have the power of authoritative recommendation and explanation of the measures which are brought before the House. The Prime Minister studied the question, gathered his information and placed a statement of the financial cost to the country, as well as other statements, before the House. And on that statement of the Prime Minister of Canada, the House voted, and the country voted afterwards to sustain what the ministry and the House had done. The Finance Minister is the exponent, naturally, of the financial side of every proposition. And, with his experience, with all the expert aid he had at his side and of which he says he availed himself, he made his statement of what the money cost to this country would be. I propose to-night to examine briefly these statements and to contrast them with what we find the conditions to be in 1908 when the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway is fairly starting out on the course of construction. Now, I do not wish to misinterpret any one, so I am going to carefully quote from 'Hansard' of 1903, where the speech of the Prime Minister is reported, the statements he then made. At page 7690, he said:

Now, it will be asked: What is to be the liability of the government, what are they to contribute to the building of this railway, for they must contribute something? What they contribute is simply this—the payment of the interest for a certain number of years. It is provided that the bonds shall run for fifty years. During the first seven years, the company are not to be called upon to meet the interest, which is at three per cent; that interest will be met by the government. After seven years the company shall pay the interest if the proceeds of the road are sufficient to earn three per cent. But, if the proceeds are not sufficient to earn three per cent, the payment shall be made by the government.

At another place, on page 7690 he said:

Now, Sir, what is the liability incurred by the government for the construction of this road from Winnipeg to the Pacific ocean? Assuming that the road across the mountain is 600 miles long, the cost of construction will be $18,000,000 and the total interest for three years will be $3,780,000 This is the whole of the liability which is incurred by the government for the construction of the railway from Winnipeg to the Pacific ocean.

This deals with the western section. He takes up the eastern section also. Then he goes on to explain the whole contract and says:

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

Having just before that explained that, just as we paid the interest on a certain amount for the Mountain section, we have to pay the interest for seven years on the cost of construction of the eastern section, he made the summation I have just read. There is nothing in the whole of the right hon. gentleman's speech in any way to qualify that plain and definite statement.

Well, Sir, the Finance Minister takes up the matter later. I shall quote from him a little more at length. He first takes up the line from Moncton to Quebec. He says that the distance is 386 miles, but, in order to be certain he estimates it at 400 miles, and then, as reported at page 8584 of 'Hansard' of 1903, he says:

I am advised by competent authorities that, from the general knowledge possessed of that country, that road can be built at a very moderate cost. From Quebec or Lévis to near the point where the railway will leave the province of Quebec it can be built at a comparatively low cost. There is some expensive work in passing from the province of Quebec into the province of New Brunswick, and as you get into the province of New Brunswick, there are some portions which are moderately expensive. But I am informed that you can build a line through that country with maximum grades no less favourable than those on the Intercolonial Railway—though that is not as good a road as my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) wants—for $25,000 per mile. On 400 miles that would be $10,000,000.

From Quebec to Winnipeg I estimate the distance to be 1,475 miles. That is a larger mileage than some of my hon. friends have given. I am not trying in these cases to make the mileage small. I am advised by an engineer who has measured the distance that in putting it at 1,475 miles, I am making a liberal allowance. I put that down at $28,000 per mile, which I am advised is a fair estimate. Remember that in both cases we are speaking of the road only, without equipment. That would make the cost of that section $41,300,000. Taking these two together, we have the estimated cost of the eastern division at $51,300,000.

Being questioned as to whether that included interest during construction, he said that it did not, and continued:

The difficulty there, as my hon. friend will see, is that you can hardly tell what amount will be expended in each year. I have had a rough estimate of that made, and it can only be a rough estimate.

In the first year we would spend only a very small sum. After that, the expense would increase very rapidly. We would spend $12,000,000 or $13,000,000 a year. Distributing the amounts over the period of construction in that way, I estimate that at the end of the period, instead of the capital of the road standing at $51,300,000, it would stand at $54,609,676.

That is, the interest during the construction period is the difference between $51,300,-

000 and $54,609,676, or a little more than $3,300,000. Then he goes on to say:

The annual interest on that sum would be $1,638,290. We would be out of pocket that interest for seven years.

By 'that sum' he means the $54,609,676 on which interest at 3 per cent is to be paid and which is $1,638,290 per year.

So that if you multiply $1,638,290 by seven you will get the minister's calculation of the amount of interest we would pay without recourse during the seven years, and it would amount to a little over $11,000,000. With reference to the Mountain section, the minister then makes his calculation:

We only guarantee our three-fourths, which may be less than $30,000 per mile; but if it costs more the company must pay the difference. We do not guarantee at the outside more than $30,000 a mile, and estimating the length at 480 miles, our guarantee cannot exceed $14,400,000. On that sum the interest during seven years is to be paid by the government, and during another period of three years it is dealt with in the way I have already described. All we are under obligation to pay is seven years of that interest. At the expiration of the seven years, the company will pay its own interest, so that we will be out of pocket seven years' interest in the Mountain section, or interest on a total of $14,400,000, being 480 miles at $30,000 per mile.

The interest on that amounts to $432,000 per year, which multipled by seven, makes the amount that the Finance Minister calculated as what we would pay under the conditions of the contract on the Mountain section $3,024,000. The Minister of Finance then takes up the statement of the Prime Minister which had been criticised, and he confirms that statement.

My hon. friend the Prime Minister, in the course of his speech, said that we could meet the responsibilities of this contract by setting aside the present year's surplus, whch is roundly stated at $13,000,000. Hon. gentlemen opposite have thought that was a rash statement. I am convinced that the figures I shall be able to give to the House will show that my hon. friend's statement is substantially correct.

He then goes on to show it:

In the case of this sum of $54,600,676, which will represent the capital account of the eastern division at the time of its completion, the annual interest is $1,638,290, and we will be out of pocket that interest for seven years. Now if you apply to any actuary of repute in the Dominion and ask him what sum of money it will be necessary to provide to-day to meet the seven years' interest as it shall accrue, he will tell you that for the sum of $8,853,502 you can provide for those seven years of interest. That is to say, that if, instead of managing our money ourselves, we turned it over to an insurance company or a trust company, or any other company which deals in annuities, and it invested the money on the basis of three per cent interest half-yearly, it would provide for that seven years' interest if we would give them now the sum of $8,853,504.

He then goes on shortly afterwards to demonstrate what amount of money should be put in the same way to cover the interest that we would have to pay for seven years on that Mountain section:

I find by actuarial calculation, obtained from an actuary, that the present value of that is $2,334,575. That is to say, if we take $2,334,575 and lay it aside now out of our surplus, under the same process as I explained before, that will provide for the payment of seven years' interest on the Mountain section, as that interest shall accrue from year to year.

Then he goes on to take up the Quebec bridge. He estimates the cost of the Quebec bridge at $4,500,000, and he says that the Grand Trunk Pacific may well be charged $2,000,000 of that amount, and that for seven years on the same principle, we would be out of pocket the interest of that $2,000,000.

Applying the same principle of actuarial calculation, we could provide seven years' interest on that bridge by the sum of $324,246. We have not exhausted our surplus yet. We have only provided some $8,000,000 for one portion and $2,000,000 for another, and there is plenty still left. If we provide further out of our surplus the sum of $324,246, we can make provision for the payment of interest on that $2,000,000 for seven years. I add these items together. The present value, by actuarial calculation, of the cost of the seven years' interest on the eastern division, is $8,853,502. Seven years' interest on the Quebec bridge represented by the present value, $324,246. Seven years' interest guaranteed bonds, Mountain section, represented by $2,334,575. These sums make a total of $11,512,325. Why, we have some millions of a surplus left yet.

Then, in order to be absolutely certain, he says that although he believes that he has made a proper calculation as to the cost of the road, he adds 25 per cent to the cost, making the $25,000 eastern section cost $31,250 per mile, and the $28,000 for the other, to cost $35,000 per mile. Then he carries out the same acturial calculation, and says that to provide for that advance, if ever that advance is required, the actuarial sum required would be raised to $13,725,706. And if that were placed at 3 per cent interest compounded half yearly in 1903, it would meet every cent of the obligation the government would be under, on the increased estimate of cost that he gave in order to save himself.

Now, Sir, I do not think there is any misrepresentation in that statement of the position taken by my hon. friend. And how does it pan out? I have placed here in parallel columns, which I have given to the 'Hansard,' Mr. Fielding's estimate of 1903, and the facts as established in 1908, and they make very interesting reading.

Cost of Grand Trunk Pacific to government.

	As declared by Mr. Fielding 1903.	As demonstrated by facts 1908.
Quebec to Moncton.. ..	$10,000,000	
Winnipeg to Quebec..	41,300,000	
Total..	51,300,000	$114,393,765
Interest during construction..	3,309,676	10,009,454
Total when constructed	54,609,676	$124,403,219
Interest for seven years thereafter..	11,468,030	26,124,676
Cost of terminals eastern division..	nil	4,591,250
Total cost 7 years after construction..	$66,077,706	$155,119,145
Interest for seven years Mountain section.. ..	3,024,000	11,304,300
Total cost to government of Grand Trunk Pacific..	$69,101,706	$166,423,445
Quebec bridge..	4,500,000	14,422,238
Total cash cost Grand Trunk Pacific and bridge..	$73,691,706	$180,845,683

The Finance Minister's statement was over $107,000,000 too little.

Now, it is fair to add the 25 per cent which, to make himself sure, as an afterthought he added to his estimate. That will give you the sum of $12,825,000 to be added to the original estimate of cost. But, giving the advantage of that $12,825,000 and the added interest upon it, Mr. Fielding's estimate at this higher value is a little more than $89,000,000 under the facts as established in the year 1908. Now, Sir, I think this is a pretty instructive example of what I have characterized as false representations under which great public works are launched upon this House and fastened upon this country. It is perfectly fair, if it is to cost a larger sum and is a necessity, that the country shall undertake it and pay it, but it is absolutely fair, and nothing else is fair, that the government which launches and fathers the scheme shall be true in the estimate that it makes. Never can you be within an absolute dollar of what it will cost. But these gentlemen in 1903 were cocksure. On this side of the House we pleaded for more information, a little further examination, more expert reports, some idea as to what the character of the country would be and, therefore, the cost of building. But the right hon. Prime Minister and the Finance Minister said that there was no need of it. This side of the House was laughed at when it made that request. They had mountains of information, and they read these mountains of information and placed them upon 'Hansard.' They knew all that it was necessary to know, and, as time would not wait and others could not wait, this matter was rushed through, and here is the instructive result. Are we, with the estimate which I have just read to the House of $180,845,683, yet up to the actual cost of the work? No, Sir. This is only again an estimate based partly on actual contracts and partly on more gathered information, but yet an estimate, and I do not doubt at all but that the estimate will be very materially exceeded. The government themselves to-day have no idea of the difficulty of building that road between Quebec and Winnipeg, when you take into account the character of the country and the difficulty of access to it. Everything that goes in has to go in either from Quebec or from Winnipeg, or, in a little while maybe, by way of the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario line, which is being built up to tap the road, and maybe by another road tapping it from Port Arthur or Fort William. But when you take the character of the country and make even these avenues of access to it, and remember that hundreds of miles of that country bear no timber for the first construction, but that everything has to be taken in over these circuitous and immensely costly means of access, you get some faint idea of what the difficulties of the building of that road are. Along a large proportion of that road there is no stone to be found and cement will have to be used, and it will have to be taken in at great cost and over roads which are of difficult access. In the summer season service roading there is very difficult. In the winter season it is quite practicable, but railway men tell me that even in the winter season you cannot do much in taking in lumber and supplies many miles away from where the contractors are working, and that you have to keep very close to where the contractors are using the supplies.

It is now interesting to find out where this amount of $13,725,706, put at interest in 1903 at 3 per cent compounded half yearly, would be in this year 1908. It would be added to by $2,300,000, and at this date you would have in the hands of your insurance man or trust company about $16,000,000 in order to pay $26,124,676 interest on the eastern section and $11,304,300 on the mountain section, or a total of $39,400,000 in round numbers. If you add to that $14,422,238 for the Quebec bridge cost, you will have a total of $51,851,214, and you will have, to meet that, the vaunted $13,725,706, which, with its accumulations of interest, makes now $16,000,000.

I think, a more silly as well as a more unfounded estimate was never presented to any parliament by a man having the responsibilities of the head of the Exchequer of a nation. Those two examples I have given as showing the evils that result from false representation and misleading presentations of great questions as they come be-

fore the House. A qualification has in fairness to be made in reference to the Quebec bridge. Since the hon. gentleman made that calculation the bridge has fallen down and of course the Minister of Finance cannot be held responsible for the amount of loss thus involved. To that extent my statement must in fairness be somewhat modified.

What are the cash obligations which today are straight in front of the Minister of Finance and this country. They are these :

Cash obligations incurred.

For Grand Trunk Pacific—	
Construction, Winnipeg to Moncton..	$114,393,765
Interest on cost of same whilst building..	10,009,454
Seven years' interest on total cost to be paid by government without recourse..	26,124,676
Cost of terminals, government's share..	4,591,250
Interest to be paid by government without recourse on mountain section..	11,304,300
	$166,423,445
For Quebec bridge—	
Total amount required..	$ 14,422,238
Total cash obligations..	$180,845,683

Bond obligations.

Canadian Northern Railway bonds guaranteed in 1903..	$ 9,385,639
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway bonds guaranteed in 1903..	58,048,000
Total obligations..	$ 67,433,639

Contingent cash liability.

Grand Trunk Pacific—	
For three years' additional interest on cost of construction, eastern division..	11,196,290
Grand total of cash and bond obligation..	$259,475,612

About all but one of these figures there is not a shadow of disagreement between either side of the House. For the Quebec bridge the total amount required will be $14,222,238, including the loss incurred by its collapse. The Minister of Railways took no exception to that statement ; he simply said that it did not belong to the Grand Trunk Pacific but he allowed the estimate to stand, and I believe that is not an over estimate. That makes up total cash obligations to the sum of $180,845,683.

There is another reckoning which I call the contingent cash obligation. That is that after we have paid the interest for seven years if the Grand Trunk Pacific shall not then out of its earnings be able to operate its road, make its betterments, and take care of itself and pay the interest on that immense sum coming up to pretty close on two hundred million dollars, then this government shall be called upon to pay three years additional interest which would amount to $11,196,290. That may be debatable but my own opinion is that it is a pretty dead certainty that we will have to advance that money during those three years, and if we do our total cash obligations will come up to $192,000,000 and over. But that is not all. The Grand Trunk Pacific has its bonds guaranteed, principal and interest, by this government to the amount of $58,-048,000, so that you must add that and then you get a total of cash obligations and of bond obligations amounting to $250,000,000 in round figures. And in addition to that there is also a bond obligation which in 1903 was entered into by this government with the Canadian Northern Railway Company to the amount of $9,385,639, making a total cash and bond obligation, which at this date and before another estimate is voted in this House, faces the government, amounting to $259,475,612. An hon. gentleman may say the bonds do not amount to anything. Is that true ? Never in the case of a man, or in the case of a nation, or in the case of a business corporation is that true ? Whenever a nation wants financial aid it must submit to the scrutiny of all its obligations and the effect is felt upon the money markets of the world, when that nation has recourse, as it must often have, to these money markets.

Now Sir, with all that bond and cash indebtedness facing this government what else is there ? With the present scale of expenditure and the multiplicity of objects which are continually claiming expenditure and which the government is meeting, and the falling of receipts which are marked both in customs and in the railways of the country ; we must not buoy ourselves up for a moment with the hope that those cash obligations can be met in any other way than by borrowing upon the money markets; London in particular. So that if you take these undoubted cash obligations—leaving out the contingent obligation of $180,845,683, which is now lessened by $26,000,000 paid on that account up to March 31, 1908—and meet them by loans, what happens? It happens that your net public debt which in 1896 was $258,500,000 and on March 31, 1908 was $278,000,000 has to be increased to the alarming total of $432,845,683. And if that contingent liability of $11,196,290 comes to us and we have to provide the money from borrowings the total debt will amount to $444,041,973 when all of these liabilities in cash shall have been covered. The most of that must be covered before the end of 1911 and all of it within a few years thereafter, so that new loans on this account will be necessary to the amount of $166,041,973.

But that is not all of it. There are now current temporary loans running at rates from 3¼ to 4½ per cent amounting to $17,-800,000 in different banks here and there wherever accommodation can be got. They

cannot always run; no country can allow that. They must be taken up. Then again if you go to the Public Accounts you will find that before 1910 ends, $57,000,000 of public debt not provided for by sinking funds will fall due and these two items together will render necessary additional new loans amounting to $74,800,000 or a total of $240,841,973, of which $192,216,797, must be raised within three years.

Now, it seems to me that that gives any sensible man room for thought, and necessitates great anxiety and the most serious consideration. And yet, notwithstanding all these facts which I have recited, this appalling load of cash and other obligations that are to be met as much as the fates are to be met in their decrees or natural laws in their working out, no amount of 'Oh, we don't care' will get rid of them; no waving of the hand puts them out from fronting you; no optimism based upon insufficient grounds of consideration or knowledge of facts will ever remove them from your path. They are there, and there to be met, and this country must meet them. And yet, Sir, in the face of these appalling facts, this government starts out in the year 1908 on an expenditure and an increase of obligations unprecedented in the former history of this country, involving in estimates alone $138,078,381, and in bounties, which the Finance Minister himself has estimated for me and which are to be paid, $2,875,000; being a total of $140,953,381. These are the expenditures authorized. But beyond that you have bridge subsidies and railway subsidies amounting to $23,566,300; you have guaranteed loans to the Canadian Northern Railway in the shape of 3½ per cent bonds, and so have added to your financial burdens $11,067,000. Thus you have in this present authorization a total of obligations and expenditures of $175,386,681. I have read to you the obligations which before were staring this country in the face, amounting to $259,000,000 and more. Add that to the $175,000,000, and you have a total of $434,000,000 of cash and bond obligations, most of them cash, which are today staring this country in the face and to be undertaken as soon as this Supply Bill shall have been passed. You may deduct $26,000,000 of that as having been already paid out upon the obligations upon the Transcontinental Railway up to March 31, 1908, which leaves you a total of over $408,000,000. And yet, Sir, I fail to see in any member of the government any move of the government, any utterance of the government, the least appreciation of the condition of things which is set forth in that presentation of what I believe to be the bare and naked facts.

Now, Sir, let me very briefly answer a question or two with reference to this. What is the accompaniment of this condition of things? Are the revenues buoyant? Is trade prosperous? I know that some one with less than knowledge than I think he ought to employ will be quick to declare that now I am going to depreciate the country. Very well; let such a one say what he likes—the truth moderately but firmly stated is the only absolute healing salve; and the man who tries to discourage the use of that is no friend to himself or to his country. Of Canada as a whole, her resources, her capabilities, her future, under anything like fair play, there is no man more optimistic than myself in the whole domain. But I do think that prudence is required, and that we ought to be careful and ought not to abuse even the sturdy power of a young country like ours. What, then, is the condition of the revenue to-day? The revenue is decreasing. What is the condition in the United States, in Great Britain, in every country in the world? There is a hold-up to business; there is a paralysis more or less thoroughly defined; there is the period which inevitably follows a debauch, when headaches come and stomachs are foul, and the man wishes he had not done what he did the night before. This is the certain accompaniment of a period of over-booming or of overgreat business progress and development, such as the world has seen in the last six or seven years. Every country in the world feels it; every other country than ours is providing for it by strengthening its financial position and by proper acts of economy. From Japan to Germany and from the United States to Great Britain that is the absolute rule. The opposite is what is being done in Canada. What do you find with reference to the revenue? In January there was a falling off from January of last year of a fifth of a million—not much, but yet a warning; in February there was a falling off of a third of a million not much, but a little more, in March, there was a falling off of $1,000,000, in April a falling off of $1,000,000, in May, of $1,700,000, in June, of $1,500,000, in the first fifteen days of July, of $1,000,000, which if kept up will make a falling off of $2,000,000 for the month of July; and to my mind the man who declares that things will immediately get better has not correctly sized up the trade or the financial condition in this country or in the other countries of the world. Your Intercolonial Railway, the figures about which I was not able to get to-day, though they were asked for by my hon. friend from Kings and Albert, show, I am certain, what the other railways of the world show, namely, a falling off. There is not a railway in the United States that does not show a large falling off in revenue. Our own will show the same, and although this year this country is I believe to be favoured, if Providence continues to smile

for a little while longer, with a bumper crop, still the railways, though they will be immensely aided, will show no increase over last year. More naturally I think, they will show a very considerable decrease, and they are preparing for it and have prepared for it. Every railway in Canada has set itself to strengthening itself by shearing off every unnecessary expense and by putting itself in a position to do the best it can in the period of depression. I notice also that in the money markets of the world the outlook is not so favourable as we would like it to be; and Canada has had her warning with reference to that very thing over and over again.

Grand Trunk Pacific bonds were put upon the British market under what representation? Under the representation of the Minister of Finance which I have read to you to-night and Grand Trunk Pacific bonds placed on the market under this most favourable representation are held yet by the men who underwrote them—and very largely held by those men. The Finance Minister himself has paid from 3½ per cent to 7 per cent for temporary loans, and when he went on the market for $5,000,000 a few days ago only 44 per cent was subscribed by the general public, and the rest is held probably still almost entirely by the underwriters. These are not the best preparatives for future loans, and if that be true the Minister of Finance, who has to go to those markets within the next year and the succeeding year and the year after, for amounts up to $120,000,000 or $150,000,000 might well ask himself whether he is doing the best thing possible to strengthen Canada's credit in those markets by pursuing the wild and reckless course of extravagance he has brought before this parliament and this country in this year of grace 1908. To my mind no more foolhardy and unwise thing could have been done than for the Minister of Finance to flaunt into the face of present creditors and future lenders of money an example of the most inflated estimates and the largest obligations that in any one year have ever been undertaken by the Dominion of Canada. Can you make better representations under present conditions than you would have made when those other loans were being made. The Grand Trunk Pacific must go on the market with more bonds, but will they be taken readily? The Minister of Finance must have more money. Will he get it on more favourable conditions under the course that he is pursuing? Men in London are thinking men, men who lend money in London are thinking men and they will turn the Minister of Finance inside out when he goes to ask for more loans and will want to know exactly all the conditions in this country and who is responsible therefor. Money-lenders are not as a rule sympathetic friends; they are the discerning surgeon and physician, they diagnose and cut to the very bone in order to find out the truth. But the Minister of Finance in reply to my hon. friend the other night, waved it all away with a simple passing of the hand, wrote it all off the book and brought it down to a mere nothing. Why, he says, suppose we had $58,000,000 of guaranteed bonds in our name for the road, what matter is that? Little likelihood that we shall ever be called upon to pay. Suppose there is three years of interest after the seven years we will never be called upon to pay; suppose there is $180,000,000 spent, we own the road. May I put two questions to the Minister of Finance? When every dollar of that money is raised, who raised it? The Minister of Finance of Canada. When it is all raised whose debt is it? The debt of Canada. When the interest is to be paid, who pays it? The people of Canada. This very costly piece of road from Winnipeg to Moncton, when finished including the interest in the Mountain section will have cost from $200,000,000 to $230,000,000, it passes for 1,400 or 1,500 miles through no man's land at the present time, although we hope it will turn out much better than it now looks. I have been curiously waiting for the First Minister and the Minister of Finance to bring to us the reports of engineers and others who have now travelled nearly every mile in that country and have had their rods and their lines upon it. How have they reported on that country? If they had reported the country as being good and had come back bearing grapes of Escol upon their shoulders, do you think these gentlemen would not have displayed the fruit? They have been as mum as oysters, which convinces me that the travellers through that country have not brought a very optimistic report as to its capabilities for furnishing local traffic. So that after all the money is borrowed and the debt incurred and the interest paid by the Dominion of Canada we may or may not get a return of 3 per cent, but if we do it will to that extent add to the revenues of the country some fifteen years from now, but not a single cent up to that period.

A word with reference to general matters. Whilst this government is adept in finding methods of expending money and lying awake nights to find extraordinary channels in which to set it running, they are not so diligent in reference to other matters. They appointed a civil service commission. That commission was not to go into the principles of the civil service because the government were careful to state that those principles were just and right. They appointed this commisison upon the reports of the civil service of this country that their expenditures had increased beyond all bounds, over and above their remuneration and that the matter ought to be looked into, and if their cause was just that the disparity

ought to be adjusted. Months and months were spent with that commission, the salaries of the commissioners were paid, their report was given and sustained the contention of the civil service absolutely, going towards readjustment. What have the government done? They have made an excuse of the enactment of that Civil Service Bill to raise unnecessarily the salaries of many men who are getting quite enough at the present time, men with high salaries and not over-onerous duties. They have increased those favourites of theirs, those men who might well have dragged along for a little bit on a salary of $3,500 or $4,000 or $5,000 and have made both ends meet, might have got porridge for breakfast and some light refreshment for tea besides keeping up the general apppearance of a household. They have rushed to an unnecessary rescue of that class of officer but they have left the under official whose salary is not, on their own confession, equal to the requirements made upon him, out in the cold. In their Bill they have taken care that the high-class man shall have his $100 a year of increase, but the civil servant in the lower classes only gets a paltry $50, though the men with the small salary and the young and growing family is the man who needs the great increase rather than the other. They have taken means in that Bill to single out their own favourites, and have advanced, and are now advancing, the salaries of those favourites by leaps and bounds. But the great mass of the service has not had a single grievance sympathetically dealt with, and the whole outside service has simply been put off with promises which, as promises sound well to the ear but which, when they are remembered only as broken promises add a weariness to the heart and add a bitterness to the daily life-struggle of these men in all parts of the Dominion.

This government got in a hurry over the insurance question, named its insurance commissioners, and has paid them up to date some $85,000, one favourite receiving $25,000 and another $14,000, and others in proportion. Those commissioners have looked into all, and in some cases more than all in the opinion of some people at least—they ought to look into. They have made their report. They had their experts, who put a Bill—the Bill—before the government. The government took the Bill and turned it upside down, making a Bill of their own. And, as usual, with Bills made by men who have no expert knowledge of that with which they are dealing, the moment the practical man got before them with that Bill in the Committee on Banking and Commerce, the principal sections were riddled from end to end. Where is that Bill to-day? Two years have passed, the government's favourities have got their big fees, the government have had their investigation—and the greatest use made of it up to the present time has been to follow certain members of parliament with emanations from that commission in the vain endeavour to annihilate those men who are opponents of this government. That may have been what the government wanted, but it is not what the country expected.

The government had a commission appointed for the civil service. Unexpectedly, that commission was bold enough to lift off the lid from one half of one department and expose the brew to the admiring gaze of the public of Canada. Immediately, the commission stopped. It was not asked to continue the same good work in other departments. But enough had been done to make it necessary that some semblance of an investigation should go on. And a semblance of an investigation was instituted. A man who had more work to do than he could do and who told the Prime Minister so—and who told him at the same time that unless he, the Prime Minister, took care of his work he would not undertake the investigation at all—was, in spite of all, appointed. Months have passed and that investigation has not had six consecutive days under the new commission, and months will pass before that investigation can be again proceeded with. And there is your department, without a proper organization, without directive power and without conscience—half its men under suspicion. And yet this parliament is asked to put millions of money into an organization of that kind to be spent behind the back of parliament. And that commission—not because Judge Cassels wishes to do it, but because the government wish it—that commission is doing just the thing that the government had done before, jollying things along to prevent any examination until the elections are over.

This government has been kind to the wrong doer and eminently kind to the middleman. When has the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) ever stood between the treasury of this country and the man who wanted to loot it? Will any one out of his own experience tell of one single case in which it has been done? But when Merwin looted the treasury, when Lodge looted the treasury, when Pierson, Dodge and hundreds of others have looted the treasury, though the Prime Minister knew it, though it was proven and put up to him, not once has the Prime Minister risen and by even a word condemned such proceedings. And to-day the middleman and the patronage list flourish in all their glory. Yesterday as a finale of the land transactions for the present session was displayed before this House one of the most malodorous deals that have ever been exposed here to our humiliation—a trust for the Indians sacrificed by the men who held that trust; Indian property sold for $9,000, and turned over almost before the bill was paid for $100,000. And yesterday the Minister of

the Interior slept during nearly the whole of the presentation of that subject. And when he got up, the first thing he did was to call the hon. gentleman (Mr. Boyce) a scandal monger. And the next thing was to give his plea. And his plea was: The land belonged to the Indians; Indians cannot eat land; you have to sell it and get money or they cannot get the good of it; we sold it—and that is the whole story.

Franchises are given everywhere. I brought one case to the attention of the House not long ago. Here were four members of parliament in good standng—Duncan Fraser, of Guysborough, Mr. McIsaac, of Antigonish, Mr. Maxwell of a British Columbia constituency and Mr. McInnes, also of British Columbia. And these four members of parliament were standing up like little men fighting for every proposal that the government tried to put through this House. And they got the townsite of Whitehorse divided amongst themselves at $10 an acres, a townsite in which lots—and an acre makes several lots—I have been informed sell at from $500 to $1,500 per lot. That is a part of the system of doping. The Prime Minister dopes the country in several ways. For instance, he gives a contract of printing to Mr. Pierson, who owns the St. John 'Sun,' who has no job office. And Mr. Pierson receives the contract and thanks the Prime Minister. Then he turns it over to a gentleman by the name of Armstrong, telling him: You do this printing and I will keep 25 per cent and you can have the other 75 per cent. That is done, and the Prime Minister knows it. Why should not the country have that 25 per cent and Mr. Armstrong do the printing and get just as much for it as he gets now? And the same thing is done in Halifax, and for the benefit of the same gentleman. The right hon. gentleman himself carries on the doping process. How? By writing out a promise of a judgeship or a governorship and giving it to a man who supports him as a member of this House.

The Prime Minister knows he did it, knows the letter was read, knows that the gentleman had it in his trousers pocket, and voted for him. Since they have come into power in 1896 they have appointed seventy-five members of parliament to positions of emolument, involving an annual salary of $350,000; and these men, until they got the office, would of course have supported the government; and they would be heathens if, after they got the office, they did not say a good word for the government. And so it goes on, and to-morrow we will be asked to swallow another measure, the infamous Quebec bridge matter, which we will have something to say about then. I believe that the proposition which is put before the House in that respect will not stand fair investigation. It was a political thing; the gentleman who has been the soul of it for these years back, is the close political friend of the Prime Minister; and had it not been for that political influence I do not believe the Finance Minister would have done what he did with reference to these bonds. Now, after it has gone to pieces through lack of government supervision, we are to shoulder the whole loss, then we are to rebuild the whole bridge, and then do what we can, little or more, to get any revenue from it afterwards. These and many other methods of the transaction of public business, alongside with what is to my mind, the utterly reckless extravagance of the government, are making themselves felt in this country, are making themselves felt outside this country, are affecting us here and affecting our credit abroad, and I think it is high time that a halt was called. I therefore move the following resolution:

That this House notes with grave concern the continuous and alarming increase in the yearly expenditures and capital obligations of the country under the present administration, as shown by the following:

(a) Comparative expenditures, 1896 and 1908.

	1895.	1907-8.
On current account. ..	$ 36,949,142	$ 76,652,401
On capital and special account..	4,753,241	35,253,979
Total..	41,702,383	111,906,380
Expenditure per head	$8.14	$18
Increase in 1908 over 1896....	$ 70,203,997	
Increase per cent..	165 p.c.	

(b) Cash Obligations Incurred.

For Grand Trunk Pacific—		
Construction, Winnipeg to Moncton..	$114,393,765	
Interest on cost of same whilst building.. ...	10,009,454	
Seven years interest on total cost to be paid by government without recourses..	26,124,676	
Cost of terminals, governments share.... ..	4,591,250	
Interest to be paid by government without recourse on Mountain section....	11,304,300	
	$166,423,445	
For Quebec Bridge— Total amount required.	14,422,238	
Total cash obligations		$180,845,683

(c) Bond Obligations.

Canadian Northern Railway, 3½ bonds guaranteed in 1903..	$ 9,385,639	
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway bonds guaranteed in 1903..	58,048,000	
Total bond obligations..		67,433,639

(d) Contingent Cash Liability, Grand Trunk Pacific.

For three years additional interest on cost of construction, Eastern Division.... 11,196,290

Grand total of cash and bond obligations.. .. ..$259,475,612

That as the scale of expenditures established by the present government and the ever-increasing multiplicity of objects to which public moneys are applied, together with the marked falling off in customs and railway receipts and the unsettled trade and financial conditions throughout the world, preclude the hope that the above certain cash obligations amounting to $180,845,683, less $26,000,000 paid up to March 31, 1908, can be met otherwise than by loans, the public net debt which,

In 1896, was.. .. ..$258,500,000
And on March 31, 1908, was.. .. 278,000,000
Will be thereby increased to the alarming total of.. 432,845,683
And if the contingent liability (d) accrues, will become.. .. 444,041,973
Thus rendering necessary new loans to the amount of.. .. 166,041,973

That on June 30, current temporary loans at rates varying from 3¼ to 4½ per cent amounted to $17,800,000, and from the present time to the end of 1910, $57,000,000 of funded debt not provided for by sinking funds will fall due, rendering necessary additional new loans amounting to $74,800,000, or a total of $240,841,973 of which $192,216,797 must be raised within three years.

That notwithstanding the significant facts above recited, the government, instead of retrenching, have at the present session authorized the following expenditures and incurred the following additional obligations to an extent unpredecented in the history of Canada:

Supplementary estimates, 1907-8.$ 5,329,633
Supplementary estimates, 1907-8 seed grain.. 2,850,000
Main estimates, 1908-9.. 119,237,091
Supplementary estimates, 1908-9. 10,665,657

Total.. .. ..$138,078,381
Bounties, 1908-9 (estimated).. 2,875,000

Total amount voted $140,953,381

Subsidies.

For eight bridges.. .. ..$ 800,000

	Miles.	
Railways, revotes..	1,681½	
Railways, new..	2,277½	
	3,959	
Which at cost of $20,000 per mile involves a subsidy of.. ..		22,566,300

Loans guaranteed.

3½ per cent on bonds Canadian Northern Railway, $13,000 per mile for 659 miles..	$8,567,000	
$25,000 per mile for 100 miles.	2,500,000	
		11,067,000

Grand total.. .. ..$175,386,681

That these huge expenditures have in numberless instances been characterized by utter lack of discrimination, absence of proper inquiry and investigation, disregard of public as compared with private interests, want of common business prudence in oversight, costly pandering to partisan interests, lack of conscience in purchases from the patronage list, and the aggrandizement of the middleman, through all of which millons have been annually wasted.

That in the opinion of this House the mad and reckless financial course of the government is seriously affecting the public credit, unduly burdening the resources of the country, and if longer persisted in, will end in public disaster.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Mr. Speaker, the resolution which the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has placed in your hands may here and there have a touch of new colour, but, subject to that modification, I have to describe it as a very old and very familiar friend. Once upon a time there lived a foolish shepherd boy who fell into the very bad habit of amusing himself by trying to alarm his neighbours by crying 'wolf, wolf.' For a little while his neighbours were aroused by it, and they came out to see what the trouble was, and to render help to the lad if help should be needed. But every time they came out they found that the alarm was a false one, that the wolf did not come. It is no wonder that after a time they became rather tired and paid no attention to the cry of the foolish lad. But the little story has rather a sad ending. At last one day the wolf did come, they paid no attention to the cry of the boy, and the wolf fell upon the innocent lambs and destroyed them. It is not likely that the wolf will come, financially speaking, to this country, and nothing will occur which will really alarm the financial world in regard to the affairs of Canada so long as my hon. friend stays where he is and we, on this side, stay where we are. But if perchance the wolf in that way should ever come, and if my hon. friend should raise the cry, no attention would be paid to him, because all concerned would remember that for twelve long weary years he had cried out 'wolf, wolf' when there was no wolf. For twelve years my hon. friend has been the prophet of gloom, for twelve years he has been painting these dreadful pictures of what must happen to this fated country if my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and his colleagues should remain in power. From the beginning of the career of this government the hon. gentleman adopted the wolf policy. This government came into power in the summer of 1896, and there was a summer session a few weeks later. There was no time to prepare a policy. All that the government did was to take up the estimates prepared by their predecessors, with some slight modifications amounting to very

little, place these estimates before the House and ask the House to approve of them, reserving until the coming session, to be held a few months afterwards, the declaration of the policy which the new government should desire to announce. One would think that, under conditions of that character, there would have been very little cause for alarm. The policy of hon. gentlemen opposite remained in force, the estimates which were brought down to the House were substantially their estimates, and one would have thought that they would have allowed them to pass with little or no comment. But no; the wolf policy was adopted from the beginning, and before this government had been more than a few weeks in power the hon. gentleman raised the very same cry of 'wolf, wolf,' which he has been repeating every year for the last twelve years. Let me show my hon. friend the evidence of that. If time permitted to make quotations to show that that was the policy of hon. gentlemen every session, it would not be without interest, but I do not want to do that. During the very first session, before this government had had time to proclaim or arrange any policy, when we were just simply taking the estimates as my hon. friend had left them, I find that even at that time the hon. gentleman pictured to us a gloomy outlook:

> The Finance Minister looks out upon a future in as normal condition as it well can be, and he deliberately asks this House, with a revenue of less than $37,000,000, to sanction an expenditure of $44,600,000, with supplementary estimates to come down. . . . $44,600,000 will be nearly $8,000,000 more than the total revenue that can be expected during the present year.

The leader of the opposition of that day, the veteran Sir Charles Tupper, was more alarming yet. He was a bigger wolf than my hon. friend. He said on that occasion that our statement of the position:

> Involved the expenditure of millions of money more than he (the Finance Minister) can show any expectation of obtaining.

He said further that the Minister of Finance:

> Was about to expend something like $10,000,000 more than he has any reason to expect to receive.

My hon. friend from North Toronto was a little more moderate. He said $8,000,000, but the leader of the opposition of that day was a larger wolf, and he said that this government was preparing for a deficit in that year of $10,000,000. Then the veteran Sir Charles said at the same time that we were preparing to destroy the credit of the country, which had been so well established under the administration of himself and his friends. What was the result? In due time the supplementaries which Sir Charles referred to came down, the accounts were closed, and we had the result before us. What was it? Did we have the $8,000,000 of a deficit which my hon. friend said was staring us in the face? Did we have the $10,000,000 deficit that the veteran Sir Charles Tupper saw facing us? Just as loudly as my hon. friend declares it now, that hon. gentleman said that we were going to have a shortage of $8,000,000, and just as loudly Sir Charles Tupper declared that there would be a shortage of $10,000,000. If there had been a shortage of $10,000,000 at that time it would not have been anything that we had need to be ashamed of. It was not our year; there was not time to mature a policy; we simply took the estimates of our predecessors, with some slight changes, and carried them through the House. If we had had a large deficit that year, it would have been something for which our predecessors were as much responsible as we were. But what happened? Was there a deficit of $8,000,000? Was there a deficit of $10,000,000? Did the wolf come? No, it did not come to the extent of $8,000,000, or $10,000,000, or $1,000,000, but there was a deficit of only $519,000. These hon. gentlemen cried 'wolf, wolf,' but the wolf did not come.

Their prophecies as to the public credit were put to the test. The hon. gentleman to-night discussed the public credit, and I may take occasion to allude to that further on, but on the occasion to which I have referred, in that first year the veteran leader of the opposition, Sir Charles Tupper, declared that we were entering upon a condition which would destroy public credit. A few months later I had the honour to go to England to float a loan, and that loan was admittedly the best loan that had ever been obtained in the history of Canada. We were able at that time to put on the market, for the first time in colonial history, a loan bearing the low rate of 2½ per cent interest, and which sold at a price to make it unquestionably the best loan in the history of Canada. So that no wolf came to the credit of Canada on that occasion. Then we come to the session of 1897, and again we find my hon. friend indulging in his prophecies of gloom:

> They are going on the straight road towards piling up millions of debt each year.

It would have been a dreadful thing if we had done that. Well, we would just have been following my hon. friend's example, for that is exactly what he did on a very large scale. However, I do not want to discuss that at this moment. I may refer to it in a few moments. We did not have the presence of my hon. friend in the House during the years from 1900 to 1905, but his mantle as a prophet of evil fell upon others, and hardly a session passed that we did not have a melancholy

resolution like the one you now hold in your hand, Mr. Speaker, and a glommy speech like that with which my hon. friend has favoured us to-night. Then we came to the year 1904, when we were approaching the elections, just as my hon. friend thinks we are to-night, and possibly he is right. I find that at that time the gentleman on whom his mantle descended spoke as follows. The hon. gentleman referred to is not in the House just now:

Now, I believe this country is going to get relief . . . but the people will secure relief as soon as they are given opportunity.

How much that sounds like my hon. friend to-night!

For here is a record that cannot be presented to a population . . . without making certain the condemnation of those who have made the record.

It was another cry of 'wolf, wolf.' The election came on soon after that, all the melancholy resolutions of my hon. friend's friends were discussed throughout the country from ocean to ocean, and the result was that the record which he said was so sure to be condemned was approved by the intelligent electors of this country. Then in the next session we had the honour to have with us again my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) and again he entered upon this business of predicting gloom. In 1905 my hon. friend felt it his duty then as now to issue some solemn warnings. The revenue of that year was $71,186,072 and he warned us that in his opinion the revenue had reached probably its highest point. To use his words: 'The buoyant point of our revenue had about reached its maximum.' But it was $71,000,000 then and it continued to rise until it rose above $96,000,000. There was another cry of 'wolf, wolf,' but the wolf did not come. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has proceeded on the same lines to-night; he has gathered up the estimates, and appropriations in every shape and form: he takes the main estimates and the supplementary estimates, and the consolidated fund, and the capital, and the railway subsidies, and the guarantees, and everything in the world that he can possibly put in to swell what he calls: This appaling presentation of the facts. Well, some of these are proper subjects to be included in our budget expenditure, but the hon. gentleman rolls all things up as he did in former years so as to convey the impression to the people of Canada that there is some dreadful disaster coming upon them, and he must not be surprised, if judging by the past, the people of Canada refuse to take him seriously.

I observe that my hon. friend and those associated with him are quite ready to denounce expenditures generally, but there are moments when they take saner views. It is easy enough to be general in these denunciations, but the best and fairest way is to approach this question from the point of view of the particular locality with which we are best acquainted. It is easy to declare that you ought to be economical in one province if you want somewhat extravagant expenditures in your own. It is easy to find fault with expenditures at a distance, but when one goes to the locality with which he is best acquainted he is obliged to take saner views. And so while hon. gentlemen opposite can see no reason for this large expenditure generally, the moment they come to think of their own counties they are able to declare that these expenditures are highly necessary. Take for example the expenditure in the Militia Department, and during this session repeated allusions have been made to the rather liberal expenditure, as it is said, we are making in that department. Is it not curious that the very moment these gentlemen opposite are denouncing the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Militia for the expenditure in their departments in connection with the militia of Canada, we find my respected friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson)—who is slumbering so peacefully just now——

Mr. HENDERSON. Oh, no.

Mr. FIELDING. What is to be thought of my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson), who, while he is going to vote for this resolution against expenditures generally, thinks the Minister of Public Works should build an armoury at Oakville in his own county. My hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Roche)—whom I do not see in his place—joins in this general condemnation of expenditure, and particularly on the militia, but he wants us to build him an armoury at Minnedosa. The hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) would like to have an armoury at Valleyfield. The chief whip of the opposition (Mr. Taylor) no doubt will vote for this amendment; he is against expenditure, but he quietly whispers in the ear of the Minister of Public Works: Send us along an appropriation for an armoury at Gananoque. The hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Marshall) is going to vote for this amendment, but he would like a drill hall at Aylmer west. The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) wants an armoury at Orillia, and the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn) thinks we should have an armoury at Picton, while the gallant colonel from Victoria Halliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes) insists that there should be an armoury in the county he represents. And so we find that hon. gentlemen opposite are against expenditures, but when it comes down to expenditure in their own constituencies they are just as anxious for it as anybody else.

We are putting a good deal of money into improvement of harbours and rivers, and perhaps there is no class of expenditure which hon. gentlemen opposite so generally

condemn. But, when they come to consider the matter from the home point of view they see it in quite a different light. My hon. friend from West Hastings (Mr. Porter) is very anxious for improvements at Belleville harbour; the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Clements) wants improvements on the Thames river; the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Herron) wants a breakwater in Macleod; the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) also wants harbour improvements; the hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Owen) wants a wharf and a shed beside in his constituency. Then the hon. members from New Brunswick, (Mr. Crocket and Mr. Fowler) while they are prepared to condemn expenditures generally, they particularly serve notice on the Minister of Public Works that they want more money for wharfs on the St. John river and the inland waters of their province. The hon. members from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Martin, Mr. McLean and Mr. Lefurgey), are champions of economy when you are speaking generally, but all the same they serve notice upon us that they want harbour improvements, and breakwaters, and piers and wharfs, and in addition to that they venture to say they would like to have a tunnel. My hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Daniel) has spoken with gratification of the amount of money we are spending in improving the harbour of that important port, and he informs the Minister of Public Works that he had better go on with his expenditure because St. John needs more. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk)—if he were here to-night I suppose he would vote for this amendment—he does not want us to spend money on wharfs and so forth in Nova Scotia, but he thinks it highly important that a wharf should be built at Lachine in his own constituency. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) is very anxious for economy generally, but at the same time he serves notice upon the Department of Marine and Fisheries that no effort must be spared to deepen the channel of the St. Lawrence so that there will be 30 feet clear navigation from Montreal to the ocean, and more than that, he has again and again condemned this government because we have not made a rush order of the report of the Transportation Commission which calls for expenditures running up to possibly $100,000,000. And so I might follow through the long list.

An hon. MEMBER. Go on.

Mr. FIELDING. The list is too long and the time too brief—Oh, yes, I had nearly forgotten that in the midst of professions of economy the other evening, most of the western members sitting on your left Mr. Speaker, wanted this government to buy up all elevators in the Northwest Territories. And the hon. gentleman from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has given evidence of his idea of economy to-night, when, in the midst of this thundering against the expenditures, we find him advocating that we should spend probably two millions more by adding to the salaries of the civil servants.

My hon. friend who usually sits near the hon. member for North Toronto is not there to-night—I refer to the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart)—but as a rule he is unceasing in his demand that we shall at the earliest possible moment enter upon the construction of the Georgian bay canal which will cost $100,000,000. I mention these things because I think they prove that the denunciations which hon. gentlemen opposite hurl in their speeches, and in their resolutions such as the one we have before us to-night, are not to be taken very seriously. As I have said, it is easy to denounce expenditures generally; but when hon. gentlemen come to look at home and see the needs of their own communities, and the demands made on this government from all parts of the country, they have to realize, as we have to realize in this growing time, that there are needs which the government have to meet and which the government will meet in the right spirit. Some of the demands to which I have referred are perhaps not unreasonable; some of them certainly will bear postponement to a later day; but many of the things asked for in this way are fair and reasonable, and it will be the duty of the government from year to year to endeavour to meet every demand of this character. I say, therefore, that when our hon. friends indulge in this general denunciation of the extravagance of the government, the people will bear in mind that while that is the course these hon. gentlemen pursue when dealing with the matter generally, when they come to deal with it from the point of view of their own needs or the needs of their constituents, they realize as well as we do the need of these increasing expenditures.

Now, one trick in which my hon. friend from North Toronto indulges frequently—and he is doing it to-night—is to roll up in his budget the votes for railway subsidies, in addition to the ordinary appropriations, and he appears to think that by putting these big figures before the country he can create alarm. Now, let us look for a moment at the history of a railway subsidy; how does it generally come about? There is a section of the country where there is either no railway at all or inadequate railway facilities, and the people make up their mind that they would like to have a railway. They have not any very clear idea of how it can be brought about, and so they come and ask the government to help them. The government, finding that there is a field for a railway in that part of the country, agree to give a subsidy for it if the people can find a company to do the work; and then the subsidy, perhaps a million dollars,

is put into the votes, and the hon. gentleman adds it to the bill which he puts before the House at the close of the session. Perhaps two or three years pass and nothing is done. The people are discouraged, and they send a deputation down here to say that they had hoped that somebody was going to build the road, but they have been disappointed, and they hope that the government will renew the subsidy for another term. Again the subsidy appears in the estimates, and again my hon. friend puts it in his bill, though it has not cost the government a penny. At the end of the second term, perhaps a company comes along and says, we think there is a chance of doing business, and if you will renew the subsidy, we will build the road. So the subsidy is brought down again, and my hon. friend for the third time puts it into his bill of expenditures. By and by the company undertakes the work and makes some progress; but it probably finds that it cannot finish it within the specified time. It comes and says to the government, give us this subsidy for a further term and we will complete the road; and the Minister of Railways puts it among the railway subsidies for the fourth time, and for the fourth time the hon. gentleman has a chance of adding it in his bill. Not one dollar of the subsidy has been paid out of the public treasury, but my hon. friend has had plenty of fun in adding a million dollars to his budget every year. I have taken a list of the railway subsidies voted from 1899 down to 1906, and I find that during that time they amounted to $39,131,159. Now, according to the annual bill which my hon. friend presents, we must have spent that amount; but the actual fact is that the expenditure on railway subdies during that whole period was just $18,319,000, or much less than one-half of the amount of the subsidies voted. So that when my hon. friend is adding these sums to his bill of expenditures every year, he is creating needless alarm; it is another cry of wolf, wolf, where there is no wolf.

Then my hon. friend gets very much disturbed about the condition of the public debt of Canada, constantly conveying the impression that there has been some alarming addition to it. Now, there is no foundation for any statement of the kind; on the contrary, the debt statement which this government is able to present is of the most gratifying character. The increase of the net debt from 1878 to 1898, a period of 18 years during which our Conservative friends were in power, was $118,135,000; that is, an average of a little more than six and a half millions per annum. The increase of the net debt from 1897 down to the close of the last fiscal year under this government, a period of eleven and three-fourth years, including a considerable sum for the Transcontinental Railway is $19,474,376. The average increase per year under the Conservative government was $6,563,000; the average increase per year under this government was $1,657,393. That is the best possible answer to the inference my hon. friend seeks to draw, that we have added largely to the public debt. But there is another way of viewing the public debt. The public debt is only a burden in proportion to the number of people who have to bear it. If Canada should have a population of twenty millions instead of what she has to-day, her public debt would be almost insignificant. The true test of the public debt is not merely the amount of it; it is the proportion in which it has increased as compared with its increase in the previous history of the country, and the proportion which it bears to the population of the country. I have made up a statement of the net debt per head, beginning with the year 1891, and coming down to the close of the last fiscal year, and it is as follows:

Year.	Net debt per head.
1891	49.09
1892	49.15
1893	48.96
1894	49.40
1895	50.57
1896	50.82

This was the point at which the debt per head stood when this government came into power. Now we come to the later years:

Year.	Net debt per head.
1897	$ 50.87
1898	50.77
1899	50.62
1900	49.88
1901	49.84
1902	49.59
1903	46.84
1904	45.74
1905	45.63
1906	44.63
1907 (to March 31)	42.84
1908	40.50

The census authority of Canada, whose figures I have quoted, has made his estimate of the poulation of Canada as it stood on the 31st of March last past being the end of the fiscal year; he has applied his usual method of computation, allowing for the natural increase of population and taking into account the immigration, of which we have carefully compiled records, and the statement made by the statistician is that on March 31 the population of Canada was 6,863,500. If that statement be correct, and it is given by the statistician as being prepared in the usual way, the net debt per head of Canada on March 31 last was $40.50 per head against $50.82 on the day when my right hon. friend assumed office. Sometimes it is said: 'Oh, well, but this government have had good luck, and have not spent much money outside of the ordinary routine; they have been able to

show a surplus in that way.' I have had an examination made of the expenditures outside of what we call consolidated fund, that is what is called the capital and special expenditure—all those things that are not charged to ordinary consolidated fund. I find that in the eighteen years, from 1878 to 1896, this special expenditure, capital and other expenditure, apart from the consolidated fund, amounted to $167,-166,252. In eleven and three-quarter years, from 1897 to March 31, 1908, the expenditure on this account has been $162,542,277. It will be seen that we expended during our eleven and three-quarter years on that class of expenditure pretty nearly as much as our predecessors did in their eighteen years. In that respect we stand about even. If you put it on the average, we have spent much more than they did on these expenditures outside of consolidated fund. But observe that at the same time there is a marked difference in the two periods as respects the public debt. The Liberals provided more generously for the public service, as I have shown, but to a large extent they paid their way. Our Conservative friends spent large sums in expenditures of the character I spoke of, but they added them largely to the public debt. Although there was $167,000,000 of capital and special expenditure during the eighteen years of our Conservative friends, they paid but a small part from the revenue and added $118,000,-000 to the public debt. Of the $162,000,000 which we have spent on this capital and special expenditure we added to the public debt only $19,000,000 and we paid out of our ordinary revenue $143,000,000, adding, as I said, only $19,000,000 to the public debt, while they in their period added $118,-000,000 to the public debt.

The hon. member for North Toronto has made a reference to the rates of interest we have been paying and to the obligations we are likely to have to assume. His remarks, to some extent, were a repetition of a statement he made outside of this House at an early period of this session. I took note of it at the time, but there did not seem to be a favourable opportunity to call his attention to it. In a speech at Hamilton, shortly after the opening of the session, I find him reported as follows in the 'Mail':

> They (the government) have marched up to a point where a debt of $100,000,000 must be paid in two years and Mr. Fielding has made no provision to meet it.

My first point in reply is that my hon. friend magnified in an enormous degree the debt which is maturing. He does not seem to think it necessary to speak on these grave matters with that sense of responsibility which should attach to him as a former Minister of Finance. A very much less sum will have to be met within the time named. He proceeds:

Mr. FIELDING.

Instead he (Mr. Fielding) was paying as high as seven per cent to the bank of England for the use of money. The highest that he (Mr. Foster) ever paid was two and seven-eights per cent.

That was an extraordinary statement for my hon. friend to make, if he did make it. We have not paid 7 per cent for any money. He should be aware of that from information given in the House.

Mr. FOSTER. In the first place, I do not think I ever said that the highest I paid was 2⅞ per cent, because I know exactly what I did pay. It is reported in the newspaper, and the newspaper does its office as best it can, but sometimes it will not get it right. The information I had was that you were paying the Bank of England rate, and the Bank of England rate at the time I spoke was 7 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING. That might justify my hon. friend at that time, but not to-night. The information has since been given to the House that we did not pay seven per cent. If it has escaped my hon. friend's notice it is a pity, because I thought he was present, and the point was important. As I have said, he might have been justified in his statement then, but he would have been fairer if he had said that if we were paying 7 per cent we paid it under an agreement which he himself made. The agreement of my hon. friend is a fair agreement; I am not assailing him for it. The agreement was that on overdrafts which we might have from the bank of our financial agents in England we should pay the current Bank of England rate. It is a fair and reasonable arrangement. But at that particular time there was a panic condition in the country. My hon. friend should have stated in fairness that the rate was entirely exceptional, and should have stated the nature of the arrangement under which it was made, but he did not. Had the bank insisted upon the letter of the arrangement as it had existed for some years they could have demanded 7 per cent, but I was able by negotiations with the bank to secure a reduction of that even at that panic period to 6 per cent, and so stated in the House, and if that escaped his notice I can understand his repeating the statement to-night. However that may be, we did not pay 7 per cent, although if we had done so it would have been under an old arrangement, which, as a rule, is fair and reasonable. My hon. friend is quoted as saying he never paid more than 2⅞ per cent. It must be evident that my hon. friend must have made some such statement, and that to the great disadvantage of his successor.

I do not feel very much concerned about the matter from a personal point of view, and I do not suppose my hon. friend does—neither of us is anxious to blow his own

horn. But, when the effect of his criticism would be to bring discredit upon the finances of Canada, I think I have a right to complain. And I think he did not put that matter as fairly as he should have done. If he thinks it important that any comparisons be made in that respect, I can only say that I think this government has no reason to be afraid of those comparisons. The hon. gentleman had many transactions —properly and necessarily—in the way of temporary loans. There are records of fifty four transactions in the way of temporary loans, some for moderate sums and some for sums running up to $3,000,000 and $4,000,000. In not one of these transactions did he obtain the rate of interest mentioned in the Hamilton speech according to the 'Mail and Empire.' In several of them, the rate was 4½ per cent; in fifty-two out of fifty-four the rate was 4 per cent or upwards. In only two out of that long list of transactions was the rate below 4 per cent. One was made at 3¼ per cent and one at 3 per cent. Now, the lowest rate of interest ever obtained on a temporary loan by the Dominion treasury was not obtained by my hon. friend as his remarks would imply. If there is any credit—I do not attach the utmost importance to it, but I have a right to reply to the hon. member's criticism—let it be stated that this lowest rate of interest was not obtained either by the hon. gentleman himself or by any of his predecessors, but by the present administration, for we have borrowed money as low as a fraction above 2 per cent for a time. But I should not confine myself to the hon. gentleman's temporary loans. He says the 'Mail and Empire' did not report him correctly; but, he evidently made comparisons between the success of his own loans and the lack of success of his successor's loans—if he did not mean that, I do not see the purpose he had in view. I have made an examination of the public loans made in the time of my hon. friend. In no case either for a temporary or for a permanent loan did he ever obtain the rate of interest stated in the speech at Hamilton, as reported. I have the record before me, and I find that the lowest rate of interest ever obtained by him—and it was a fair rate, and I am not complaining of it—was in 1894, when he issued a loan of £2,250,000 at 3 per cent and running for forty-three and three-quarter years, for which he obtained £97, 9s. 2d. for every £100 of stock. The net rate of interest was 3.16 per cent—over 3⅛. Now, my hon. friend insists on making comparisons, so let me call attention to a loan issued by the present government in 1897 for £2,000,000 at the extraordinary low rate of 2½ per cent sold at a discount, of course, but at a price, which made the net interest 2.86 per cent, a little less than 2⅞. So, he will see that, in his management of the finances, he never obtained loans on as favourable terms as he says he did, and the present Finance Minister never paid the rate of interest which was charged by my hon. friend.

Now, on the question of taxation, the hon. gentleman has revamped the old story of the amount of taxes the people pay. It is a curious fact that there are times when the more taxes the people pay the better off they are. That may seem an extraordinary statement, but it is an absolute fact in the sense in which I give it; it is a fact when the people pay an increased tax, not by virtue of increase of tariff but by virtue of their own increased ability to buy, due to the greater prosperity of the country. I have been called upon to discuss that before with my hon. friend. Let us bring it down to the individual. Here, for instance, is a labouring man: in 1896, he only paid a tax of $5, but in 1906 or 1907, he pays a tax of $8 or $9. Why did he pay only $5 in 1896? Because the times were hard and wages were low and his purchasing power was not great. He could only afford to wear one suit of clothes, and so he paid only a small tax. But in 1906, times were good, wages were high, and employment was steady; the man was earning more money and he could afford to buy two suits of clothes that year. The increased taxation that he paid is evidence that the man was better off. Which of these two years would be the better one to that man? Would he prefer to go back to 1896 when he could only afford to buy one suit of clothes and pay but a small tax? Or would he prefer the better days of 1906, when, through the better times, regular employment and higher wages he was able to afford two suits and was well able and willing to pay the tax?

My hon. friend entered into a discussion of Grand Trunk Pacific affairs. I shall not follow him in that; I gave my views on that to the House the other day, and covered most of the points which the hon. gentleman has referred to to-night. If I can see any special purpose in his address, some special point that can be stated as the summing up of it, I think it is this: that we should not have commenced the Transcontinental at the time we did. I take issue with my hon. friend, and I believe the country is with me and against him. I believe that in view of the tremendous development in the west which is now in progress, the results of which we are seeing year after year, we did not begin the Grand Trunk Pacific one year too soon. I believe there is not a man who voted for the Grand Trunk Pacific scheme in 1904 who would not as freely have voted for it if he had thought that the cost was going to be more than was then supposed. The hon. gentleman is virtuously indignant about the cost of the road. What could any public man do in such a matter but go to some

experienced engineer and take his advice? That is what we did. The estimates we presented were the estimates of the eminent engineer, Mr. Schreiber, the long experienced and well-trusted chief engineer of railways and canals. And when my hon. friend speaks of it as a 'silly' thing to present these estimates to the House, I humbly submit that the opinion of Collingwood Schreiber on a matter of that character is almost as good as that of my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster). The road is costing more, to some extent, as the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) showed, because, though we were looking for a good road, the commissioners had given us even a better road than we were aiming to get. The road is well built. And it is well known that economy is not always gained by cheapness of construction. It pays to build a road well. There are great railways built and running to-day which realize that mistakes were made in former years when the roads were too lightly built, with curves and grades that were not what they should have been. And untold millions are being spent all over this continent of America to overcome difficulties of that character. By making a good road, by bringing your grades down to the finest point, by giving us such a road as we are getting in the National Transcontinental, we are doing the best thing to cheapen the transportation of the country. And if the people of Canada have put into that road one dollar more than they thought they would need to do in 1903, they realize that they will get the benefit of that dollar in the cheaper transportation which will come to them as long as grass shall grow and water run.

My hon. friend has much to say, and is very much alarmed about the credit of Canada. He thinks some dreadful things are going to happen. I again remind my hon. friend that there is not a sentiment in his speech to-night that is not to be found in the speeches of Sir Charles Tupper and himself in the year 1896, and in their speeches of the years following. It is an old, old story of the dreadful things that are going to happen, but which never do happen. My hon. friend talks of the credit of Canada to-day as suffering. But away back in 1896 the illustrious leader of the Conservative party said just the same thing. Now there are some foolish ideas about the credit of Canada. One respected member of this House who had not given the matter much consideration, though he is usually well informed, solemnly advanced the argument one day in the course of discussion, that because we borrowed money some years ago for 3 per cent or less, and have since paid as high as 4 per cent and sometimes higher, therefore the credit of the country was going to the dogs. Well, that is a foolish argument. Money is a commodity which, like other commodities, rises and falls in value; whenever you find an abundance of money, money is cheap, and when you find money scarce, then money is dear. Now if we want to make comparisons of the credit of Canada there is abundant material to enable us to do so. The true way to test the credit of Canada is not to ask how much we paid years ago and how much we pay now, but how much did we pay years ago in comparison with some standard security, and how much do we pay now in comparison with the same standard security. Now the highest standard security is the British consols, of which I may say something later. Let me make a comparison now with that very high class security known in financial worlds as India government stocks as quoted in London. In 1896 India 3 per cent stock at its highest quotation was 115, and the Canada 3 per cent stock at its highest quotation was 107. There was a difference against Canada of 8 points. Turn to the situation now. In recent quotations the highest for India 3 per cent stock was 93, while the highest for Canadian 3 per cent stock is 97. So we have this position, that in 1896 Canada was 8 points worse than India; in this present year Canada is 4 points better than India government stock. Now if we make a similar comparison with the great corporation stocks of London which are, very high class, it will be found, if you make the same comparison, that Canada has come closer to them, and is often on even terms, but certainly very much closer to them then in 1896, and that is a true comparison.

Why, Sir, so strong has been the credit of Canada in that respect that we have been able to secure from the British government, under this Liberal administration, a great financial concession which my hon. friend laboured in vain to secure in his day. I do not say that he is to blame because he did not secure it; he and his colleagues made the best effort they could. Again and again they pointed out that the Canadian stocks were not admitted to the trustee list, that is to say, that people who hold trust money in England were not allowed by the laws of England to buy Canadian stocks, and that diminished our field of buyers. Again and again the late government, and especially Sir Charles Tupper, laboured to secure admission of our stocks to the trustee list, but he laboured in vain. But after this government came into power—whatever other cause there may be, and I am not here to blow the trumpet of this government, but merely to defend them and put their case fairly—turn to the record and you will find to-day that after the administration of a few years of Liberal government, and consequent on the great progress that was coming to Canada, with the finest development, with the higher position Canada was taking in the eyes of the world, this Liberal government was able to

secure for Canada that great boon that the Conservative government tried in vain to obtain.

Not very long ago, and this has a very important bearing on the credit of Canada, a member of the British parliament put on the Order Paper a question to Mr. Asquith, who had not then left the position of Chancellor of the Exchequer. This member of parliament called the attention of Mr. Asquith to the fact that Canadian three per cents stood at a higher price than some of the securities guaranteed by the imperial government, and he wished Mr. Asquith to explain how it was. Mr. Asquith was not willing to admit that, on a close calculation, there was that discrimination against guaranteed securities of the imperial authorities. But at all events, we had this fact, that the two securities were so close together that there was a dispute between the financial men in the British parliament as to whether the guaranteed securities of Great Britain or the securities of Canada occupied the highest place.

Now with regard to this question of increase generally, I must say that my hon. friend is really not wise when he imagines that the people of Canada are going to be deceived by his comparisons between what happens now and what happened in 1896 with regard to the expenditures of public money. The conditions certainly have changed. There was an old Canada in 1896; a new Canada has grown up since then. I think it was Sir William Van Horne, who has a habit of saying quaint things, who said that Canada had been living on a back street for a long time. Canada no longer lives on a back street. Canada has moved up on to the main street, and has her sign out, and the public know to-day that Canada is one of the rising nations, that Canada is becoming rapidly one of the great countries of the world. This has not been accomplished without some expenditure. Does any man imagine that the country is going to stand still ? If my hon. friend wants to talk of increased expenditures, let me call attention to the following comparative statement for the year's 1896 and 1906 :

Service.	Expenditure.			Revenue.		
	1896.	1906.	Increase.	1896.	1906.	Increase.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Post Office.....	3,665,011 30	4,921,577 22	1,256,565 92	2,964,014 23	5,933,342 53	2,969,328 30
Railways & Canals, Collection of Revenue	3,826,225 51	8,779,677 46	4,953,451 95	3,480,217 19	8,058,620 73	4,578,403 54
Excise.....	470,869 86	555,923 25	85,053 39	7,926,005 94	14,010,220 30	6,084,214 36
Customs.....	896,332 50	1,548,384 08	652,051 58	19,766,741 48	46,064,597 89	26,297,856 41
Totals.....	8,858,439 17	15,805,562 01	6,947,122 84	34,136,978 84	74,066,781 45	39,929,802 61

In regard to the Post Office, note the magnificent revenue of a little under $6,000,000 as compared with the revenue in 1896 of $3,600,000. I have taken a ten year period. The figures of later dates are somewhat larger. Then in regard to Railways and Canals. In the year 1896, we only received a revenue of $3,480,000, but in 1906 we received $8,058,000. While these figures show a deficit on the road, and while they show a large increase of expenditure the account is balanced by a large increase of revenue. Take the Excise Department. In 1896, we admit that there was only spent by our predecessors $470,869 and that the expenditure increased in 1906 to $555,923, but, in 1896, they collected under $8,000,000 and in 1906 this government collected over $14,000,000 of revenue. Though there was an increase in expense to the country there was an enormous increase of revenue. Take the Department of Customs. In 1896, the then Minister of Customs expended $896,000 and we have to admit that ten years later the expenditure was $1,548,000. But the revenue which was collected by the Department of Customs in 1896 was $19,000,000 while the revenue which my hon. friend the present Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) collected in 1906, was $46,000,000, so, my hon. friend ought in all fairness when he tells the people about this enormous increase in expenditure, to also tell them that in many of the departments these expenditures are met by corresponding increases in revenue. In regard to increases of expenditure generally, nobody expects that the Dominion of Canada is going to stand still. The increase in expenditures has had something to do—it has had much to do—with the increased development that has come upon this Dominion. If we had not built railways in various parts of the country could there have been that development? Could the Crow's Nest country have been developed if we had not put money into that

railway by large and liberal subsidies? Could the western prairies have been filled up as they have been with immigrants from other lands if we had not spent money on immigration and the building up of our railways? Surely it must be evident that when we are spending these sums of money we are contributing to the development of the country. The needs of the country are large and varied. The west needs railways to open up the country, the lake and St. Lawrence districts need river and harbour improvements, and the maritime provinces require breakwaters and wharfs to facilitate trade and to protect the lives and property of the mariners and fishermen. At one point a public building is required to give reasonable accommodation to the public business; at another point an armoury is required in response to the military enthusiasm of the people. Those who wish to be sectional will see only their own need and not be willing to see the need of others. It will not do to make comparisons in that way. The duty of the government is to see the needs of the whole country. My hon. friend from North Toronto on one occasion made reference to our spending moneys at the little places in Canada. Sir, the mass of the people of Canada live in the little places. The needs of the cities are great and we are not unmindful of their interests, but whence come their progress and prosperity if not from the hamlets and villages scattered throughout the country and which originate the trade which passes through the great cities? The needs of the country are great and we are not forgetful of the great works or the little ones either. We are building the Transcontinental Railway and we are going to push on to completion this work which interests the whole country from ocean to ocean. We are going to build the Hudson Bay Railway and thus realize the expectations of the people of the west. We are providing for the various needs of the country according to their respective requirements. It is the duty of a government, Sir, not to be sectional, not to think of this particular place or that, but to take a broad look throughout the whole country and adapt its policy to its needs. That is the policy which this government has followed. We look back to-night with pride and pleasure upon the twelve years of Liberal administration, upon the results of this policy we have adopted, and in the face of the splendid record, which any Liberal candidate can present to an audience in any part of Canada, I do not hesitate to say, Sir, that that policy will continue to command the support of an intelligent and patriotic people.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.) My hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has made us a stump speech and he has opened it up by telling us a little story about the wolf at the door. Well, I may say to my hon. friend that I do not think he can be called a watch dog as far as the public treasury is concerned nor can he be compared with the man who once guarded the public treasury, Alexander Mackenzie, and whose record and experience in days gone by have been made public in this country by a letter which was published shortly after 1875. My hon. friend refers to historic incidents and fables. I would think he might have referred to the days of old when a king and his courtiers banqueted and feasted while the enemy was at the gate and the handwriting was on the wall. The Minister of Finance pumped up his courage to-night, because, notwithstanding all his boasting, notwithstanding all the vain glorious promises as to what his government will accomplish in the future, and all the vain glorious references to what he has accomplished in the past, he knows that the trend of public opinion in Canada to-day is against him. He has referred to the financial situation of the country. He failed to tell us however, how he expects to meet the $200,000,000 to $250,000,000 of obligations which must be met by this country within the next two or three years. Before I sit down I will read to him some words from the London 'Economist' which go as far in their condemnation of the record of this government as any words uttered by my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster). He boasts of his loans. He is proud, Mr. Speaker, that a loan of this Dominion of Canada placed on the London market was taken up only to the extent of forty-four per cent. He actually boasts here to-night of the fact that within the past year the government has been paying six per cent at the Bank of England and apparently he does not understand how much that reflects on his lack of foresight in not preparing for the financial stringency which was foreseen by every important business interest in the country, but was not foreseen by the Minister of Finance for Canada. He boasts of the fact that he placed a loan on the London market that he had to go to financial underwriters in London and that only forty-four per cent of it was taken up.

He boasts of the position of Canadian securities to-day under his management, but let us look at another comparison. A Canadian loan, backed by all the enormous resources of this country but handicapped with the evil financial record of this government, was subscribed for to the extent of only 44 per cent or less than one-half. At about the same time the Irish land loan was placed on the London market by the British government and it was subscribed for between seventy and eighty times over. My authority is the London 'Morning Post,' of July 8, 1908. Is the Minister of Finance proud of that? What has he to say with regard to it? Nothing. What has he to say with respect to the conditions when the new loans fall

due within the next few years? The Minister of Finance says nothing, but the London 'Economist' has something to say and I shall quote from that journal a few words which may serve to tone down the enthusiasm of gentlemen opposite, and which may also serve to enlighten the people of this country as to the opinion which will be held by the great financiers of London of the future financial standing of Canada should the present rate of expenditure be maintained. After referring to the great progress Canada has made in recent years; after referring incidentally to the fact that the public debt of Canada is now four times greater per head than that of the United States, the article continues:

The country in short has been making rapid progress and is well able to carry its burdens provided there is no monstrous addition in the immediate future.

The article goes on to enumerate the great public works and undertakings which this government proposes, and it continues:

Here—deducting what has already been spent by the government on account of its section of the Grand Trunk Pacific—is a total of not far from two hundred million dollars to be raised in London before long, to say nothing of the considerable aggregate of Dominion debts falling due, or of the possible necessity for borrowing for other services now that the era of buoyant revenues is over.

I invite the special attention of the Minister of Finance, and the special attention of the Prime Minister, and above all the special attention of the members of this parliament and the people of the country to the words which follow:

This, it must be allowed, is a staggering outlook. Instead of economizing the government has gone on increasing debt and expenditure as a means of mitigating depression; always a risky policy.

And in the face of that opinion from an impartial and well informed source—because the London 'Economist' is recognized as one of the greatest financial authorities in the world—the Minister of Finance entertains this House with a stump speech, and he gives not one word of information as to how these enormous obligations will be discharged. I was amazed that a gentleman occupying his position should not in the course of an hours' speech give one word of information to the people of Canada as to how these enormous burdens are to be met in the future. Not a word of comment on them, not a word of explanation, not a word as to provision for the future, but many words in idle taunts against some half dozen members on this side of the House who had asked for legitimate expenditure of public moneys in their constituencies. Sir, we on this side of the House have not objected and do not object to proper and legitimate expenditures, but we do object to the expenditures of this government in countless instances for the past ten or twelve years for purposes which are not in the public interest and which the Minister of Finance knew were not in the public interest when he sanctioned and authorized them. I was told of one instance, out of hundreds in his own constituency, where an opponent of the Minister of Finance at an election in his county went to a certain voter and inquired as to how he intended to vote and this gentleman who had previously supported the Minister of Finance was not well satisfied. Why, he said, Mr. Fielding means well; he has built this breakwater as a means of giving more employment but he knew and we all knew that it was of no possible use, and why did not Mr. Fielding take that money and divide it amongst us. I say we do not object to legitimate expenditure but we do object to middlemen's profits. The Minister of Finance has declared that there is a new Canada to-day, a new Canada which was not born until after 1896. Well, Mr. Speaker, there is a new Canada and there is a new sign at the door of almost every department in the public service, and it is a sign to the middleman: Apply here. That invitation to the middleman has not been neglected by that very numerous class, and they have been well rewarded.

The hon. gentleman referred to a great many subjects in the course of his speech, but he omitted to refer to a great many more. To a certain extent he dealt with one or two important subjects, but he dealt with them in a small way. He spoke of the enormous expenditure by the government of Canada in recent years, but he did not mention the fact that the government has taken out of the pockets of the people during the past twelve years $252,000,000 more than the taxation would have amounted to upon the basis that existed in 1896. And where has this money gone? Look around this country and point me to any great enterprise that has been completed and paid for. I admit that something has been done by the government in improving the canals, in continuation of a policy initiated by their Conservative predecessors. I admit that the Intercolonial has been extended to Montreal, that some public buildings have been erected through the country, and that something has been done for the St. Lawrence route. I do not desire to minimize in the least anything the government has done in the way of legitimate expenditure for public works, but look at the great public works that are now proposed by the government and which have not been paid for, or paid for in only small part. Look at the Transcontinental Railway: it will cost nearly $200,000,000 of which we have paid up to the present time only $26,000,000. Look at the Geor-

gian bay canal, which these hon. gentlemen flaunt before the country whenever they think it expedient to do so; look at the Welland canal which they are proposing to build, in their speeches out of parliament if not in parliament; look at the necessary but unaccomplished development of our ports; look at the proposal for building the Hudson Bay Railway; look at dozens of other great and important and necessary public works in this country, the expenditures on which the country will have to face during the next few years, and ask yourselves whether or not, having regard to the enormous increase of taxation within the past twelve years, the country has received any fair and adequate return for that money which has come out of the pockets of its taxpayers.

My hon. friend dealt among other things with the Transcontinental Railway. He did not dwell upon it to any very great extent; but I desire to say one or two words with regard to it, for the purpose of placing before the people of this country the ideas of the Finance Minister and the principles upon which the government propose to deal with capital expenditure. In a recent debate in this House my hon. friend was good enough to refer to some statements made by me as the cost of that road as 'monstrous representations' or some similar phrase, and I think it is well to look a little at the cost of that road and at the views of the Minister of Finance with regard to it. What is the position which we take with regard to the cost of that road? We point out in the first place that whereas the Minister of Finance estimated the cost of the road from Winnipeg to Moncton at $51,300,000, it is now admitted by the Minister of Railways and the Minister of Finance that without taking into consideration interest, or terminals, or anything execept the bare cost of the road it will amount to $114,500,000. I take that as the cost of the road to the country, because some one must pay for that road, and there is no one to pay for it, so far as I am aware, except the people of this country. The Minister of Finance says that that is a complete mistake and a monstrous statement to place before the people of this country. In order not to do him injustice, I will use his own words:

> Let me say at once that it is a monstrous statement to say that that represents the cost of that road to Canada.

And he concludes his sentence by saying:

> Therefore you must strike it out entirely.

Let us look at that for a moment. In considering the cost of the Transcontinental Railway you must strike out that item entirely; what follows? This follows: That it makes not the slightest difference to this country whether that road costs $51,300,000 as the Minister of Finance estimated, or $114,500,000, as the reality proves. Further than that, if you are to strike out that item entirely, as the Minister of Finance argues, then it would not make the slightest difference to the people of this country whether the road cost $250,000,000, and therefore all inquiry into Major Hodgins' charges or into the Grand Trunk Pacific complaints is utterly idle. Would any one imagine that these were sober words proceeding from the mouth of the Minister of Finance of Canada. One would imagine that language of that kind could only come from some person who was entirely reckless or regardless of his words and absolutely void of any responsibility for the effect they produce. But my hon. friend went further. He said that interest on construction should be struck out for the same reason. Therefore it necessarily follows that it makes not the slightest difference to the people of this country whether they pay 10 per cent or 3 per cent on the cost of construction. Does the Minister of Finance or any one else imagine that the people of this country can be deceived by an argument of that kind? I concur in the view that has been taken by many gentlemen on this side of the House that in placing the cost of the National Transcontinental Railway at about $192,000,000, I have placed it very much below the mark; that when the people of this country come to foot the bill, it will be found that the amount which I named, and which as the hon. member for North Toronto truly says is only an estimate, will be found very much below the mark.

Mr. Speaker, it is rather a grave situation that confronts the people of Canada to-day. My hon. friend boasts of his revenues. Let me read one or two further paragraphs from the article in the London 'Economist' to which I alluded a moment ago. After dealing with the attempts which have been made to settle the great northern portions of this country the article uses this language:

> The tendency is to push railways further and further north into the solitudes lying above the main line of the Grand Trunk Pacific in Ontario, Quebec and British Columbia, where development even under the most favourable circumstances, is bound to be slow; and schemes are actually on foot for invading Labrador and Ungava. The higher price we have to pay for money in England may deter the federal and provincial governments from voting cash subsidies to such projects, but some of them are certain to obtain guarantees, which may easily prove embarrassing.

My hon. friend the Minister of Finance puts to one side with a wave of his hand the liabilities which this country has assumed and which it is proposing to assume in respect to these guarantees of great undertakings. That is not the view that is taken by the article I have quoted

from this great financial journal, which declares that these guarantees may well prove embarrassing. The Minister of Finance has a different outlook and a different view entirely to that entertained with regard to these conditions by this great financial journal. Further on in the same article it says :

Hereafter we are likely to get into trouble over the government end of the Grand Trunk Pacific. Many in parliament are of opinion that the company, which has agreed to pay an annual rental equal to 3 per cent on cost for this portion, will be obliged to back out of its bargain. It does not begin paying rent till some time after the completion of the road, but recent explorations have not revealed any great timber or mineral wealth along the route between Winnipeg and Quebec, whilst the division from Quebec to Moncton can hardly be remunerative in view of the competition of the Intercolonial, a government line barely meeting operating expenses. On all sides it is felt that the government should have been content with the company's original design, to begin at North Bay and go on to the Pacific, North Bay being a terminal of the Grand Trunk proper. Unfortunately, the government yielded to party and sectional pressure.

And this is comment from a great financial journal upon the action of that gentleman who to-night boasted that this government was never under any conditions subject to sectional prejudices. The article continues as follows :

The company intended, of course, to live honourably up to its covenant, but circumstances may force it sooner or later to ask to be relieved of the stretch of 1,000 miles from Moncton to North Bay—such, at least, is the growing impression, in which event Canada will be saddled with another white elephant. This, however, is a matter for the future. I mention it merely to strengthen the argument that we had better go slow, and let the remote north remain unopened till we have fulfilled the obligatons, direct or incidental, undertaken in behalf of other parts of the Dominion.

Mr. FIELDING. Would my hon. friend mind sending the paper to me ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Certainly. I think that article was written by a gentleman who has been in remarkably close touch in the last ten years——

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman has stated this is the comment of a great financial journal, he has given the impression that it was a statement by the editor. I have not opened the paper yet but I do not believe the article was by the editor at all.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It was from the Ottawa correspondent of that journal.

Mr. FIELDING. I took down the words, the hon. member spoke of the comment of a great English journal and he has presented to this House an article by a correspondent and represented it to be the comment of the London 'Economist.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is comment found in the columns of that great financial journal and it is the comment of their Ottawa correspondent who has been in exceedingly close touch with this government and who announces in that very article that the government is going to undertake the construction of the Hudson Bay railroad and who wrote the article at a time when the government intended to undertake the building of that road and to embark on it this session.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. member did not say it was a correspondent, he said it was the comment of this great London financial journal and it was not until I asked him to send the paper to me that he made any allusion to the correspondent.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The article was at the hon. gentleman's disposal at any time during my speech and I say it is the comment of the journal to which I allude, found in its columns.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. member knows that is not fair, there is all the difference in the world between the comment of a journal and the comment of a correspondent. I offer no opinion as to whether the correspondent is wise or not, the editorial of a great paper is one thing, the opinion of a correspondent is another.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend seems to be very familiar with this correspondent. I do not know whether it was any one in close touch with the hon. member who wrote it.

Mr. FIELDING. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understand the gentleman has been in close touch with the government in the last ten years. It is perfectly obvious he was in close enough touch to know the intention of this government to build the Hudson Bay Railway immediately, although that intention seems to have been modified to a considerable extent in the last three or four weeks.

Mr. CONMEE. Does the hon. gentleman agree with the article ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What part of it ?

Mr. CONMEE. The whole of it. For instance does he agree that the road should have been built to North Bay and no further ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I shall read some portions with which I do agree.

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Farrer salaried by the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I was under the impression that Mr. Farrer was a good deal closer to the government than to the Can-

adian Pacific Railway but my hon. friend with his superior information will no doubt correct me in regard to that.

Here, deducting what has already been spent by the government on account of its section of the Grand Trunk Pacific, is a total of not far from $200,000,000 to be raised in London before long, to say nothing of the considerable aggregate of Dominion debts falling due, or of the possible necessity for borrowing for other services now that the era of buoyant revenue is over.

I agree with that. What does the hon. member for Rainy River say, does he agree with it ?

Mr. CONMEE. No.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. From what part does he dissent.

Mr. CONMEE. I disagree with the whole article.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If $200,000,000 are not to be raised in London or elsewhere how much is to be raised in London or elsewhere ? My hon. friend does not reply ; he does not seem to be able to explain with what portions of that he does not agree.

Mr. CONMEE. I am waiting for my hon. friend's answer.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If my hon. friend will examine the 'Hansard' of 1903 and 1904 he will find exactly what I thought then and what I think now on that point. What I stated then I am now prepared to stand by. Here is another part of the article which is headed :

From our Ottawa correspondent.

Whose identity is announced by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot).

This, it must be allowed, is a staggering outlook. Instead of economizing the government is bent on increasing debt and expenditure as a means of mitigating depression—always a risky policy.

Does the hon. member (Mr. Conmee) not think that a risky policy? So on, all through the article. I have already placed those portions of it on 'Hansard' and I say it is a most striking comment on the course that this government has pursued in its financial policy in the last ten or twelve years, and it comes, if my hon. friend from Bellechasse is to be believed, from a gentleman who has never been regarded as unfriendly to the party in power.

Mr. TALBOT. I think the balloon is pricked and burst.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has placed an exhaustive statement of the position before the House. So far as the important and significant portions of that statement are concerned, the Finance Minister, has made no attempt to meet them. They relate in the first place to the rapidly increasing expenditures of this country; in the second place to the tendency of this administration to increase that expenditure still further in the face of falling revenues ; and in the third place to the necessity of meeting loans in the London market of between two and three hundred millions during the next three or four or five years. These all-important points have not been grappled with by the Finance Minister who has uttered no word with regard to them, yet in the significant and pregnant words of the article I read here to-night it is these matters which are engaging the attention of financiers in the great money markets of the world although they are not engaging the attention of the government of this country. These are considerations which it was proper to place before the House at the close of the session and when we come to realize what the proposed expenditures of the government amount to I say that no hon. gentleman who reads the resolution and takes to heart the enormous figures of expenditure and the necessary increase of the public debt in the resolution, can find it consistent with his duty to vote against the resolution proposed.

Mr. TAYLOR. One word in reply to a statement made by the Minister of Finance referring to myself. I am satisfied that the minister would not willingly misrepresent me and must have made his statement from hearsay, relying on the report of some person who was present in the House when the discussion took place. Had he taken the trouble to read 'Hansard' he would not have made the statement that he did and I presume when he made that statement reflecting on myself the same application might be made to the hon. gentlemen on this side to whom he referred. I shall read for his information what took place. We were discussing the militia estimates. And I made this statement :

Mr. TAYLOR. It is fair to assume that these armouries will cost about $10,000 apiece and this vote of $50,000 will therefore erect five armouries.

The Minister of Militia had a vote in the estimates of $50,000 for armouries. I made this reference to it :

I would like to know where the minister is going to place these. I want to remind him that they ought to put Gananoque in as good a position as the government found it in when they came into power. We have at Gananoque a battery and a company of rifles. When this government came into power we had a first-class drill shed and armoury, but the government saw fit to tear it down and to purchase another site.

And they promised to build another armoury in its place. That was eleven years ago, and they have done nothing. I asked that $10,000 of this $50,000 that was being devoted to the construction of armouries

might be used to carry out the promise of the government to replace the armoury in Gananoque which they had torn down. But the promise they made, like every other promise which they have made, has been left unfulfilled. They took the whole $50,000 for buildings in constituencies of their supporters and neglected the pledge that they had made to Gananoque. The hon. minister says that I made application for an expenditure of public money. All I asked was they should keep the promise they made. In the course of the debate there was the following:

Mr. TAYLOR. What about carrying out your arrangement at Gananoque?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I will put that on the list when I return to my office in the morning.

Mr. TAYLOR. Gananoque should be the first on the list because we had a drill shed and armoury there and the minister tore it down. He bought a site but he has not given the boys an armoury since.

The minister says that this is an application for public expenditure. I asked this government to carry out the promise and replace the armoury that they had torn down, and the minister acknowledged the corn.

Mr. C. L. OWEN (East Northumberland). I wish to put on record my disapproval of what I am bound to call the unwarranted and extraordinary expenditure of public money by the government now in power. My name has been mentioned here to-night as asking for a wharf at Brighton village. I am justified in asking for it. I did not ask for a wharf where there is no water. I did not ask for a wharf in an inland lake. I did not ask for a wharf which would turn into a bridge in the course of construction. I did not ask for a wharf to cost $13,000 at a little village on Lake Huron where the postal revenue is $16.14 per annum. I asked for a wharf where it is really needed in the interest of the public, and I say it is a shame and a disgrace to the government in power that they have not built a wharf at Brighton. It is a village of 1,800 inhabitants, with a large trade. I pointed out the need publicly in this House. I did not wait on the minister privately, but I went with a deputation who laid the matter before him. And he gave the deputation to understand that something would be done. I fully expected that there would be an item in the supplementary estimates for a wharf at Brighton village. I am surprised that it was not brought down, because the Minister of Public Works stated in the House that his policy was to spend money where it is needed. I cannot believe that that is his policy, because he has not carried that out in the case of Brighton village.

One can hardly realize that the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) were at that great Reform convention held here in Ottawa in 1893. They were greatly alarmed at that time at what they called the large expenditure—which happened to be about $42,000,000. And, if I remember rightly the speeches of the Prime Minister in the campaign of 1896 in the province of Ontario, he told the people he was greatly alarmed at the annual expenditure and promised that if his party were given the reins of power, he would reduce the annual expenditure $2,000,000 or $3,000,000. I believe the people are surprised at what the right hon. Prime Minister is doing. If he was alarmed in 1896, they are alarmed now. I am safe in saying that no parliamentarian, however long he may have sat in this House, has ever seen that wilfully wasteful expenditure of public money as we have witnessed this session. I am not one of those who do not believe in the development of the country. I believe in spending money for the development, but I do not believe in wasteful expenditure. It has been proven in this House time and again that money has been expended, not in the best interests of the people of this country, but mostly in the interest of the middlemen. As stated by an hon. member this evening, we have middlemen rapping at the door of every department, and every one of them has had his wishes gratified. That is not expending money in the public interest; and I protest against such wasteful and extravagant expenditure.

Mr. SPROULE. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) speaking with regard to the correspondent of the 'Economist,' led the House to believe that there is a great difference between the casual correspondent and the editor of a responsible journal. But this was not written by a casual correspondent. I have it before me and it is headed 'From our Correspondent.' It is not signed but is adopted by the paper as expressing the views of the paper. It carries with it all the weight of an editorial in that journal.

Amendment (Mr. Foster) lost on the last division recorded.

Mr. A. C. BOYCE. Before you leave the chair, Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals to a matter of great interest to my constituency of West Algoma, of which I gave notice a week ago, but which has not been brought earlier to his attention owing to a misunderstanding with regard to the matter. Speak of it to-night because of a despatch from Sault Ste. Marie in the Toronto paper, which arrived to-night, to the effect that 'the rail mill of the Lake Superior Corporation closed down this afternoon for an indefinite period.' An unofficial statement was made that the reason is lack of orders and scarcity of ore to run

the blast furnaces. In that connection I would draw the attention of the Minister of Railways to the state of things at those works. A little while ago the works at Sault Ste. Marie were obliged to close down from lack of orders. Since then the work has been resumed, but again, unfortunately, the orders not being of sufficient importance to justify the continuance of the work, the mills have closed down again. Now, following that cessation of work at Sault Ste. Marie, come some very disquieting rumours with regard to the importations of steel rails from the United States for some of our leading railways. In this connection let me draw the attention of the minister to section 37 of the Act respecting the National Transcontinental Railway, which requires that company to purchase all material and supplies for the construction of the western division and the equipment of the railway from Canadian purchasers when the same are produced in Canada and when such supplies can be purchased of the desired quantity, of equal quality, and on terms equally advantageous. Section 42 of the same Act states that this agreement is made for the express purpose of encouraging the development of Canadian trade. Now, we learn that substantial orders of rails for the construction of the western division of the Grand Trunk Pacific, namely, that portion which is being constructed by the company itself, has been given to United States makers, to that extent depriving Canadian producers of the trade they should receive, and to that extent, apparently, in violation of the specific agreement I have just referred to. I now quote from the 'Railway Engineering Review,' of Chicago.

A summary of rail requirements of the Grand Trunk Pacific in the construction of the five sections of the new Canadian Transcontinental road now under way has been given by the minister of the Interior. The total amounts to 267,840 tons of steel rails. Of this total 230,371 have been purchased from the Dominion Iron and Steel Company, Sydney, N.S.; the Algoma Iron and Steel Company, Sault Ste. Marie; and the United States Steel Corporation.

It has also been brought to my attention that large imports of steel rails for the construction of the western division have been made from American firms in addition to this. The Pittsburg and Detroit papers report that large orders have been placed by the Grand Trunk Pacific with Pittsburg firms for use in the construction in the western division, and that, with the exception of a few orders given to the Dominion Steel Company and the Algoma Steel Company, all the rails to be laid on that section of the road would be of American make. Now, I am not giving that as my own statement; I am simply saying that this is what the Pittsburg papers say in regard to the importation of these rails. The Detroit 'Free Press' likewise made a similar statement. Assuming that there is truth, in the statements of the 'Engineering Review' and in that of the Pittsburg and Detroit papers, what they say appears to be verified by men engaged in the steel business in Canada. Then we have to contemplate the conditions of the contract in section 37 as to the class of material, and I commend to the perusal of the Minister of Railways, with regard to the quality of the United States steel rails, an article which appears in the 'Canadian Journal of Commerce' of June 12. This merely contains a quotation from the 'Standard of Empire':

The 'Standard of Empire,' which aims at being the organ of Greater Britain, has the following strong statement regarding United States rails. It will be noticed, by the way that the Imperialistic journal makes no endeavour to discriminate between the United States and America, though it must be aware of the fact that a good sized slice of Greater Britain is also on the American continent, as well as a few other countries:

The serious slump in American rail exports to many of the countries where hitherto they have found a ready market, has brought consternation and despair to American steel firms. In Europe the American rail has been wiped out. To be exact, during more than half of last year the value of American rails imported into all the countries of Europe was less than one per cent of the amount imported during the corresponding period of the previous year. During the same time the imports of American rails into Canada dropped from £268,885 to £56,580. This loss of eighty per cent is even more significant when we bear in mind that owing to the proximity of the Dominion to the United States, the American firms have an immense advantage over everybody else. In other British possessions and foreign countries, the Americans have suffered more or less severely. Thus, a long and appalling list of accidents has at last brought home to the world the fact that the basic steel, dumped so profusely in so many different countries, is worthless for railway purposes. It is no unusual thing for American rails to break in half in the mere process of unloading, and over and over again they have been crushed out of all shape after a few weeks service on lines where the traffic is far from heavy. It is now recognized that the defects are not only due to the inherent unsuitability of the basic process and the careless methods of American manufacture, but also to the fact that the makers fail to discard the faulty metal in their ingots. As a consequence, a revulsion of feeling has set in in favour of the open-hearth steel.

Now, whatever merit there may be in that article, I am not going to do more than draw the attention of the minister to that portion which deals with the suitability of the United States steel rails. Now, there is at Sault Ste. Marie an in-

dustry which is capable of turning out steel rails of excellent durability and workmanship. I suppose that most of the railways in Canada have used them. The contract price, as the minister has shown in an answer to a question in the House, is on a par with that of other rail manufacturers, and there is no reason why there should be any preference shown to American firms over Canadian firms in the importation of steel rails for this great railway, provided the conditions remain, under that clause of the contract, the same as they are in the United States in regard to price, workmanship and suitability. Now, I desire to draw the attention of the minister to a statement recently brought down by the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), showng the importation into Canada of iron and steel in the rail and other forms during the fiscal year ending March 31, 1908. Amongst the items mentioned in the statement you will find these :

Iron and steel railway bars or rails..	$ 1,278,084
Pig iron..	3,388,665
With other steel products..	5,417,860
Total..	$10,084,609

Possibly the minister is familiar with the firms who are importing, but there is no getting away from the fact that there are and have been a lot of very heavy importations of steel rails from the United States, some of which at least have been specially imported for use upon the western division of the Grand Trunk Pacific. In contrast with that let me remind the minister of a statement made by Sir Thomas Shaughnessy, president of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, in the famous speech that he made in Toronto not long ago at the celebration of the opening of the Toronto Sudbury line in which he said that every rail, spike, bridge, tie, car and locomotive was of Canadian production and that despatch and quality of the Canadian product were equal to the very best. I know that I need not emphasize to the minister and to the House the condition of things which exists at Sault Ste. Marie, in Nova Scotia, and at Port Arthur and in connection with many other steel and iron industries, in which a large amount of Canadian, British and American capital is invested. I would ask him to give these matters his very serious consideration and do what he can now, to show the Canadian spirit which should and perhaps will influence him in the matter, to see that the terms of the agreement between this company and the government are strictly adhered to in spirit as well as in letter, that our Canadian industries get the full benefit of the work of the construction of that great road and that all materials and supplies which are the product of Canadian industries are used in the construction of the road, provided the conditions upon which they are obtainable fall within the basis laid down by section 37 of the agreement to which I have referred the minister. It is not an unfair thing to ask. It is creating a feeling of great unrest and serious alarm among the Canadian steel and iron workers to read these reports from time to time. It must create a feeling of unrest and alarm and when, on top of that, you have the Algoma Steel Company at the Soo closing down twice in two months for lack of orders and the manufacturers of pig iron at Port Arthur being obliged to close down, while at the same time we are face to face with these heavy importations from the United States, it is a matter which requires grave consideration which I earnestly hope it will receive from the minister. I trust that he will feel that I bring this matter to his attention and to the attention of the House in a spirit of fairness and from a desire to see that full justice is done to Canadians and Canadian industries and to see that Canada gets, in the development of her trade, the full benefit of the agreement governing the construction of the Transcontinental Railway.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals). The question which my hon. friend has alluded to is one which is of very great importance to Canada and he will agree with me when I tell him that I have always taken a deep interest in the Soo industry. Before I came to this House and while acting in another sphere I went to a considerable length in doing what I could to see that that important industry was retained and maintained for the people of Canada. Although at the present moment the conditions are not just what I would like I still have faith in the Soo industry and we want to provide the largest possible share of orders for its product. We have two of these industries in Canada, one at Sydney and the other at the Soo. I am sure if my hon. friend will consult those interested in the Soo industry they will tell him that this government has shown its friendship to their industry in a very practical way. On two occasions at least since I have had charge of the Railway Department we have endeavoured to make it smoother for the Soo industry than it might have been if we had not made that endeavour. I believe with him that the steel rails made at Sydney and at Sault Ste. Marie are equal to any made on the continent. I am perfectly in sympathy with that view. I do not agree with the article read by my hon. friend which says that steel rails made in the United States are inferior because they make some magnificent rails there. I will communicate with the president or general manager of the Grand Trunk Pacific to see if there is any truth in the report that orders for rails have been given to the United States makers. I am

anxious to do what I can to see that the rails to be used on Canada's great Transcontinental Railway shall be produced in the Dominion of Canada.

CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY.

Mr. R. S. LAKE (Qu'Appelle). This is the last opportunity I shall have to ask the Minister of Railways and Canals a question that I asked once or twice before as to whether he has been able to find the report of the engineer who was sent out last fall to inspect the Canadian Northern Railway between Irwood and the Pas Mission ?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yesterday I placed on the desk of my hon. friend the report of our engineer dated February last and that is the only report we have in the department.

Mr. LAKE. Last autumn I met a gentleman on the Canadian Northern and he told me he had been commissioned by the government to go over that road, and he gave a very graphic description of his trip.

Mr. GRAHAM. Perhaps it refers to the same report ; was it Mr. McArthur ?

Mr. LAKE. No, it was Mr. Paradis. He gave me a graphic description of his trip as he would to an old friend, for I have known him for many years and he told me the land was swamp, and that nothing could be hauled over the line in the summer season until the whole country was drained. He told me a hand-car was the heaviest thing they could run over a considerable part of the line and that they had laid the rails so that when the frost came they could take a train of materials out. The report which the minister refers to was made by a gentleman who was sent out there after the freeze up and when there was a foot of snow on the ground. I should like to know if it is possible that a subsidy of 12,800 acres per mile, and which the Minister of the Interior says has been selected in western Saskatchewan, could have been given to such a railroad as that.

BEAUHARNOIS CANAL—ROBERT SYNDICATE.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). As this is the last occasion we will have to question the government, I would like the Minister of Railways to give me the information he promised with regard to the present condition of the Robert syndicate lease.

Mr. GRAHAM. I had a copy of the lease in the House last night.

Mr. BERGERON. The lease has been in my possession since it was signed, but I want to know what has been done under it. Has the Robert syndicate made its payment to the government, and are they carrying out the conditions of the lease. A company called the Canadian Light and Power Company is applying to the city council of Montreal to light the city, and that company is supposed to be the Robert syndicate under another name. As I understand it the Robert syndicate cannot under the terms of the lease amalgamate with the Montreal Light, Heat and Power Company according to clause 16 of the lease. Their lease is very stringent on that point, and I would like to know if the Minister of Railways has been notified of any change ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I will have to ask information from my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) what does the lease say about that ?

Mr. BERGERON. In order to protect the people of Montreal against monopoly the clause 16 of the lease says : The Robert syndicate shall not amalgamate with the Montreal Light, Heat and Power Company, and it is commonly supposed in Montreal that the Canadian Light and Power Company which is negotiating with the city council is in reality the Robert syndicate. I do not believe they could do that without the authorization of the Minister of Railways.

Mr. GRAHAM. I imagine not. If the lease says they shall not amalgamate with a certain company that would seem to imply that they could with some other company, but anyway I think it would not be done without notifying the department and I have had no such information.

Mr. BERGERON. The Robert syndicate cannot amalgamate with the Montreal Light, Heat and Power Company, but the Canadian Light and Power Company might. A subterfuge of that kind would be tantamount to bad faith on the part of the syndicate and I should think the Minister of Railways would know something about it.

Mr. GRAHAM. We have no information in the department with regard to that but I shall make inquries. They have paid $6,000 and another $6,000 is due on the 1st of July and I presume will be paid in due course.

CANAL AT BRADFORD, SOUTH SIMCOE.

Mr. H. LENNOX (South Simcoe). The Minister of Railways said some days ago that he would tell me before the close of the session what he would do in reference to building a short stretch of canal near the village of Bradford in south Simcoe. I would be glad if I could tell the people interested that the Minister of Railways had decided to construct that small piece of work.

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not think I promised my hon. friend that I would tell him what

I would do; but I did look into the matter and I find that the report shows the mileage to be greater than my hon. friend had supposed.

Mr. LENNOX. Three-quarters of a mile?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is about three times that. I had an approximate estimate made but it is not one on which we can rely. We will have to consider the matter as we proceed with the work of the canal.

Mr. LENNOX. After the close of the session the minister will have very little to do, and if I write to him would he answer me and let me know what he intends? When we spoke of it some days ago the chief engineer was ill and the minister could not give any information about the matter.

Mr. GRAHAM. I know my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) will write me a very courteous letter and if he does I will give him all the information I possibly can in reply. I would not like to commit myself to anything because I really do not know what I am in a position to say.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION REPORT —FRENCH VERSION.

Mr. BERGERON. I wish to remind the hon. leader of the House that we have not yet had the report of the Royal Commission on the Civil Service in French, although to my knowledge it has been in the Printing Bureau for several months.

Mr. FIELDING. I have been informed by the Secretary of State that the delay is not in the Printing Bureau, but with the translators. I agree with my hon. friend that it should by this time be in the hands of those who want it in French.

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

Ottawa Victoria Memorial Museum—additional amount, $200,000.

Mr. FOWLER. At what time in the century is it expected that the museum will be finished?

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works. I may say to my hon. friend that the museum is being constructed very rapidly indeed. The contractor is Mr. Goodwin, who, although his contract price is some $300,000 lower than the estimate of the chief architect, and some $200,000 or $300,000 lower than the next lower tender, has been carrying on the work with very great rapidity and with very great satisfaction to the department. I think he will have the building completed next year. If it were necessary, and I think perhaps it may be considered necessary, to have many of the geological specimens stored at as early a date as possible to preserve them from fire, some provision to that end may be made even before the coming winter.

Mr. BERGERON. Are all the lands and buildings bought for the new departmental buildings on Sussex street?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have agreed for the purchase of the larger number of lots but in respect to some we were not able to agree, and we are taking proceedings by expropriation.

Mr. BERGERON. What about the Lindsay block?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We have not decided to purchase the Lindsay block. I made some inquiries of a tentative nature with regard to the price, which I found was pretty heavy.

Mr. SAM. HUGRES. You will come to it after a bit.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Perhaps so in the somewhat remote future. The Lindsay block, however is not necessary to the departmental buildings which we are now planning.

Resolution reported.

RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

Bill (No. 215) to authorize the granting of subsidies in aid of the construction of lines of railway therein mentioned—Mr. Graham—read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is the Bill in the same form as the resolutions?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I asked if any of the roads proposed to be subsidized are now actually under construction.

Mr. GRAHAM. I endeavoured to get all the information I could along that line. I find the following are partly constructed or under construction, Nos. 32, 40, 43 (three miles), 45, (a portion constructed, balance under construction), 55 (two miles under construction), 60 (a portion under construction), 61, (a portion under construction), 62, 65 (four miles), 66 and 68 (under construction). An hon. gentleman asked the mileage of each of the great railways under this. I cannot guarantee the accuracy of these figures as the subsidies are sometimes voted under names of other companies, but my clerk figures it in this way:

	Miles.
Grand Trunk Pacific..	330·9
Canadian Northern Railway..	202·9
Canadian Pacific Railway..	270·15

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I could not get access to these applications this morning and consequently cannot say much as to their contents. Taking a view of the items which I have had some opportunity of examining I observe that No. 39 provides for a subsidy

to the Canadian Pacific Railway in respect of 34½ miles. Section 40 provides for a subsidy for the Canadian Pacific Railway for 123 miles. So far as the Canadian Pacific Railway is concerned. I have never known it to have difficulty in carrying out its undertakings in respect to the building of branch lines. It is a very wealthy and prosperous company. Its stock is considerably above par, standing at 150 or 160; it pays 7 per cent and so far as my memory goes its officers have publicly announced that in the larger portions of Canada to-day railway building should be carried on without assistance from the government. I observe further in respect of 123 miles to be built by the Canadian Pacific Railway, that the information contained in the documents on the table is very meagre. It states that the road is already under construction; if that is so I would be of opinion that that railway is quite able to carry the construction of that road to a conclusion. I do not observe from the documents before the House that there is any application by the Canadian Pacific Railway. It does not purport to be signed by any person. No. 68 relates to sixty miles of the Canadian Northern from Hawkesbury to Ottawa which, I understand, is partially completed. The same thing is true of items 49 and 62 which are to aid branch lines of the Grand Trunk Pacific. Item 62, is for a branch line from Port Arthur to the main line of the Transcontinental Railway. That is distinctly a part of the enterprise of the Grand Trunk Pacific, as will appear by reference to the statute under which the Grand Trunk Pacific was incorporated, section 12 of chapter 122 of the Acts of 1903. I refer to section 12 of that Act, which I would read if it were not that I desire to economze the time of the House. The same observation will apply to No. 49 which is distinctly a part of the Grand Trunk Pacific. I have not been able to look at the application with regard to that particular item. But an hon. member who looked into it informed me that there is no application excepting a very informal one purporting to be made by the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I do not vouch for that of my own information, for I could not find the document.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is all the information it gives.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Here, for instance, is the way the application reads in part:

Name of railway. A railway.
Province. The province of Quebec.
What subsidy applied for? 200 miles.
8. From Montreal to a point on the Transcontinental.
9. Applicant. Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Mr. GRAHAM. The hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) will remember that I explained that it was put in this way only to show that there was an application.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

This subsidy was granted in response to one of the largest deputations that have visited us this session, and who urged it very strongly. That is the reason it was informal—it was put that way merely to keep the record.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am only dealing with the information that has been laid on the table.

Mr. GRAHAM. I explained that fully last night.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I was not aware of it. It must have been at the time when I was absent from the chamber. The points I take with regard to these five items—which are the only ones I have had an opportunity to look into—is that they must necessarily be built by the railway companies to whom subsidies are proposed to be paid. So far as that point is concerned. I might be permitted to allude to some observations made in this House by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson). I quote from 'Hansard' of 1906, page 5965:

I recognize that the Grand Trunk Pacific came in 1903 or 1904 and asked authority from this parliament to build certain branch lines as well as to have the lease from the government of Canada. They asked authority from the government of Canada, when it should have constructed a trunk line from Winnipeg to Moncton, to lease and operate that trunk line. A part of the scheme and arrangement and agreement on the part of the Grand Trunk Pacific was that they should build certain branch lines; and they are held to that agreement.

And further on:

The Grand Trunk Pacific Company are bound to build it; they are under obligation.

This is with reference to a line to the city of St. John. He deals with that exactly as with the other line. He is referring to the two branch lines to which I have alluded, and an additional one to the city of St. John. And he says that the Grand Trunk Pacific are 'under obligation.' The report proceeds:

Mr. DANIEL. Under what charter?
Mr. EMMERSON. Under every discussion that was held in this House in 1903 and 1904. They are under a moral obligation, more than that they are under a pledge, by reason of the project in its entirety. They asked for authority to build certain branch lines.
Mr. CARVELL. Will the hon. gentleman be kind enough to tell me where we shall find the statute that contains that?
Mr. EMMERSON. I am not putting that claim forward. It was not within the statute, but it was within the agreement, and a well understood agreement, and they are bound to do it.

That was the view of the government, as expressed by the then Minister of Railways, as regards the two lines, for both are included, I take it. I am not taking the point that railway subsidies should not be granted where absolutely necessary for the purpose of proper and legitimate railway development in this country. But I do take the point that where wealthy railway corporations need branch lines which would be carried to completion without a subsidy from the government, or where the company is under the business necessity of building these lines as part of its system, or under some arrangement or agreement with the government, it seems to me that we are going rather far in subsidizing such lines and making a heavy drain upon the revenues of the country. Looking at the five items I have mentioned, two are subsidies for the Canadian Pacific Railway, one for the Canadian Northern Railway and two others for the Grand Trunk Pacific. I find that the total amount of these subsidies authorized by the resolution and Bill is a little over $4,000,000, which is a pretty large sum and a pretty serious obligation. It might turn out, of course, that the roads will cost less than $22,000 a mile, in which case the amount of subsidy would be less, but the total subsidy authorized is no less than $4,079,000. I do not know how many more instances of this kind would develop if one had a proper opportunity to investigate every one of these applications. I deeply regret that, within the time allowed, it is impossible to make such an investigation, and that the information brought down is of so scanty and unsatisfactory a character. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals may be able to give some information with respect of the five lines of which I speak. In the absence of information it does not seem to me that the government has any justification for proposing to subsidize lines which, so far as the facts before the House indicate, would be built in any case without aid from the government.

Mr. GRAHAM. With reference to the two Canadian Pacific Railway lines, one has slipped my memory at the moment, and the one is of 123 miles in length and will not run over $3,200 a mile, as it is in prairie country north of Moosejaw. But, as the committee will remember, earlier in the session, a very strong plea was made to the Railway Department to urge the Canadian Pacific Railway to build a line 123 miles of north of Moosejaw. The reason was that the company had gone so far as to let the contract a year or two ago and people had rushed in there in great numbers. But for some reason it was cancelled. Apparently the road was not going to be built. I took up the question with the Canadian Pacific Railway authorities, and they announced that they would proceed with the building of the road. That was accompanied by a request that if the government were giving subsidies to that kind of a road, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company should be treated as other roads were treated. I thought so myself, and I put it in the list. The other one was applied for by the Canadian Pacific Railway themselves directly. I made what inquiry I could, and I was assured that it was a road that would serve the people and ought to be aided. Now there is this question as to granting subsidies to a road partly constructed, or that would be. Looking at it from one point of view, my hon. friend would be right, but that has not been the view held by the various governments. I find case after case where subsidies have been given to roads already constructed and in operation. If a country needs opening up by a railway, and a railway company is ready to go on with that, knowing that the policy of the government of Canada has been so far to aid railways, and if they proceeded on that assumption, I am inclined to think that it would not be a wise policy to say that because they went on with the work we should not aid it, if it is doing similar work to other roads that are aided. The road from Montreal is not a Grand Trunk Pacific road, it is not so in stated terms. I suppose their charter giving them the right to build brach lines would possibly be the only one at the present time. But in answer to a deputation, all that we said was that we would consider the advisability of aiding a line connecting the Transcontinental with Montreal. I was careful to put it in that way. It is necessary, both for the city of Montreal and for that portion of Canada, as well as for the success of the road, that the connection should be made. Of the Canadian Northern between Montreal and Hawkesbury and Hawkesbury and Ottawa, quite a portion is graded, and the remarks I made a moment ago would apply to that. Work on that road ceased some little time ago. However, I feel this way, possibly I may be wrong, but believing that we must before many years, notwithstanding all that has been said, have another line across the continent on Canadian territory, this being a portion of it, as it will be when it is linked up, and having aided the other two lines, I think it is only fair that we should aid this one. A part of the grading has been done. Taking, however, the view I expressed a few moments ago, that even if some work has been done on a road, it should not be a bar to getting assistance, if doing the same work. I was in favour of granting a subsidy to that line.

Mr. EMMERSON. When there was under consideration the other evening a proposition to build a branch line on Prince

Edward Island connecting with the main Prince Edward Island Railway, I submitted as a proposition for the consideration of the government that they should first determine with respect to branch lines already constructed and connected with their government system. The Minister of Railways and Canals on that occasion said he had very strong personal views with respect to branch lines. I need not quote what he stated, but it will be within the memory of hon. gentlemen that he personally spoke favourably with respect to them, and he said that another announcement would be made in connection with that subject. Yesterday I had occasion to make some remarks when the resolutions upon which this Bill is founded were under consideration. I then asked the government as to their ideas with respect to the branch lines themselves, because while I take no objection to the policy of aiding railways so far as this country can do so, and while I am in favour of that policy, yet it seems to me there should be certain limitations. Furthermore, I think that in determining as to the advanced ground that should be taken by this parliament in relation to aiding additional lines, there should first be considered the position and the condition of the branch lines already constructed, and which have been aided financially by this government. Now the Minister of Railways has stated that he is favourable to aiding the construction of the line of railway between Montreal and the city of Ottawa. His reasons therefor were that this portion between Montreal and Ottawa would undoubtedly be a part of a third transcontinental line of railway. He is aware that there are to-day already running between this city and Montreal three lines of railway, two of them it is true owned by one company and the other owned by the Grand Trunk Railway Company, formerly known as the Canada Atlantic Railway. Now it would seem to me that it is a matter of very serious consideration whether the government, in taking this forward movement, should not first deal with the branch lines, and with its own railway system. The Minister of Railways is disposed to aid a trunk line, the Canadian Northern, and very properly. I take no exception to that. But it seems to me that the government for whom he speaks should take into consideration the Intercolonial, and the relationship which exists between that railway and the lines now connected with it. Now, my hon. friend the Minister of Railways promised a later declaration with respect to the matter, and we had from the right hon. gentleman leading the House, yesterday, in answer to a question put by me, a statement as to the course that the government would take in the matter. The government accepted the principle as one that would be in the interests of the country and as one that would be adopted. The proposition would be adopted if the Intercolonial Railway were owned by a private corporation and that is a business proposition which must be acceptable to the country and in the interests of the country. He stated that

The matter has been given a good deal of consideration, but we have not yet been able to make up our minds that it is a policy we should adopt. Whilst we are not prepared to say to my hon. friend——

That is referring to myself—

—that we shall adopt this policy, we realize that it is one which requires consideration and makes it incumbent upon the government to make the fullest inquiry in order that we may be in a position to discuss the matter adequately at another session.

That declaration may mean a good deal. There is a statement that an inquiry will be had, and I think it is due to this committee, as it is due to the country, that the nature of that inquiry should be disclosed. The government apparently have given the matter a good deal of consideration and they realize that it is a policy that requires consideration and places upon the government the responsibility of making the fullest inquiry in order that the matter may be considered at the next session or at another session. We are asked to deal with these propositions. There are railways that may be aided. Certainly we are incurring obligations with respect to certain proposed railways. We should not lose sight of the railways which we have already constructed, the railways in the eastern section of Canada and the railways that were constructed as feeders of the Intercolonial Railway and which were very largely constructed because of the fact that they would be feeders. I had occasion at the last session of this parliament to invite the attention of the House to the statements made by Sir Charles Tupper when he was asking assistance for the construction of certain of these lines and he justified that aid and assistance, properly so, by the fact that these lines would be feeders. I do not propose to take up the time of the committee by going fully into the question, but I think it might fairly be accepted on all sides that the Intercolonial Railway has not been rounded out and will never be rounded out until it has control of its sphere of influence, until it has the control and management of the lines which may serve and which do measurably serve as feeders. In the interest of that section of the country these lines should be operated by the Intercolonial Railway. Now, I would like to ask the minister if he can acquaint this committee with the character of the investigation which is to be made. I quite appreciate the fact that no government should acquire any railways as feeders, that no government should acquire any of these branch lines without first getting the fullest possible information, without

first knowing what they were doing and then that they could only acquire them as a business proposition. I simply put that question to the minister, and I trust that he will take us and the country into his confidence with respect to the proposed inquiry. I ask if the government intend to have that inquiry and if they intend to have it at once ?

Mr. GRAHAM. The question of branch railways, I have discovered, during the short time that I have been in this department, is one that is very vital particularly along the line of the Intercolonial Railway. If the Intercolonial Railway were run by a company there are branch lines now that would be a part of that system. The government railway is under somewhat different conditions possibly, but if the Intercolonial Railway is to retain its position it is worth while to very seriously consider if it ought not to go that far in carrying out business principles in order to see that it gets the traffic that rightly belongs to it. If, in the maritime provinces, keen competition should arise with the Intercolonial Railway we might wake up some morning possibly and find that another line had the branch lines and consequently the business that they now give to the Intercolonial Railway in a minor way. This is a large question. It affects Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Quebec. In all there are in the railways that would be called branches about 1,200 miles. There has been a report upon the branch lines of New Brunswick made at the request of the government of New Brunswick. That report I have. In short this is what I propose to do : In order to get the information that would be a basis to work on, it will be necessary to ascertain the length of each line, the amount of its traffic, its revenue, expenditure, rolling stock, the condition of the road and the probability of the development of business along the line.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What option there is on the line.

Mr. GRAHAM. The option possibly.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. And who holds the option ?

Mr. GRAHAM. These things would have to be investigated thoroughly, and I assume that the investigation would be along the line of getting this information so that we would be in a position to discuss in a business way the question as to whether we should take over these branch lines. During the recess I propose to have such an investigation made.

Mr. FOWLER. The Minister of Railways and Canals has proved himself a most excellent jollier. The minister says that he has already in his hands a report from the commission appointed by the late government in the province of New Brunswick in regard to branch lines. I have no doubt that report was a very full and exhaustive one because the gentleman who acted on that commission received a very handsome honorarium and I know he is a man of ability and I believe he made a thorough examination.

Mr. EMMERSON. There were two of them.

Mr. FOWLER. There were two of them. It seems strange that the Minister of Railways found it necessary to make another examination.

Mr. GRAHAM. If my hon. friend had the responsibility he would not accept the report of any other officials except those immediately responsible to him no matter how eminent they might be. Before I would take any step towards serious consideration I would want a report of a man responsible to me as I am responsible to this House.

Mr. FOWLER. Surely the minister would have sufficient confidence in the men who ran the government of New Brunswick before March the 3rd to believe they would only appoint men who were competent, straightforward, honest and trustworthy ? When the minster says he is going to make a further examination he is simply jollying the hon. member for Westmoreland.

Mr. GRAHAM. There is a province of Quebec and a province of Nova Scotia as well as a province of New Brunswick.

Mr. FOWLER. Then let us know what the policy is in regard to the branch lines in New Brunswick ? The majority of this House have been cheerfully voting large sums of money for railways in all parts of the country, and it seems to me it would be far more important to take over the tributary lines of the government railways. We have granted a large subsidy for a line to Hudson bay although we know nothing of the territory through which it shall pass, and we have conflicting testimony as to the practicability of the water route when the railway is built. The minister can quite understand that one management instead of several ; that the utilization on the branch lines of the lighter rails taken from the main line, instead of selling them to favoured friends as old junk, with tremendous profit to the men who buy and great loss to the railway which sells ; the minister knows that this would tend to great economy in the management.

Mr. EMMERSON. The old rails on the Intercolonial have not been sold as old junk to friends of the government. They have always been put up to tender and the highest bidder got them.

Mr. FOWLER. Perhaps a better price may have been obtained than the hon. gen-

tleman would get for the broken pots and pans in his own house, but all the same these rails were sold as junk to be broken up. Mr. Mathew Lodge made extensive purchases of these rails and I understood he was quite a friend of the government because the government was quite a friend to him.

Mr. EMMERSON. I dont think Mr. Lodge ever bought any rails.

Mr. FOWLER. Perhaps not when my hon. friend was minister, but it was commonly reported that he did.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think not, but what is the point if he bought them by tender?

Mr. FOWLER. I said that these rails were sold to Mr. Lodge whom I took to be a friend of the government.

Mr. EMMERSON. Sold by tender.

Mr. FOWLER. So were the timber limits and the coal lands sold by tender, but we know what happened. In certain districts in New Brunswick very great sacrifices have been made by the people to get these lines of railway. In one of the counties I have the honour to represent a heavy and a grievous tax was placed on the people for the purpose of getting these branch lines built. New Brunswick, compared with some other provinces, is poor in resources, but here in the great provinces of Ontario and Quebec, between Ottawa and Montreal, where there are at present three lines of railway, a fourth is being built, and it is being largely subsidized by this government; subsidized to an extent that would go a long way towards purchasing these branch lines in New Brunswick and making them part of the Intercolonial. The principle of acquiring these branch lines was adopted three or four years ago, when the government purchased the Canada Eastern. Why did they do that?

An hon. MEMBER. Because it was connecting with the Canadian Pacific Railway, another great trunk line.

Mr. FOWLER. But the Canadian Pacific already had a connection with the Intercolonial at St. John. The reason why they acquired the Canada Eastern was because of the political exigency that existed at the time, and because it was necessary to carry out a pledge whereby they had been enabled to elect a supporter in the county of York, N.B. That is the reason why; and at the very time that scheme went through I brought up the question of the acquisition by the government of the rest of the branch lines in the province of New Brunswick. I asked if that policy was to be adopted, and I got a very unsatisfactory reply from the then Minister of Railways. But it seems to me that if we have all the money required for these various railway schemes—although the Finance Minister may have some difficulty when he comes to borrow—and if we have cheerfully voted for the building of canals in these upper provinces, which yield no revenue whatever to this Dominion, we ought to have some consideration for the maritime provinces in this regard. Take the scheme of the Georgian bay canal, which will cost, at the lowest estimate, about a hundred millions or, if we may judge from our experience with the Grand Trunk Pacific, will cost more than double that estimate, which would be $200,000,000, a very small portion of this would enable us to purchase all these branch lines in the province of New Brunswick. For these reasons, I do think that the government should announce its policy now in favour of the acquisition of all the branch lines which are feeders to the Intercolonial Railway. It should not be a question whether or not these branch lines are particularly profitable, but only whether the price at which they can be obtained is a fair price or not.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend, in referring to purchase of the Canada Eastern Railway by the government, knows that he was not accurate in his statement of the object. The object of securing that line was to protect the Intercolonal in its sphere of influence, and to prevent the Canadian Pacific Railway acquiring the line and invading the territory controlled by the Intercolonial. The purchase was made at less than $6,000 per mile. It was the cheapest railway that was ever purchased in Canada; but it was for that particular purpose and for no other that the railway was acquired, as my hon. friend knows.

Mr. FOWLER. I find no fault with the price paid for the Canada Eastern Railway: but I do say that the purchase was not for the reason stated by the hon. member for Westmoreland, but that there was an understanding between a certain gentleman who was very prominent at that time and very influential in the county of York whereby the government party were enabled in the election of 1900 to carry the county of York for the government. The government did not carry out the terms, and session after session passed by until the election of 1904 came on, when the government found it necessary to carry out the terms, otherwise there would have been trouble. Any gentleman who was a member of this House at that time, and was acquainted with the then member for York, would know that he was calculating on this arrangement, and that he could be heard in these corridors declaiming against the government for their failure to carry it out. It was common knowledge that in the last session he was kicking all the time because that arrangement was not carried out, and finally it was carried out. But gratitude is a lively sense

of favours yet to come, and as the railway had been bought, the people returned to their previous allegiance, and elected my hon. friend who now represents the county of York, and who will be elected again to represent it at the next election.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I had a great deal to do in the provincial legislature with urging from time to time the adoption of resolutions in favour of the acquisition of these branch roads. The hon. gentleman truly says that the government of which I was a member appointed a commission for the purpose of making an inquiry into all the branches in the province which were feeders of the Intercolonial Railway, with a view of furnishing the Minister of Railways with such information as would be of value in order to enable him to determine whether or not it would be desirable to take over these roads. My hon. friend has given us a bit of ancient history. What is more important to us to-day, in regard to the Canada Eastern Railway, is to know whether the acquisition of that railway was in the public interest. I say unhesitatingly that it was. The Canada Eastern has proved to be a valuable feeder of the Intercolonial, and I personally have felt, and I have not changed my view in that respect, that it would be in the interest of the public and to the advantage of the Intercolonial Railway to have it considered by an expert whether all the branches in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Quebec would be likely to prove valuable feeders to the Intercolonial if taken over. I think my hon. friend is unfair to the Minister of Railways in suggesting that he is trying to jolly my hon. friend who represents the county of Westmoreland, who has taken a warm and earnest interest in this question. I think the Minister of Railways is pursuing a prudent course, which will commend itself to the best judgment of the people of the country when he proposes. through the officials of his department, to conduct a minute inquiry into all these branch lines in the provinces of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Quebec. I feel sure that my hon. friend the Minister of Railways is thoroughly sincere in this. I feel that he desires to obtain the fullest possible information, and I can say for one that I am satisfied that the information which he will obtain will convince him that it will be not only in the interest of the maritime provinces, in the interest of the province of Quebec and in the interest of the whole country, but also in the interest of the Intercolonial Railway itself, that he should adopt the policy which has been adopted universally by all the great trunk lines in the country, that is, to acquire all these branches, or such of them as can be acquired on reasonable terms, which will prove valuable feeders to the Intercolonial Railway and increase its traffic and its earning power.

Mr. FOWLER. It must be grateful to the Minister of Railways to get a certificate of sincerity from so sincere a person as the Minister of Public Works. The minister tells us that as a member of the local government of New Brunswick he appointed a commission to inquire and obtain for the Minister of Railways so much valuable information. It is unfortunate that he did not discuss the matter with the Minister of Railways.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That does not happen to be what I said.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not remember the exact words, but that is practically what he said. It is unfortunate that he did not discuss the matter with the Minister of Railways so as to learn from him whether he would consider as valuable the information which that commission was supposed to obtain. Now, the hon. Minister of Public Works is in a position, as a member of the government, to make his influence felt in regard to this matter of branch lines; and when all these subsidies were being considered by the government, why did he not put in a word for the branch lines in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Quebec?

Mr. PUGSLEY. How do you know that I did not?

Mr. FOWLER. I am sure that he did not, because knowing the great influence which the hon. gentleman would have on his colleagues, knowing the great assistance he has been to the government and the tremendous strength he has brought to it, which the First Minister must realize, his influence would be so great that he would be able to impose his views upon his colleagues and if he had advocated with his heart and soul and strength the construction of these branch lines they would have adopted that policy.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I think it strange when we hear so much from ministers and members on the other side about the acquisition of feeders for the Intercolonial Railway that they have said nothing about the Prince Edward Island Railway, which would be the most valuable feeder they could have for the Intercolonial Railway if a connecting link between the Intercolonial Railway and it were constructed. It seems there is either a concerted plan on the part of the government to overlook Prince Edward Island or else there is some ulterior motive in relation to the buying of these branch lines. We have had many promises of investigation and report. It seems strange that they should overlook the most profitable feeder the Intercolonial Railway could have.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

QUEBEC BRIDGE.

Bill (No. 217) respecting the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company—Mr. Graham—read the second time and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has the government come to a conclusion as to whether the present site and the works there will be utilized or will some other site be chosen? Have any inquiries been made on the subject ?

Mr. GRAHAM. The position of the government is this. Leaving aside everything that has happened, this fact stares us in the face, the Quebec bridge is down and the Quebec bridge has to go up. It is the duty of the government to see that the plan is carried out as parliament has directed. This Bill provides for taking over the enterprise in accordance with the agreement. Different opinions are expressed as to using the present site. Some members say that the present material will do. I am not offering any opinion, but I say the first duty of the government is to select a board of engineers composed of two or three of the most prominent engineers in the world. To them will be entrusted the duty of seeing if any or all of the piers, if any or all of the material or design, is adequate for the construction of the bridge. To them will be entrusted the task of selecting a design for the construction of the Quebec bridge. My idea is to submit to them the question of site as well, and to take their advice largely as to the best place to build the bridge and the design to be followed. For, whatever has happened, it must be obvious to every person that no mistakes ought to be made in the future, but that the structure to be erected there should be a lasting one and a credit to Canada, because it will be the greatest of its kind in the world.

Mr. ROBITAILLE. I hope that estimates will be made not only for the present site but also for construction by way of the Island of Orleans. It may be remembered that the objection to the Island of Orleans scheme was that it might cost $1,500,000 or $2,000,000 more. But the cost of railway terminals is also to be considered. Estimates should be made so as to show the cost of both bridge and terminals by either route. It may be that the bridge by the Island of Orleans scheme will cost more, this will be more than made up in the saving on the terminals.

Mr. FOWLER. Is the government to pay the bridge company anything for compensation ?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is provided for in the agreement—the par value of the stock with 5 per cent simple interest and the bonus of 10 per cent.

Mr. LEFURGEY.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the amount of the stock ?

Mr. ROBITAILLE. It will be $400,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. Hon. gentlemen are inclined to guess at that. I have here the figures given me by the accountant :

Par value of the capital stock (round figures, $263,000) to which is to be added a bonus of 10 per cent and 5 per cent simple interest from the date the stock was paid up (approximately) $353,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The statute provides that the government may take over the work on paying the amount of the stock with simple interest at 5 per cent per annum, the interest to be reduced by any amounts paid as dividend, and also a bonus of 10 per cent. But there is something more important, and it is this : the government, taking over the stock and the whole enterprise, must assume all the obligations of the company entered upon with the consent of the government and also the bonded indebtedness. What is the amount covered by this last obligation so far as the minister is aware ?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have a statement here showing the liabilities up to July 1 :

Statement as to July 1, 1908, showing the liabilities for which the government will be responsible in connection with the taking over of the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company; also a statement of the assets of the said company.

Liabilities.

Total amount claimed by the Bank of Montreal as due by the bridge company, being the balance of principal advances on bond account together with interest on the same; also the amounts of temporary loans and interest on the same from the date the last advance was made on bond account..	$3,976,796 23
Total indebtedness of the company to the federal government, being the amount advanced under authority of chapter 35 of the Acts of 1907..	2,000,000 00
Interest on above, from February 9 to June 30 (approximately).. ..	23,334 00
Customs duties due to the federal government..	133,027 00
Land expropriated from the Quebec Improvement Company, some 32 acres, for which the company would accept in final settlement.	14,000 00
Par value of the capital stock (round figures, $263,000) to which is to be added a bonus of 10 per cent and 5 per cent simple interest from the date the stock was paid up (approximately)..	353,000 00
Total for which the government will be liable..	$6,500,157 23

Roughly speaking, this is about the amount of the bonds I think. The Phœnix

Bridge Company make a claim for material delivered, but of course that is not allowed. I need not discuss it.

Mr. FOWLER. How much is it?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think it is $215,000 for material delivered which does not belong to us. These following amounts are given me as assets if the bridge is to be constructed in the same place :

Assets.

Piers which the company claims may be utilized in reconstructing the bridge on new plans, and which cost about $1,125,000, but which the company claims could not be built to-day for less than $2,000,000.. ..	$2,000,000
Approaches, including Chaudière bridge, which the company claim are worth..	1,000,000
Large quantities of manufactured steel, delivered at the time of the accident, or stored up in the company's yards since then, and part of which the company claim could be utilized in construction..	1,000,000
Total assets..	$4,000,000

Mr. FOWLER. It is a pity you had not built more piers; as the profit on them would have met all the loss on the bridge.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, if we could have sold them, but unfortunately the market is confined to only those piers needed for the bridge. Those that are there could not be built for less than $2,000,000.

Mr. FOWLER. I suppose the material spoken of there is under water.

Mr. GRAHAM. No ; a great deal of it is stored. Some of the engineers claim that a great deal of it could be used. I suppose much would depend on the design of the bridge. I do not care to express an opinion. but it seems to me that the present site and piers will do. If the site is retained. the piers ought to be usable.

Mr. FOWLER. It strikes me that this is a pretty fair bargain for the company, but a pretty bad one for the country.

Mr. GRAHAM. We are not making a bargain but carrying out the statute.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—PUBLIC BILLS AND ORDERS.

Mr. FIELDING. There is a Bill on Public Bills and Orders which I would ask leave to call. I quite realize that a Bill of this character can only go through at this stage by general consent, and I think probably the character of this Bill may get such consent. I beg leave to move that item 66 on Public Bills and Orders, being Bill (No. 187) to amend the Canadian Temperance Act, be now called.

Mr. LANCASTER. Before that motion is put, while I do not object to the subject matter of the Bill, I desire to protest against this Bill taking precedence of my Bill on a very much more important subject. This House unanimously passed my Bill to amend the Railway Act early in the session, and sent it to the Senate before Christmas. It was a Bill to protect the lives of every man, woman and child from the fatal accidents that are taking place every day at railway crossings. The Senate amended that Bill three or four months afterwards, and sent it back to this House. A week or ten days ago I asked the House to consider this Bill, and was told by the Minister of Railways that it was too late in the session, and that they could not take up any Public Bills and Orders. I think if any Bill is to be taken up, it should be that one.

Mr. FIELDING. I would not care to offer any opinion on that point to-night. I realize now that this Bill to amend the Canada Temperance Act can not go through, unless it meets with general approval. I judge from what my hon. friend says that this Bill may be a matter of debate, I offer no opinion concerning it. But if there is no objection to this Bill, we can deal with it.

Mr. LANCASTER. Two wrongs do not make one right. I was pointing out that a much more important Bill did not get any such treatment, and I do not think it is right.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to look at the Bill. Let it stand till to-morrow.

Mr. FIELDING. Then we will let it stand till to-morrow, if my hon. friend prefers. There is another Bill, item 65, a Bill from the Senate relating to the water carriage of goods. If there be no objection, I would like to take that up.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the nature of it?

Mr. FIELDING. It relates to an important subject.

Mr. LEFURGEY. There is a good deal of objection to that ; it is an obnoxious Bill.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If I had any idea that these two Bills were coming up I would have looked at them, but I have not been able to do so. Otherwise, I would be happy to go on with them to-night.

Mr. FIELDING. The attention of the House was called to it by the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean), and I intimated to him the other day that the Bill would not be called. However, I will not press it now.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 1.50 a.m., Saturday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SATURDAY, July 18, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

NATIONAL BATTLEFIELDS COMMISSION—PURCHASE OF LANDS AT QUEBEC.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 219) respecting the National Battlefields at Quebec. He said: This Bill is introduced in consequence of the resolution adopted by the National Battlefields Commission which has been communicated to me as follows:

At a meeting of the National Battlefields Commission, held on the 16th instant, the following resolution was adopted:

Resolved, whereas the great work entailed in the tercentenary celebration of the founding of Quebec has absorbed all the time of the National Battlefields Commission; whereas it is most expedient that the commission should be empowered to secure without undue delay certain properties belonging to private parties and which will be required for the Battlefield park; whereas section 10 of the Act constituting the commission requires the authority of parliament before any land or immovable property is purchased or acquired by the commission; whereas delay means the enhancing in value of many of the said properties which might at present be obtained at a much lower figure than would be likely later; the National Battlefields Commission urgently recommends that the Act respecting the National Battlefields at Quebec be amended so as to empower the commission, subject to the previous authority of the Governor in Council, to acquire if necessary, any or all of the properties specified in a memorandum sent to the Governor General in Council on the fifteenth day of July instant such properties as are not mentioned in the said memorandum to remain subject to clause 10 of the said Act.

J. GEO. GARNEAU,
Chairman, National Battlefields Commission.

Section 10, which is here referred to, reads as follows:

No land or immovable property shall be purchased or acquired by the commission except with the previous authority of parliament.

This law relates not merely to the money voted by parliament but to all other moneys which come into the hands of the commission; none of these moneys may be used for the purchase of lands except with the previous authority of parliament. As the public knows, large sums have been subscribed to the Battlefields Commission, and it is expeceted that the Prince of Wales will hand over the money to the commission with some statement made to him of the property which it is intended immediately to acquire for the purpose of creating a Battlefields park. I have a plan, here which I will place in the hands of hon. gentlemen on the other side, showing the property which it is intended to acquire. This property is described in the following statement prepared by Mr. E. G. Meredith, notary public.

1. A tract of land on the north side of the Ste. Foye road, belonging to the Heirs Tourangeau and others. (Site of the battle of Ste. Foye,—a part of which surrounds the lot of land upon which is erected a monument to the memory of General Lévis and General Murray—'Monument des braves') and which is bounded as follows, viz.:

In front to the south by the Ste. Foye road, in rear to the north, by the brow of the hill (Cime du Cap)—on one side towards the east by lot number twenty-five,—belonging to I. A. Fortin, and on the other side towards the west by lot number twenty-eight, belonging to the representatives of the late J. W. Dunscomb.

Which said tract of land was formerly known and distinguished as lot number twenty-six (26) upon the official cadastral plan for the Banlieue, parish of Notre Dame de Quebec, but which lot has since been subdivided—and the said tract of land is now known and distinguished by different numbers, all of which are subdivisions of the said original lot number twenty-six—together with and including all or any part of the said original lot—number twenty-six, as the same is now laid out and shown on the plan of the subdivision of the said lot number twenty-six as streets or avenues, and including all or any dwelling houses or other buildings of any kind erected on the said tract of land.

2. A strip of land on the south side of the said Ste. Foye road, to be taken off the front or northerly end of lots numbers sixty-eight (68), seventy-five (75) and seventy-six (76), and seventy-nine (79) on the cadastral plan for the said Banlieue, parish of Notre Dame de Quebec, the said strip of land to be of such a depth as, when the same is added to the present width of the said Ste. Foye road, will make the said road seventy-five feet wide in that locality.

3. A strip of land on the east side of the Belvedere road, to be taken off the west side of the said lot number sixty-eight (68) above mentioned, and off the front or west end of lots numbers sixty-nine (69), seventy (70), seventy-one (71), seventy-two (72) and seventy-three (73) on the cadastral plan for the said Banlieue, parish of Notre Dame de Quebec, the said strip of land to be of such a depth as, when the same is added to the present width of the said Belvedère road, will make the said road seventy-five feet wide from one end of the same to the other.

4. A strip of land on the north side of the St. Louis road (starting from the junction of the said Belvedère road and the said the St. Louis road and running in a westerly direction) to be taken off the south side of lot number two hundred and twenty six (226)—the front or south end of lot number two hundred and twenty (220)—and about one third of the whole frontage or south end of lot number two hundred and eighteen (218) upon the cadastral plan for the parish of St. Colomba de Sillery. The said strip of land to be of such a depth as, when the same is added

to the present width of the said St. Louis road, will make the said road seventy-five feet wide in that locality,—with any houses or buildings to be found on the said strip of land.

5. A strip of land on the west side of 'Gilmour's Hill' (which leads from the St. Louis road to 'Wolfe's Cove') starting from the junction of said 'Gilmour's Hill' with the said St. Louis road and running in a southerly and southeasterly direction as far as the brow of the hill (Cime du Cap)—the said strip of land to be taken off the easterly side of lots numbers two hundred and fourteen (214)—two hundred and seventeen (217) and two hundred and twenty-eight (228) upon the cadastral plan for the said parish of St. Colomba de Sillery. The said strip of land to be of such a depth as, when the same is added to the present width of 'Gilmour's Hill,' will make the said hill seventy-five feet wide in that locality, together with any houses or other buildings erected on the said strip of land.

6. A strip of land seventy-five feet in width by the whole length of the 'Marchmont property' now the 'Merici Convent,' on the west side of the Plains of Abraham,—which was formerly distinguished as lot number two hundred and twenty-seven (227) upon the cadastral plan for the said parish of St. Colomba de Sillery but which is now subdivided into numerous lots,—the said strip of land to be taken as close as may be found to be practicable to the brow of the cliff (Cime du Cap)—and also the whole of the irregular tract of land which will lie between the said strip of land when laid out and the said brow of the hill or Cime du Cap.

7. A tract of land comprising several lots of land with houses and other buildings erected thereon in the neighbourhood of 'Wolfe's Monument,' to the east of the Plains of Abraham, which is bounded as follows:—In front towards the north by St. Louis street or Grande Allee, in rear towards the south by Monument street (on which street Wolfe's monument is erected), on one side towards the east by lot number one hundred and fifty-three and on the other side towards the west by the Plains of Abraham with the streets intersecting or adjoining same namely:—Wolfe street and Monument street, the said tract of land comprising the lots numbers one hundred and fifty-two, one hundred and fifty-four, one hundred and fifty-five, one hundred and fifty-six, one hundred and sixty-one, one hundred and sixty-one A, one hundred and sixty-one B, one hundred and sixty-two, one hundred and sixty-three, one hundred and sixty-three A, one hundred and sixty-three B, and one hundred and sixty-four, (152, 154, 155, 156, 161, 161A, 161B, 162, 163, 163A, 163B and 164) on the cadastral plan for the Banlieue parish of Notre Dame de Quebec.

8. A piece of land forming the southerly part of lot number four thousand and forty-one (4441) on the cadastral plan for Montcalm ward of the city of Quebec, containing from five thousand to eight thousand feet in superficies, and a piece of land forming the southerly and southwesterly part of lot number four thousand four hundred and forty-two (4442) on the said cadastral plan containing from twelve thousand to fifteen thousand feet in superficies, (said properties belonging to the Ladies Protestant Home of Quebec and the heirs Lampson respectively).

9. The lot of land originally bearing the number four thousand four hundred and forty (4440) on the cadastral plan for Montcalm ward of the city of Quebec, which is now subdivided into numerous lots belonging to the Seminary of Quebec and commonly called 'the Seminary farm,' with the house and other buildings thereon erected.

10. A small piece of land forming the south east corner of the property of the church of England Female Orphan Asylum (which adjoins the said seminary farm.

The only objection which I can see to this Bill at the present time is that no maximum purchase price is fixed. I pointed that out in Quebec, and I asked if it were not possible to fix a maximum price, and I received this telegram from His Excellency:

Description of property battlefields mailed yesterday, terms of sales not yet arranged as owners of scheduled property advancing price daily. Think commission should be empowered to use moneys already subscribed for purchase.

The Bill, therefore, which I introduced is as follows:

An Act Respecting the National Battlefields at Quebec.

Whereas the National Battlefields Commission has requested that it be empowered to purchase, acquire and hold the lands or immovable property hereinafter referred to, and it is expedient to comply with such request: therefore His Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:—

1. The National Battlefields Commission may subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, purchase, acquire and hold the lands and immovable property set forth and described in the schedule to this Act.

Then follows the schedule which I have read.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When the Act now proposed to be amended came before parliament this session, objection was taken by several hon. gentlemen to the provisions of section 5 which read:

The commission may purchase, acquire and hold the lands or immovable property in the city of Quebec, or in the vicinity thereof, where the great battles were fought, or which were occupied by the various commands of the respective armies upon the battlefields.

The section is very indefinite as to the extent of lands proposed to be purchased, and it seems to confer upon the commission a very wide power which might commit the people of this country to an enormous expenditure, the extent of which cannot be foretold. There was very little information before the House at the time and by reason of the paucity of information clause 10 to which the Prime Minister has just called attention was inserted, and it reads:

No lands or immovable property shall be purchased or acquired by the commission except with the previous authority of parliament, and no expenditure shall be made by the commission until it has been approved by parliament.

It is beyond question that the measure as introduced would have involved a very protracted debate and would have encountered very strong opposition if it had not been for the insertion of a provision of that kind. I think it was I who suggested that provision, but I did not suggest it exactly in that form. The amendment which the Prime Minister inserted in the Bill in accordance with my suggestion went beyond the scope of what I proposed. What I recollect to have proposed on that occasion was that no moneys voted by this parliament should be expended for any such purpose unless with the previous approval of parliament. This parliament voted the sum of $300,000 by section 8 of the Act to be paid over to the commission, and by section 16 it was provided that the whole or a portion of that amount might be devoted to the purposes of the celebration which is to take place during the coming week. But apart from the moneys which were to be derived by the commission from the parliament of Canada there were other moneys, the anticipated origin of which is set forth in section 7. The commission was authorized to receive moneys contributed not only by this parliament but by the different legislatures of the provinces, or by any municipal or other body, or by any private individual for the purposes of the Act. So far as the money voted by this parliament is concerned it might be and no doubt was a very proper thing to insert the provision which is embodied in section 10, but in as much as a very large amount of the moneys now available to the commission have been derived, not from the vote of this parliament but from other sources, I am inclined to think parliament might intrust to the Governor in Council the supervision of the expenditure of these moneys for the purposes mentioned in the Act, now proposed by the Prime Minister. Possibly a word or two in amendment of the Act, as just now introduced, might be inserted. So far as I am personally concerned I would not insist very much on that. It may be said of course that information should be given to parliament with regard to the price proposed to be paid, and I would think that the commission would do well not to be in too great haste if such haste should involve the payment of any exorbitant sum for any portion of this land. It will be remembered by hon. gentlemen that section 6 of the statute confers upon the commission all the powers of expropriation with which any railway company is invested under the Railway Act for the purposes of its undertaking. In that provision the commission has a very effective safeguard against the payment of any exorbitant price, and bearing that in mind and also that the proposed purchase is to be subject to the approval and supervision of the Governor in Council, for my part I do not see any objection to the legislation which the Prime Minister proposes.

Mr. FOWLER. It seems to me that under the legislation which was passed with regard to these national battlefields, the commission entered upon a campaign of money collection, and that there was an agreement or contract entered into between the subscribers to that fund and the commission or this parliament, that the conditions under which the commission was appointed and the duties prescribed for them and the power given them, were to be maintained. It was under these conditions the subscriptions were made. Now these conditions are proposed to be removed, and proposed to be removed at this, the last day of the session when there is no time to consider these matters. But there is a plea of urgency. Urgency is a plea that has been made to do service on many occasions. Where can possibly be the urgency? The people who own these lands on the Plains of Abraham have known for many months that there was a proposition to acquire them for a national park, and why has it become so suddenly urgent that these lands should be acquired by the commission? What has caused the price to go up so rapidly just at this juncture? I cannot see anything in that plea at all. I do not see any sufficient reason put forward why the tacit contract or agreement between this parliament and the gentlemen and legislatures who have subscribed to this fund, should be violated. Let this national commission take options upon this property. Parliament will meet soon again, a new parliament, it is true, but parliament will meet in the course of a very few months before the new year. Let the commission take four or five months option upon this property, and then parliament will be in a position to deal with it. I do not see any necessity for this Bill, and I must protest against it.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it correct to say that the grant that has been made by parliament of $300,000 is none of it available for the purchase of this land? Has all that land been taken by the commission?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The greater part of the land has already been appropriated by the commission, and I am told the whole of it will be subscribed.

Mr. FOSTER. Not for the purchase of land?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Not for the purchase of land. If my hon. friend will refer to the discussion which took place in this House at the time of the second reading of the Bill he will see that there was a vigorous insistence that all moneys, both

moneys voted by parliament and moneys coming from other sources, should be subject to the control of parliament. This was particularly in view of the possible purchase of the Ross rifle factory. The Ross rifle factory is not included in the present grant of land.

Mr. FOSTER. I understood the Prime Minister to say that none of the Ross rifle property is included.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is correct.

Mr. THOS. CHISHOLM. Without attempting to debate this question, I merely wish to enter my protest against the passage of this Bill at this late hour of the session.

Mr. BARR. As one that voted against this enormous grant, I must enter my protest against this proposition in the last hours of the session. I think we might well afford to wait until parliament meets again.

Mr. LENNOX. As I understand the matter, when we did put this saving clause in the last Act, section 10, I think, people would understand that before we disposed of the money we would thoroughly investigate the circumstances. I think that duty is cast upon us, and I regret that at this time of the session the right hon. gentleman has brought this matter up. I do not blame the administration for not having brought it up sooner, because I presume they could not bring it up until about this time. In the meantime, I think we are not right in disposing of this money that the people have contributed, without knowing more of the circumstances than we do. The Prime Minister says that we are not by this attempting to purchase the Ross rifle property. That is true, but we are committing ourselves to a scheme which will involve in the end the purchase of that factory. Whilst I realize that we have no time to discuss the matter now, if I had control of the situation I would not sanction the proposal of this money at the present time. So far as I am concerned, I throw upon the government the entire onus of seeing that what is right is done in this matter.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first and second time and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Mr. LANCASTER. I think the Prime Minister should explain where the urgency for this Bill exists. It may be necessary to do it at some time, but I do not see any present necessity. Why won't it do just as well four or five months from now ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have stated that the only authority we have is a resolution of the Battlefields Commission, which pleads urgency for this measure.

Mr. LANCASTER. The right hon. gentleman did not give any reasons, even today, to show necessity. Why cannot a better bargain be made in the fall of the year or next spring when parliament will be in session? Generally speaking, in a hasty bargain the country gets the worst of it and the other fellow gets the best of it. Although I understand the commission as saying that it is necessary, I take that to mean that it is going to be in the near future. But surely it is not absolutely vital that it shall be done next week? The land is not going to run away, the affairs of the country will still be going on and I do not see any reason for doing it now without the information which we ought to have. It is a matter which might be thoroughly investigated, and unless there is some great urgency I am bound to say that I must protest against the Bill passing.

Mr. BARR. There does not seem to be any reason why we should accept the ipse dixit of the commission or that this parliament cannot perform its duties without a direction from the commission. We must hold ourselves responsible for the way the money is used, for the trust which is given to us by those who subscribed this money.

Mr. FOSTER. As I understand it, this Act is absolutely independent of and makes no change in the National Battlefields Act as we passed it?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. With this exception only nothing is changed.

Mr. FOSTER. It makes no change in any other particular ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. FOSTER. This is an Act which stands entirely by itself for this one purpose and no other?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is right.

Mr. FOSTER. The Governor in Council is authorized to approve of the purchase and holding of this land and no other?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No other.

Mr. FOSTER. Then the Bill remains to apply to all other purchases that are made and none of these purchases can be consummated without coming to parliament and asking the assent of parliament thereto? What is the extent of the land that is being purchased ? There are rings and edges around the other part of the land. I could not tell from that plan which the right hon. gentleman has shown us what already belongs to the government. I take it as a matter of fact that the waste land of the government will become part of the National Battlefields. I cannot tell anything from that plan as to whether, when this purchase is made to go with what the government owns and which is not occupied by the rifle factory, we will have any more

than eight or ten lumps of land scattered here and there, or whether it is to help to fill out or complete a portion of land which lies altogether and becomes a connected part. If we are just to have patches of land here and there throughout the city and call that a park it does not amount to much.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If I had the plan I could show my hon. friend what we propose to purchase.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like to say that there is a feeling abroad that there will be a great deal of extravagance in connection with this undertaking. Now, when the government is proposing to make changes, giving wider and greater power to the commission it is important that the government should point out that this is likely to run into an enormous expenditure. For myself I think it would be better if the government would halt a little until parliament sees how these men will expend the money and the amount of caution they will exercise in the expenditure of it before they are given wider powers. I do not wish to enter any very strong protest, but I do say that it is unfortunate that the government, at this very late hour, should introduce this legislation, and I hope the government will direct the attention of these gentlemen to the fact that they have great powers and that they must exercise great caution or they may call upon parliament to appropriate a larger amount than the people are willing to pay.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think it will be doing my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) no injustice to say I do not believe he has any undue confidence in this government; I cannot understand him suggesting that we should make a recommendation to a commission, which, in his opinion, ought to be composed of far better men than we are. One member of the commission is Mr. Garneau. Perhaps my hon. friend does not know Mr. Garneau. He is the mayor of Quebec. The next commissioner is Senator Sir George Drummond, in whom my hon. friend must have confidence. The next member of the commission is Colonel Denison, and I think my hon. friend must also have confidence in Colonel Denison.

Mr. FOSTER. He will keep order.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The fourth commissioner is Mr. Walker, of the Bank of Commerce.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. He will hold the purse strings.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think he can be trusted. The next commissioner is Mr. Turgeon, and if Mr. Turgeon is inclined to be, as we are supposed to be, extravagant, he will be checked by the other members of the commission; so that I think my hon. friend's opinions are utterly uncalled for.

Mr. HENDERSON. While we may have the utmost confidence in these men, I must say that recently they have got into very bad company.

Mr. FOSTER. When we began about this national battlefield the idea seemed to be generally approved of, and we thought that this commission would be able to look over the whole matter, arrive at its plans, and submit to parliament a proposal as to what it intended to do, so that we would know just exactly what was meant by the National Battlefields park. We thought we would know how much ground we were going to have and how it was proposed to lay it out and beautify it, and that an estimate of the whole cost would be given. What I object to, and I think it is a valid objection, is that you buy a little piece here and a little piece there and a little in another place, and there is absolutely no general plan at all as to what we are going to have. No general information is given to us as to what the scheme will be when it is all thought out. I would like to have seen the commissioners propose their plan, and then let that plan be submitted for the information of the House. As I understand it, the whole of the Seminary property is to be bought by them. I cannot see why it is necessary to buy the whole block of Seminary land. What the commissioners seem to be aiming at is to get certain broad driveways that will be good for a park, but broad driveways will also be good for the city of Quebec and the locality. What you are really doing is constituting a system of broadened avenues for the city of Quebec, just as your Improvement Commission in Ottawa has splendid driveways here. Whether it be a necessary part of the National Battlefields plan to improve the driveways of the city of Quebec is a question, unless we knew that the park itself was adjacent to these driveways, and it does not appear that it is. The plan which the Prime Minister has given us to-day does not delimit the ground that we will own, but, as it looks from that plan, here is a block owned by us there, there is a portion that we do not own and there is another little piece that we do own, and so it is cut up in that way. It seems to be the purpose of the commission to have a broad driveway connecting the Plains of Abraham proper with other portions of the city. Is it necessary, in order to have that driveway, to buy the whole of that Seminary land, or cannot a right of way for the driveway be secured through it? I understand it is the purpose to divide that property up into lots and sell it. As a matter of real finance the Seminary could very well afford to say to the Battlefields Commission:

Give us a good driveway through that property, embellish and adorn it, it will make our property many times more valuable than it is; we are going to sell it for town lots anyway, and we will give you the right of way. Now, you propose to buy the whole of it, and it will cost a great deal of money. Why do we need the whole of it? Why cannot an arrangement be made to have a driveway through it, which would largely appreciate the property, without putting the Battlefields Commission to the cost of the whole of it? Those are the thoughts that occurred to me.

Mr. FOWLER. I was not in the House when this matter was first discussed. Does it apply only to the battlefields on the Plains of Abraham, or is it the intention to purchase every battlefield throughout the country and make parks?

Mr. BARR. Why don't the British buy the field of Waterloo?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. At the outset I was in favour of having the commission take over the whole Plains of Abraham, even to a greater extent than is proposed in the present amendment to the Bill. From my viewpoint I do not think it would be becoming to see any private property remaining in the middle of the Plains of Abraham. In my opinion, it would be well to take the whole bank of the river along where the various stages of the battle of the Plains of Abraham were fought, so that there might be one uninterrupted stretch of land from the citadel clear away to the right hand side of the plains. The visitor to Quebec to-day will find only a little 10-acre field available for the great review of troops at the Tercentenary. If the plan were carried out as I have outlined, and if the Ross Rifle Company were given a site for their factory elsewhere, and if the government moved the building from the Plains of Abraham, then with the present amendment the thing would be pretty nearly complete. That jail on the Plains of Abraham is an eyesore; it is right on the spot where the French forces stood during the engagement. Wolfe's monument is better surrounded now than it was before, but it is within a hundred feet of back yards. To my mind, the best plan would be to make a clean sweep from the citadel off to the right and up to where the grand stand is now being erected for the pageant. That would necessitate the purchase of certain property, but it is not so large as it looks on the map. The Ross rifle factory bugaboo could be overcome by the minister selecting a site somewhere else and moving the whole factory there. I do not think it would be a very expensive job if it were gone about in a business way to get that whole land clean from the citadel away up to the right, and then, in case of a great review of troops, there would be plenty of room to manœuvre. Even from the point of view of defence it would be well to have that part of the plains free from buildings.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In answer to the question of my hon. friend from Kings (Mr. Fowler), I may say that section 5 creates the commission and states its objects to be:

> The commission may purchase, acquire and hold the lands or immovable property in the city of Quebec, or in the vicinity thereof, where the great battles were fought, or which were occupied by the various commands of the respective armies upon the battlefields.

It does not go beyond the city of Quebec and the vicinity; it is connected simply with the events of 1759 and 1760. In reply to my hon. friend from Toronto I might say that it would have been a good idea had the commission submitted a report of what they intend to do, but the correspondence which I have had shows that the property is rising rapidly in price every day and the longer the purchase is delayed the greater the cost will be. With regard to the property of the Seminary, I may say that the Seminary own a pretty large piece of land there. They have cut it up into town lots. The commission have decided, and very properly in my judgment, to acquire this property. The object of the commission is to make a park which will include all the land where the battle took place, and the visitor to Quebec will be enabled to see the very spot where Wolfe landed and brought up his troops. The second battlefield of 1760 will also be converted into a park.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. FIELDING moved that item 64 in Public Bills and Orders—second reading of Bill (No. 187) from the Senate, to amend the Canada Temperance Act.—Mr. Black—be now called.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have no objection to this item being called, but I call attention to the fact that it has been on the Order Paper since June 17, and one would have supposed that, if the government desired to have the Bill passed, they would not have postponed its consideration until the very last day of the session. Why is it that the consideration of so important a Bill has been left so long?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). We have reached the stage of the session when, in the general cleaning up, we are taking up matters of general importance which are not on the Order Paper. That is the only reason.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. So far as the order is concerned, my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) has taken up the last Bill in the list of public Bills and Orders, instead of beginning at the beginning.

Mr. FIELDING. I am not proposing to follow the order in which the Bills appear on the Order Paper. We have some regard for their order in importance.

Motion agreed and Order called.

Bill read the second time.

Mr. WM. S. LOGGIE. The Bill stands in the name of the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Black) but I understood that the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) would take charge of the Bill.

Mr. RICHARD BLAIN. I would direct the attention of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) to the fact that this is a piece of temperance legislation, and would ask him whether it will embody a clause for the abolition of the bar in the House of Commons.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Has not that been abolished long ago ?

Mr. LANCASTER. It was in full blast yesterday.

Mr. S. W. W. PICKUP This Bill is for the purpose of amending the Canada Temperance Act. Twelve counties out of the eighteen in Nova Scotia have adopted the Canada Temperance Act, known as the Scott Act. Two counties, for reasons peculiar to those districts, have voted to have the Act repealed so that at present ten counties in the province are under the operation of the Act. The Act has proven very efficient where the sentiments of the people are in favour of its enforcement. The principal amendment sought by this Bill is to prohibit the carriage of liquor from a license county to a Scott Act county. This legislation only applies to districts where the people by their votes ask that no liquor be sold, and does not apply to any province or district that has not adopted the Act. It is only fair that the wishes of the people be met. There are three amendments covered by this Bill, and all are necessary to satisfactorily carry out the Act.

House went into committee on the Bill.

On section 1,

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON. As this is an extension of the Canada Temperance Act, I would ask the hon. member who is in charge of the Bill whether or not, in order to continue this Act in operation in these counties, it will be necessary again to submit it to the electors? I understand that this Canada Temperance Act comes into operation only on approval of the people. Now, if we materially alter it and incorporate in it much larger powers, would the effect be that the people would have to vote upon it again, and express approval of the new conditions, in order to continue its operations ? We should be very careful that we do not destroy the Act in attempts to amend it.

Mr. FOWLER. There is a decision on that point. It does not need to be voted on again.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Yes.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

WATER CARRIAGE OF GOODS.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Reference was made last night by the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to item No. 63, Bill (No. 178) from the Senate, relating to the water carriage of goods. If there be no objection and any hon. member interested in the Bill will move the second reading, I should be glad to move that the order be called.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) does not come very often ; I do not see why he should have special privileges and I would object.

Mr. FOWLER. I think this Bill relates to too important a matter to be taken up at this time when there is no proper opportunity for due consideration of the Bill. I find there are some very drastic changes proposed and I do not think we should be called upon to legislate in regard to this matter at this time.

Mr. FOSTER. I protest in exactly the same way. I do not know what the Bill is, it has never been before this House, it may be a most important Bill and a very salutary Bill but it is not right to ask us, two or three hours before the House prorogues with scarcely more than a quorum present, to undertake its consideration.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is a matter of very great regret that the government did not take this up before. It has been on the order paper since May 29, it would have occupied only five minutes to give the Bill its first reading and send it to a special committee where it could have been investigated and progress could have been made without delaying the House for more than a few minutes. Instead of that no action has been taken by the government respecting a subject of great importance not only to the shipping interests but more especially to the shippers and producers and similar other interests as well. The Bill has rested untouched on the order paper since May 29, and now it is proposed, at nearly 1 o'clock on Saturday, the last working day of the session we hope, to have that Bill considered. Such a proposal is really grotesque in its absurdity. Why was the Bill

not sent long ago to a subcommittee of this House for the purpose of making an investigation similar to that which has been made in the Senate ?

Mr. FIELDING. This Bill, although an important one, possibly, was never a government Bill, it was brought in by a private member of the Senate and sent here in the ordinary course of business. In cleaning up the business of the session, attention was called to it and I mentioned it to the House. It is not a government Bill and it was not the duty of the government to send it to a committee. I brought it up at the request of the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean).

Mr. JOHNSTON. The Bill stands in my name but I am not the promoter. The promoter of the Bill, Senator Campbell, has had several discussions with me within the last few days. He expressed considerable anxiety as to its fate. He represents that very large interests particularly in Ontario desired that this Bill should be pressed to an issue at this session. He represents it as very important, personally I know very little about it. When the Bill was introduced in the Senate objection was taken to it by the shipping interests in Montreal and elsewhere and representatives of those interests appeared before the committee of the Senate. Senator Campbell represented to me that the representative of the shipping interest has consented to the Bill and directed my attention to the observations of Mr. Meredith who appeared before the committee of the Senate. The members have the report of Mr. Meredith's statement and I need not detain them.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. gentleman's statement that Senator Campbell had told him that the shipping interests had agreed to this Bill, is not sufficient reason for going on with it. It might be agreeable to the shipping interests and obnoxious to the people's interests.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The people are pressing for it.

Mr. LANCASTER. The fact that there was a controversy over it in the Senate indicates that the question is so vast, that the changes made by the Bill are so radical, that we should have at least a special committee of this House to take evidence with regard to this matter and report to the House. There is no ground for making an exception in the case of this Bill. The Minister of Railways ten days ago refused to deal with a level crossings Bill which this House passed unanimously, and when it was amended by the Senate and sent back here, the Minister of Railways refused to deal with it because it was too late in the session, and that was ten days ago. Although my Bill was dealing with a very grave matter involving the lives of men, women and children at railway crossings, the Minister of Railways refused to make an exception in its favour. If an exception could not apply to a Bill of that importance, then it ought not to apply to this Bill.

Mr. FIELDING. It is evident from the difference of opinion concerning this Bill that it cannot go through. I move therefor for leave to withdraw the motion.

Motion agreed to.

THE RESTAURANT.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER presented the first report of the Joint Committee of both Houses on the proposed restaurant.

Mr. BERGERON. Did the committee visit the old restaurant ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. No. I move that the said report be now adopted.

Motion agreed to.

RELIEF OF CATHERINE ANN CANNON.

Mr. GALLIHER moved :

That in accordance with the prayer of the petition of Catherine Ann Cannon this day presented and received by this House, the order of the House do issue to the proper officer to remit to the petitioner the sum of $200 paid under rule 88 S.S. 3 (C), on the Bill (No. 175), letters RR of the Senate, intituled an Act for the relief of Catherine Ann Cannon.

He said : This sum of $200 is practically a fine imposed by reason of the fact that the petition was presented a day or two late. It was sent to Ottawa in time to be presented, and was received by me from the permanent solicitors a day or two late. The grounds upon which the refund is asked are set out in the petition. This woman has practically no means, I think she has three or four children who depend on her for support. The extra fine is imposed for reasons over which she had no control. The inadvertence or omission on the part of some one here, gave rise to her being obliged to borrow the sum of $200 for the purpose of meeting the fine imposed.

Mr. LANCASTER. The merits were not gone into, I suppose, by the Senate.

Mr. GALLIHER. Yes, the case was heard and determined in her favour.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY — EARNINGS AND EXPENSES.

Mr. FOWLER—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. What is the amount of the gross earnings of the Intercolonial railway for June, 1908,

and for the three months, April to June, inclusive ?

2. What are the working expenses for the two months of April and May, 1908, respectively ?

3. What were the earnings and working expenses respectively, for April, May and June, 1907 ?

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

1. Earnings, April, 1908, $740,576.43; earnings, May, 1908, $689,736.62 ; earnings, June, 1908, not yet received.

2. Working expenses, April, 1908, $740,-851.01; working expenses, May 1908, $781,-086.18; working expenses, June, 1908, not yet received.

3. Earnings, April. 1907, $817,952.34 ; earnings, May 1907, $799,095.95; earnings, June, 1907, $754,141.27.

Working expenses, April, 1907, $669,-380.90; working expenses, May 1907, $715,-888.88; working expenses, June, 1907, $751,-472.47.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—STATION AT NEWCASTLE.

Mr. FOWLER asked :

1. Who is the inspector of the work being done at the Intercolonial station at Newcastle?

2. By whom was he recommended, what is his remuneration, and how much money has been paid to him to date ?

3. Was a man named Fallon recommended to this position by the federal member for Northumberland county, New Brunswick ? If so, why was this recommendation not acted upon ?

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

1. H. A. Vye, of Newcastle.

2. The department has no information. His remuneration has been arranged at the rate of $3 a day, but nothing has yet been paid him.

3. No.

INTERCOLONIAL CONFERENCE — EXPENSES OF CANADIAN MINISTERS.

Mr. BERGERON asked:

1. What was the amount of money voted by parliament to defray the expenses of Canadian ministers attending the Intercolonial conference at London in 1907 ?

2. How many ministers from Canada attended that conference officially ?

3. Was the whole amount so voted expended, and how much did each minister receive ?

4. Was any other official mission accomplished ? If so, who was the minister, and how much did he or they each receive for such services ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance):

1. $24,000.

2. Three.

3. No. The Prime Minister, $6,800; each of the other two, $4,000.

Mr. FOWLER.

4. Yes. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries, after the conference, proceeded to other duties. He received on account of expenses in connection with the negotiation of the Franco-Canadian convention $3,-500, and on account of investigation respecting icebreakers, $1,730.06.

Mr. BERGERON. I intended to ask also for the expenses of the two ministers who went to Paris concerning the Trench Treaty.

Mr. FIELDING. The question only refers to those who attended the conference. If it had included the visit to Paris, I could have given that also.

LAND GRANTS TO RAILWAYS IN THE NORTHWEST.

Mr. CRAWFORD—by Mr. Turriff—asked :

1. The area of land reserved for selection for railway land grant purposes in Manitoba and the Northwest Territories?

2. The names of the companies participating in land grants?

3. The date that lands were granted by parliament to the several companies?

4. The area reserved for each company on July 1, 1896?

5. The area earned by each company ?

6. The area granted by parliament previous to July 1, 1896?

7. The area granted since July 1, 1896?

8. The area patented on July 1, 1896?

9. The area patented since July 1, 1896?

10. The area patented to each company?

11. The area unpatented?

12. The reasons why patents are not issued?

13. The amount paid in survey fees to date?

14. The amount paid in survey fees since July 1, 1896?

15. The amount paid in survey fees since July 1, 1896?

16. When can taxation be imposed on the lands granted to the several companies?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. No land reserved at present for selection for railway land grant purposes.

2. Alberta Railway and Irrigation (formerly Northwest Coal and Navigation Company). Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company. Canadian Northern Railway Company (from point on Canadian Pacific Railway to Hudson Bay). Canadian Northern Railway Company (formerly Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company). Canadian Pacific Railway Company, main line. Canadian Pacific Railway Company Pipestone extension Souris branch. Canadian Pacific Railway, Souris branch. Great Northwest Central Railway Company (formerly Northwest Central Railway Company). Manitoba and Northwest Western Railway Company. Manitoba South Western Colonization Railway Company. Manitoba and South Eastern Railway Company. Qu'Appelle Long Lake and Saskatchewan

Railroad and Steamboat Company. Saskatchewan and Western Railway Company.

3. Alberta Railway and Irrigation Company, 20th July, 1885 and 23rd June, 1887, (formerly Northwest Coal and Navigation Company), 2nd May, 1889, 26th March, 1890, and 16th May, 1890. Alberta and Athabaska Railway Company, 23rd June, 1887. Brandon and South Western Railway Company, 16th May, 1890 and 23rd July, 1894. Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company, 16th May, 1890. Canadian Northern Railway Company, 19th April, 1884. (from point on Canadian Pacific Railway to Hudson Bay). Canadian Northern Railway Company, 2nd May, 1889. (formerly Lake Manitoba and Canal Company), 16th May, 1890. Canadian Pacific Railway Company, main line, 15th February, 1881. Canadian Pacific Railway, Pipestone extension Souris branch, 23rd July, 1894. Canadian Pacific Railway, Souris branch, 16th May, 1890 and 30th September, 1891. Great Northwest Central Railway Company, 2nd June, 1886. (formerly Northwest Central Railway Company). Lac Seul Railway Company, 16th May, 1890. Medicine Hat Railway and Coal Company, 23rd June, 1887. Manitoba and North Western Railway Company, 20th July, 1885 and 2nd June, 1886. Manitoba South Western Colonization Railway Company, 20th July, 1885, and 30th September, 1891. Manitoba and South Eastern Railway Company, 16th May, 1890. North Western Railway Company of Canada, 2nd May, 1889. Qu'Appelle Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Company, 20th July, 1885, and 23rd June, 1887. Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company, 2nd May, 1889 and 3rd September 1891. Rocky Mountain Railway and Coal Company, 23rd July, 1894. Saskatchewan and Western Railway Company, 23rd July, 1894. Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Railway Company, 2nd June, 1886.

	Acres.
4. Alberta Ry & Irrigation. Co. (formerly North West Coal & Navigation Co.)..	1,114,368
Brandon & South Western Ry Co...	122,880
Calgary & Edmonton Ry. Co...	1,800,000
Canadian Northern Ry Co. (from point on C.P.R. to Hudson Bay), Canadian Northern Ry. Co. (formerly L. Manitoba & Canal Co...	30,000,000
Canadian Pacific Railway Co. (main line)..	26,414,245·10
C.P.R. Pipestone Extension	
C.P.R. Souris Branch.. ..	500,000
Souris Branch..	2,010,870
Great North West Central Ry. Co. (formerly North West Central Ry. Co...	708,827·16
Manitoba & North Western Ry. Co...	3,000,000
Manitoba South Western Colonization Ry. Co.. ..	2,226,080
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake & Saskatchewan Railroad & Steamboat Co...	2,822,235·06
Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Co..	322,500
	71,042,005·32
5. Alberta Railway & Irrigation Co. (formerly North West Coal & Navigation Co..	1,114,368
Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co..	1,888,448
Canadian Northern Ry. Co. (from point on C.P.R. to Hudson Bay), Canadian Northern Ry. Co. (formerly L. Manitoba & Canal Co...	3,321,408
Canadian Pacific Railway Co. (main line)..	18,206,986
C.P.R., Pipestone Extension, Souris Branch.. ..	200,320
C.P.R., Souris Branch.. ..	1,408,704
Great North West Central Ry. Co. (formerly North West Central Ry. Co.)..	320,000
Manitoba & North Western Ry. Co...	1,501,376
Manitoba South Western Colonization Ry...	1,396,800
5. Manitoba and Southeastern Ry. Co..	680,320
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Co.. ..	1,625,344
Saskatchewan and Western Ry. Co...	98,880
6. Area granted by parliament previous to 1st July, 1896..	56,087,072
7. Area granted by parliament subsequent to 1st July, 1896	None.
8. Alberta Railway and Irrigation Co., (formerly Northwest Coal & Navigation Co.)..	203,046·57
Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co..	4,535·24
Canadian Northern Ry. Co. (from point on C.P.R. to Hudson bay), none patended.	
Canadian Northern Ry. Co. (formerly Lake Manitoba and Canal Co.), none patented.	
Canadian Pacific Ry. Co. main line..	1,334,982·77
C.P.R. Pipestone Extension, Souris Branch, none patented.	
C.P.R., Souris Branch, none patented.	

	Acres.
Great Northwest Central Ry. Co. (formerly Northwest Central Ry. Co.), none patented.	
Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.	241,933.94
Manitoba Southwestern Col. Ry. Co.	40,950·32
Manitoba and Southeastern Ry. Co., none patented.	
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Co.	1,638·44
Saskatchewan and Western Ry. Co., none patented.	
	1,827,087·28
9. Alberta Railway and Irrigation Co., patents now all issued	911,321·43
Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.	1,408,234·78
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.	2,523,949·03
C.P.R. main line	16,776,741·67
C.P.R. Pipestone Extension Souris Br.	121,131·17
C.P.R. Souris Branch	1,393,070·37
Great Northwest Central Ry. Co. (Patents now all issued	320,000
Manitoba & Northwestern Ry. Co.	1,257,625·98
Manitoba Southwestern Col. Co.	909,687·01
Manitoba Southwestern Co.	678,358·24
Qu'Appelle Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad & Steamboat Co.	1,130,436·22
Saskatchewan and Western Ry. Co. (Patents now all issued)	98,880
	27,529,435 88
(10) Alberta Railway and Irrigation Co.	1,114,368
Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.	1,412,770
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.	2,523,949·03
C.P.R. Main Line	18,111,724·44
C.P.R. Pipestone Extension Souris Br.	121,131·17
C.P.R. Souris Branch	1,393,070·37
Great Northwest Central Ry. Co.	320,000
Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.	1,499,559·92
Manitoba Southwestern Colonization Ry. Co.	950,637 33
Manitoba & Southeastern Ry. Co.	678,358·24
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad & Steamboat Co.	1,132,074·66
Saskatchewan and Western Ry. Co.	98,880
	29,356,523·16

	Acres.
11. Alberta Railway & Irrigation Co. (all patented)	
Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.	475,678
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.	797,458·97
Canadian Pacific Ry. Co. Main Line	95,261·56
C.P.R. Pipestone Extension Souris Br.	79,188·83
C.P.R. Souris Branch	15,633·63
Great Northwest Central Ry. Co. (all patented).	
Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.	1,816·08
Manitoba Southwestern Colonization Ry. Co.	446,162·67
Manitoba & Southeastern Ry. Co.	1,961·76
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake & Saskatchewan Railroad & Steamboat Co.	493,269·34
Saskatchewan & Western Ry. Co. (all patented).	
	2,406,430·84

12. Calgary and Edmonton Ry Co.—407,402 acres held as security for repayment of money advanced the company on account of transportation contract dated June 21, 1890. 67,762·92 acres bought back by this government at the rate of $2 per acre, and the amount so derived from the purchase of these lands by the government applied as payment of the survey fees on account of this company's land grant. The balance 513·08 acres being selected by the company and directly upon such selection being made patent will issue forthwith.

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.—532,800 acres held as security for repayment of money advanced on account of transportation contracts dated February 5, 1896, and May 12, 1896. 236,863·61 acres held for approval by council of construction of the last section south of Pas Mission. Patents for the balance, 27,795·36 acres, except where unsurveyed, are in course.

Canadian Pacific Ry. Co., Main Line.—45,316 acres in course of being patented. 4,928·5 acres awaiting release from timber berths before patents may issue to the company. The balance 45,017·06 acres not yet surveyed.

Canadian Pacific Railway Pipestone Extension, Souris Br.—Balance of 79,188·83 acres not surveyed.

Canadian Pacific Railway Souris branch—Balance of 15,633·63 acres not surveyed.

Manitoba & Northwestern Railway Company—The balance, 1,816·08 acres patents held pending adjustment of figures with the railway company.

Manitoba Southwestern Colonization Railway Company—Patents in course for 443,311·51 acres but held awaiting receipt of survey fees. The balance 2,851·16 acres being selected by the company.

Manitoba & Southeastern Railway Company—800 acres held pending adjustment

of squatters' claims. The balance 1,161·76 acres unsurveyed.

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake & Saskatchewan Railroad & Steamboat Company—Held as security for repayment of money advanced to the company on account of transportation contract dated 5th of August, 1889.

13. The amount paid in survey fees to date is $724,479.39.

14. Total survey fees paid in connection with railway land grants from commencement to 30th of June, 1896—$56,537.18.

15. Total survey fees paid in connection with railway land grants from the 1st of July, 1896, to 3rd of July, 1908—$667,942.21.

16. Upon the issue of the patent except in the case of the main line land subsidy of the Canadian Pacific Railway. In the case of this subsidy an exemption for twenty years is provided for in the original charter.

EXPENSES OF TRANSCONTINENTAL COMMISSION.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. What have been the totals for each year of the expenses of the Transcontinental Commission for salaries, rents, travel and contingencies, including everything not going into construction?

2. Are these expenses charged up to construction account against the Grand Trunk Pacific Eastern Division?

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

1. The total expenditures for all salaries, rents, travel and contingencies for each year at headquarters, and on the lines are as follows :

1904-1905	$ 778,363 63
1905-1906	1,755,668 34
1906-1907	948,007 86
1907-1908	1,009,846 29
	$4,491,886 12

2 Yes. All expenditures of the Transcontinental Railway Commission are under clause 15 of the agreement, being the schedule to the National Transcontinental Railway Act, chargeable to 'Cost of Construction.'

QUEBEC BRIDGE—SALARIES TO OFFICIALS.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. What amounts have been paid yearly to the directors and officials of the Quebec Bridge Company?

2. What is now being paid, and the sum per year to each?

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

1. $500 to directors ; $2,400 to secretary ; $6,000 to chief engineer.

2. Since collapse of bridge the directors receive nothing. Secretary and chief engineer same salary as above, as their time does not expire until 1st of September next.

NET SALMON FISHING PRIVILEGES.

Mr. FOWLER asked :

By what right does the federal government grant or refuse to grant net salmon fishing privileges in the Restigouche river?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. By right of power to legislate in respect of sea coast and inland fisheries, under section 91, paragraph 12 of the British North America Act.

Whatever question may exist as to the proprietary interests is in abeyance by reason of tacit arrangement with the New Brunswick government by which the Dominion is administering licenses pending adjustment of relative rights and jurisdiction.

MR. CONGDON'S ACCOUNTS—SEED GRAIN—WOOLLEN INDUSTRY AND THE TARIFF.

Mr. FOSTER. Before government orders are called I would like to call the attention of the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) to a question that was asked him yesterday with reference to two matters and also to ask the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if he has the petition of the woollen industry which he was to bring down.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I beg to lay on the table the correspondence with the woollen manufacturers with respect to the woollen duties.

Mr. OLIVER. In reply to the inquiry of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), I beg to say that a telegram was sent to the Yukon some time ago and the following answer has been received from Mr. Henderson, the Commissioner of the Yukon Territory :

Congdon's books and accounts as public administrator audited by controller's staff under direction of Commissioner Ross; handed over to Newlands, his successor, on Newlands' resignation; audited to satisfaction of Senkler who succeeded him; audited last summer by Beddoe, Department of the Interior; now being audited to date by Stockton, Auditor General's Department.

In regard to the inquiry as to seed grain distribution, I beg to say that the papers I had hoped to be able to place on the table in printed form are in the printer's hands and I expect to be able to place them on the table to-day before the House rises.

Mr. FOSTER. I understood that there was a memorandum from the Manufacturers' Association setting forth the grounds upon which they make their request.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I received the following message from the Canadian Manufacturers' Association :

Toronto, July 16, 1906.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier,
House of Commons, Ottawa.

The executive council of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association now in session, knowing that under existing tariff conditions a number of our largest Canadian woollen industries must suffer annihilation before another year, appeal to you for immediate relief. What two hundred woollen manufacturers have asked of you in the memorandum submitted is the least that will save them from ruin. They, together with the thousands of working people dependent upon them for their daily bread, and the farmers who have hitherto found profitable employment in wool growing, join us in the firm stand that this important question must be disposed of before the closing of parliament. The association awaits your answer.

(Sgd.) Canadian Manufacturers' Association.

I replied on the same day as follows :

Telegram.

Ottawa, July 16, 1908.

Canadian Manufacturers' Association,
Toronto, Ont.

Government regret that with present information they are unable to agree to the proposals respecting increased duties on wool goods. In a country with the climate of Canada the cost of woollen clothing becomes a question of very great importance. A proposal to increase the taxes on what might almost be called a necessary of life naturally arouses much opposition among the consumers and their representatives. The government have on more than one occasion given evidence of their appreciation of the importance of the woollen interests and their desire to give reasonable encouragement to it. They hope that to some extent the difficulties which the manufacturers are meeting are due not to tariff conditions but to a depression in trade which they believe is but temporary. This view is supported by the fact that in the neighbouring republic where a very high wool tariff is in operation there has been trade depression. The government, with due regard to the people of all sections of the country, feel that this is not the moment at which they should adopt a policy of increased taxation, especially on articles of a necessary character. The complaints that have been made by the woollen trade as to evasions of the Customs laws are being carefully looked into and if it be ascertained that they be well founded, the proper remedy will be applied. The questions of tariff revision as respects the woollen industries cannot possibly be dealt with in the few hours of this session that remain. We can assure the manufacturers that we are fully appeciative of the industry and that if we cannot at this stage meet their wishes it is because we are obliged to consider the wishes of all classes throughout the country.

(Sgd.) WILFRID LAURIER.

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. FOSTER. I understood that there was a memorial accompanying the request. Would the right hon. gentleman be good enough to lay that on the table ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, on Monday morning ; perhaps this afternoon.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT.

Consideration of amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 189) to amend the Civil Service Act.—Mr. Fisher.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to have some explanation of these amendments.

Mr. FISHER. The only change of importance is the addition of a section bringing the Act into force on the 1st September. The other amendments are simply verbal alterations that, in the opinion of the Senate make the Act clearer, but do not change the meaning.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would not be inclined to agree with the view of the Minister of Agriculture with respect to the Senate amendment to section 45. I observe that at the end of the section the Senate has added the following words :

Or if such action is required during the recess of parliament, by the Governor in Council, subject to ratification by the two Houses at the next ensuing session.

I do not appreciate the necessity of that amendment.

Mr. FISHER. This amendment has been urged by the chief officers of the two Houses and especially by the librarians of parliament. During the recess there is absolutely no authority in the Act to enable anything to be done.

Mr. FOWLER. Enable what to be done? I have not a copy of these amendments.

Mr. FISHER. I would be glad to go over the amendments seriatim. The first amendment is one to paragraph 2 and is in the following words :

The word 'now' when used in this Act shall mean the date of its coming into force.

That is necessary by reason of the fact that the Act will come into force on the 1st September. The next amendment is to clause 8. Clause 8 reads as follows :

As soon as practicable after the coming into force of the Act, the head of each department shall cause the organization of his department to be determined and defined by order in council.

The Senate have added the following words :

Due regard being had to the present status of each officer or clerk, as the case may be.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN What do they mean by that ?

Mr. FISHER. I understand that they mean simply to safeguard the present position of the clerks. I did not think it necessary but the Senate wished these words in.

Mr. FOWLER. If they have an effect at all they prevent the object that the clause seems to call for. By saying 'due regard being had to the present status of each officer or clerk as the case may be' the minister's action is restricted; how can he reorganize his department?

Mr. FISHER. I do not think the words have the effect my hon. friend fears. I thought the clause without them meant that and I did not consider these words altered the sense of the clause. The next amendment is in clause 38 which would now read:

Notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act or any words to the like effect shall be deemed sufficient to authorize the payment of any such salary or remuneration.

I think that makes it clearer.

The next amendment is in clause 45 in the 25th line where they have inserted 'or under the Civil Service Act.' That to a certain extent extends the application of the clause not only to the sections herein indicated, but to any section under the Civil Service Act where the Governor in Council takes any action in regard to the employees of the House of Commons or the Senate. Then they add at the end of the clause the words:

Or if such action is required during the recess of parliament, by the Governor in Council, subject to ratification by the two Houses at the next ensuing session.

That was put in at the request of the chief officers of the Senate, the House of Commons and the library. The librarians pointed out that during recess when it would be absolutely impossible to get a joint resolution they would be absolutely tied and could do nothing, they could not work out the classification of their employees or the organization.

Mr. FOWLER. They would have the disciplinary rights of deputy ministers and could surely get along without this amendment.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I can see no necessity for the amendment. The matter of classification can be dealt with somewhat similarly and what pressing need can there be for any action between the two sessions of parliament? I presume it is because I do not understand the matter thoroughly, but certainly no explanation that has been given to the House seems to afford any justification for the intevention of the Governor in Council.

Mr. FOWLER. It seems to me that no circumstances could arise to require such legislation.

Mr. FISHER. The amendment says: 'If any such action is required during the recess.' That means only in case of emergency. If no action was required there would be no interference.

Mr. FOWLER. Can the minister suggest any possible situation requiring this? Even a mutiny could be dealt with by the officers.

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

DOMINION LANDS ACT AMENDMENT.

House proceeded to consideration of proposed amendment by the Senate to Bill (No. 181) to amend and consolidate the Acts respecting the public lands of the Dominion.

Mr. OLIVER. There is one amendment to section 15, adding a subsection under the heading 'cancellation of entry.' The new paragraph reads:

Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to two years' imprisonment who buys, trades or sells or professes to buy, trade or sell land or any interest in or control of land open to homestead entry or for which homestead entry has been granted before patent therefor has been issued.

When this Bill was being put through the Commons it was supposed that this particular offence which is undoubtedly very prevalent was covered by the provisions of the Criminal Code, but on further examination it did not appear to be so covered and therefore the Senate inserted this provision.

Mr. LAKE. Will the minister make any special provision on the first September for the rush of people who are likely to besiege the land offices to make entries.

Mr. OLIVER. We will do the best we can, but of course there are some conditions that cannot possibly be met.

Mr. LAKE. I think proclamation should be issued and a general notice sent to the post offices as to what the conditions will be.

Mr. OLIVER. We will give the fullest information possible.

Mr. FOSTER. No applications are valid until the first of September?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Then suppose there are parties looking around now and there is a kind of an Oklahoma rush on the first of September, in what order will the applications be received?

Mr. OLIVER. First at the counter.

Mr. FOSTER. After the proclamation opens?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. The big chap will have the advantage, won't he?

Motion agreed to, and amendments concurred in.

At one o'clock, House took recess.

House resumed at three o'clock.

PROHIBITION OF OPIUM.

Mr. LEMIEUX moved that the amendment made by the Senate to Bill (No. 205) to prohibit the importation, manufacture and sale of opium for other than medicinal purposes, be now read the second time and agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the effect of the amendment?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The effect of the amendment is to give to opium merchants a period of six months within which to dispose of the opium which they have imported. During those six months the opium will be in bond, and will have to be exported from the country.

Mr. FOSTER. The Bill allowed three months?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, no delay at all.

Mr. BLAIN. I cannot quite understand why the merchants of opium require six months to dispose of their stock. Surely it will not take that length of time. It seems to me that if this is such an evil as to call for drastic legislation—legislation which I approve of, I may say—a great deal of injury might be done during those six months.

Mr. LEMIEUX. During the six months for which the delay is given, the merchants will not have the right to sell opium within the country for other than medicinal purposes. It will be held in bond, and they will have to give surety to that effect, under regulations to be established by the Minister of Customs. I may say that they asked for a delay of eight years, claiming that the quantity of opium which they have on hand warranted them in so doing. They say that the process of manufacturing or curing the opium is such that they cannot sell it for several years. We could not see our way to granting that request, but we have thought it right to give them a reasonable time within which to export their stock from the country.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would think that would be reasonable, otherwise the Act would amount to confiscation. I understand from the minister and would gather from the words of the amendment, that it does not authorize any sale within Canada prohibited by the Bill. The prohibition as to sale still continues as it was when the Bill passed this House, but a period of six months is allowed during which it is lawful for opium merchants to have the opium in their possession for sale, but not for sale in Canada?

Mr. LEMIEUX. That is correct.

Mr. BLAIN. I may say that the hon. minister's explanation is entirely satisfactory.

Motion agreed to, and amendment read the second time and agreed to.

BOUNTY TO SOUTH AFRICAN VOLUNTEERS.

Mr. OLIVER moved that the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 109) to authorize a bounty to volunteers who served the Crown in South Africa be now read the second time and agreed to.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What will be the effect of the change from the expression. 'officer, non-commissioned officer or man' to the word 'volunteer?'

Mr. OLIVER. It is not anticipated that there will be any change. In the first draft of the Bill the word 'volunteers' was used. Then on suggestion it was changed to the expression 'officer, non-commissioned officer and man.' In the third draft it was changed to 'volunteer' in the second section, and should have been changed in the third section to make it conform to the second. The Senate noticed the difference and made the third clause conform to the second. The word 'volunteer' will include 'officer.' The Senate also changes the expression 'nursing sisters' in the second subsection to 'female nurses.' The expression 'nursing sisters' is the technical description of these nurses, but it does not seem necessary to refuse concurrence in that change, though the expression used by the Senate is not the proper one.

Mr. LAKE. The effect of the Bill as it left this House is not altered?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Amendments read the first time, and agreed to.

SUPPLY—DUTY ON MATERIALS FOR INTERNATIONAL TUNNELS.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). Mr. Speaker, as the items for the Customs Department were concurred in some time ago, I shall not have an opportunity of bringing a matter before the House which I would like to explain. A question arose and was agitated through the country, being taken up by the Manu-

facturers' Association and the press, as to whether the ruling of our department with reference to the admission of materials for the construction of the Detroit tunnel was more liberal than that of the United States department. The department thought that we had sufficient assurance in the instructions of the United States government to warrant us in what we were doing and that we were perfectly safe. However, the hon. member for West Kent (Mr. Clements) and the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) took that view, and subsequently, I think, the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) thought that there might be a possible doubt. We did not so think, but in deference to their remarks, and with a view to putting the matter beyond question, I asked the commissioner to again inquire of the Treasury Department, although I did not like to do so as it seemed to imply that their other letter was not sufficiently plain. The following correspondence has been exchanged between the two departments :

Division of Customs.

Treasury Department, Office of the Secretary,
Washington, June 24, 1908.

Hon. John McDougald,
Canadian Commissioner of Customs,
Ottawa, Canada.

Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 18th instant, relative to the free entry of materials for use in the construction of the tunnel between Canada and the United States at Detroit, Michigan.

The department's letter of March 13 last to the collector of customs at Detroit, a correct copy of which is set forth in your letter, is correctly interpreted by you as authorizing the free entry of all materials to be used in the tunnel whether under water or on the American shore, except materials used above ground on the open approach to the tunnel.

Respectfully,
(Sgd.) J. B. REYNOLDS,
Assistant Secretary.

No inclosure.

Department of Customs,
Ottawa, June 18, 1908.

The Assistant Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C.

Sir,—I have the honour to state that the customs tariff of Canada (1907) contains the following provision for free entry of materials for international bridge and tunnels, viz.:—

596. Materials to be used in Canada for the construction of bridges and tunnels crossing the boundary between the United States and Canada, when similar materials are admitted free under similar circumstances into the United States, under regulations prescribed by the Minister of Customs. Free.

Under this provision the contractors for the 'Detroit River Tunnel' between Detroit, Michigan, and Windsor, Ontario, are now making free entries of their materials for the whole covered portion of the tunnel on the Canadian side, not including the open approaches.

This department has received a copy of instructions from the Treasury Department on this subject as follows:—

Division of Customs.

Treasury Department,
Office of the Secretary, Washington.
41072 C.A.H.

March 13, 1908.
C.P.M.

The Collector of Customs,
Detroit, Michigan.

Sir,—The department is in receipt of your letter of the 6th instant, relative to the entry free of duty of tools and materials to be used in the construction of the tunnel between Canada and the United States under the Detroit river.

The matter of the free entry of materials used in the construction of a tunnel between Canada and the United States was considered by the department in connection with the construction of the tunnel between Port Huron, Michigan, and Sarnia, Ontario, and it was decided that all materials brought into the United States for convenience and taken back into the tunnel and used therein should not be regarded as dutiable importations, without regard to the part of the tunnel in which the same were used. Materials used above ground in the approaches to the tunnel on the American shore were held to be subject to the payment of duty. You will be governed accordingly.

Respectfully,
(Sgd.) BEEKMAN WINTHROP,
Assistant Secretary.

The Department of Customs understands by your letter to the collector at Detroit that it covers materials for the entire length of the tunnel on the American side whether under water or on the shore, the open approach to the end of the tunnel alone being excluded. However, a question has been raised and statements made in the House of Commons that under your ruling above quoted, possibly Canadian materials may be only admitted free of United States duty when to be used in that portion of the tunnel which is under the waters of the Detroit river, and not for that portion of the tunnel which is on the mainland beyond the river on the American side.

As the item in our tariff is based and made contingent upon reciprocal action on the part of your government, will you please state if the view this department has taken of your ruling as above mentioned is correct.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
Commissioner of Customs.

Mr. FOSTER. The reply from the United States seems to be entirely satisfactory as establishing their understanding of the ruling. It is a pity that the same explicitness was not had months or maybe years ago, as in that way a great deal of unnecessary discussion would have been saved. This meaning of the regulations being established, can the department in any way use its influence with the contractors to see that Canadian manufacturers and Canadian labour get a really fair show in the purchase of supplies? Is it possible for the department to use any influence in that

way, as the tunnel seems to be about equally divided between the two countries in point of distance?

Mr. PATERSON. If I may refer to a previous debate, the contractors pointed out in letters which were submitted to the House that $160,000 or $170,000 worth of material had been purchased in Canada. I also read letters from them in which they said they had asked Canadian cement manufacturers to tender, but these manufacturers, for some reason or other, appeared not to have been anxious, as they declined in some cases and in no case had they taken the trouble to personally interview the contractors. It cannot be expected that the interests of a merchant will be looked after if he will not take some trouble himself; and certainly, where there are to be such large purchases to be made, they seem to have been lacking in that respect. I have no doubt that under the provisions of the tariff we will get an amount of revenue on goods imported from the United States for use in the open approaches on the Canadian side, and I have no doubt either that our manufacturers are in a position, this being reciprocal, to secure a portion of the business of supplying materials for the tunnel on the American side; as they have an equal opportunity to compete with the Americans on the American side, as the provision is reciprocal. Therefore, I have no doubt, if our cement manufacturers are now in such a position that they have a surplus, they will be able to do business. Of course, we are not in a position to force anything to be done.

Mr. FOSTER. No, the contract is already made.

Mr. PATERSON. But I have no doubt, if our manufacturers, especially of cement, desire to secure a portion of this trade, they will be able to do so. The material for the open approaches on both sides is dutiable; our cement manufacturers would not, I think, stand a chance for anything beyond. Our producers being protected with a very large duty on cement, I think that all the cement used in the open approaches on our side will go to our own people. Another point that was raised was that American workmen were being employed and that Canadian workmen were not getting an opportunity. I have been told that employment has been given to all Canadians who make application, and that many thousands of dollars have been paid to Canadian workmen. I can imagine that to be the case. A work such as that is not one in which a great many men may desire to engage, because it is considered somewhat hazardous—at any rate, as a heavy work. I mention this because it was thought that there had been some discrimination against our workmen, and I am sure that has not been the case.

CIVIL SERVICE BILL AND EMPLOYEES OF HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture a question with respect to the Civil Service Bill. During the discussion I noticed that certain officers of the House of Commons were mentioned as having increases under the Bill, whereas I did not see any reference made to certain others. For example, there are the accountant and assistant accountant, the sergeant-at-arms and the deputy sergeant-at-arms. I have these four in my mind at the moment, all being very faithful and old officers. They are giving, I think, entire satisfaction to the members of this House by their courteous manner and their willingness to assist the members. May I ask the minister whether these gentlemen will have an increase in salary under the Bill, and any others that I may not have mentioned?

Mr. FISHER. I do not remember mentioning any individual officers at all in the debate on the Civil Service Bill. I could not, without examining the salaries of these gentlemen and seeing where they would fit into the new subdivisions, answer the hon. gentleman's question. That depends entirely upon the facts. I do not know the facts, and, therefore, I could not say in detail how the increases that will probably occur under this Bill will affect individuals.

SALE OF INDIAN LANDS—QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. A. C. BOYCE (West Algoma). I desire to refer to a statement read in this House yesterday by the right hon. Prime Minister, on page 13804 of the 'Hansard.' I was not in the House at the time the right hon. gentleman read the statement, and I regret that he is absent just now. As this is the last opportunity there will be of referring to the matter, I must refer to it now, trusting that the right hon. gentleman may be here before I have finished. The letter is as follows:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have received from Mr. Sifton the folowing telegram:

Winnipeg, Manitoba, July 16, 1908.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Ottawa.

Please read following to House: Mr. Boyce's statement that improprieties exist in sale Indian lands unfounded, statement that application put in under name different from real applicant at my suggestion or request or with my knowledge absolutely untrue. I do not know that Mr. Philp has or ever had any interest, did not know Messrs. Wilson and Reesor had acquired these lands until a year after sale took place, sale made by officials in ordinary way and under ordinary rules

given so far as I know, no privilege whatever to purchasers except what were open to any applicant. I unqualifiedly deny the existence of any improprieties or irregularity whatever.

Mr. Speaker, I consider that a most extraordinary statement to be made in this House by any hon. member, especially by the Prime Minister himself. In the first place, I appeal to you, Sir, that it is absolutely a breach of parliamentary procedure that an hon. member should read in the House a statement made by one member of the House which reflects upon the statement or veracity of another member. I refer to these words :

Mr. Boyce's statement that improprieties exist in sale of Indian lands unfounded.

That perhaps is not absolutely unparliamentary.

Statement that application put in under name different from real applicant at my suggestion or request or with my knowledge absolutely untrue.

Now, if the hon. gentleman had been in his place in this House and had used those words, it would I submit have been a breach of parliamentary etiquette. I fail to see why, because that hon. gentleman chose to disregard my notice that the matter was coming up in this House, and chose to stay away, and then from a distance of 1,500 miles send a telegram to the right hon. gentleman containing a statement which he could not make if he were in the House—I fail to see why that is not as much a breach of parliamentary etiquette. He says that my statement that an application was put in under a name different from that of the real applicant is absolutely untrue. Let me in justice to myself refer to what I did say. At page 13495 of the 'Hansard' I referred to the letter which was brought down, a copy of which I had obtained from the Indian Department—and I took great care to compare it with the original—that is the letter which contans the statement of which the hon. gentleman complains in his telegram, and all that I did, as you will recollect, was to read that letter with this accompanying comment :

I will now put in the link. Here is a letter that I have extracted from the files, and hon. members can conclude for themselves as to whether this may be the link or not.

Then again, in the closing paragraph, on page 13500, I said :

I ask the hon. gentleman to take those words to heart in conjunction with the very serious matter which I now commend to his attention and leave with him. There is not a fact that I have stated but which is referred to in the documents in his department. I am not responsible for any of them. Every one of these facts is set forth in the documents extracted from the Department of the Interior. How many more there may be that we have not seen I do not know, but I do know that there has been knitted together a case which the right hon. leader of the government cannot excuse and cannot justify. One by one these facts have been knitted together, and they disclose a transaction which is absolutely unjustifiable.

That is what I said, Mr. Speaker, and before I sit down I shall ask your ruling upon the statement as to whether, in the first place, any such statement as that referred to in this telegram read by the right hon. gentleman was made, and, secondly, if it were made, whether the hon. gentleman is justified in characterizing it, by telegram from a distance of 1,500 miles, as being absolutely untrue. I venture to assert that if the right hon. gentleman had taken pains to scrutinize this telegram he would have hesitated before he placed the hon. member for Brandon in the most invidious position that this telegram places him in, emphasizing as it does the absolute want of foundation, the inherent want of foundation for the very statements he himself makes, and tries to make this House believe. Refer to the first part of the telegram :

Mr. Boyce's statement that improprieties exist in sale Indian lands unfounded, statement that application put in under name different from real applicant at my suggestion or request or with my knowledge absolutely untrue.

These are emphatic statements of his own knowledge. Then in order to exculpate himself personally, the hon. gentleman goes a little further and says :

I do not know that Mr. Philp has or ever had any interest, did not know Messrs. Wilson and Reesor had acquired these lands until a year after sale took place.

This is what I call to your especial attention and the attention of the House :

—sale made by officials in ordinary way and under ordinary rules given—

I presume it means 'giving,' although I attach no significance to that.

—given as far as I know, no privilege whatever to purchasers except what were open to any applicant.

And then comes this second denial which is contradicted by the former part of the telegram :

I unqualifiedly deny the existence of any improprieties or irregularity whatever.

An emphatic denial of the existence of a state of things, which, in the former two sentences, he absolutely says were beyond his knowledge. Then, again, I suggest that the statement is absolutely irregular because the hon. member has no right to make a speech to this House through another hon. gentleman in the form of this

statement of the hon. member for Brandon, and I submit with all deference and respect that the right hon. gentleman should have had more regard and respect for parliamentary procedure than to have read that statement. I say again, and the hon. gentleman knows it very well, that the telegram bears on its face an absolute contradiction as between the statement with which it concludes, and the statement with which it commences. The gentleman who signed that telegram assumes to state that he emphatically denies certain statements. In the body of the telegram it is stated that he has no knowledge of the facts, that as far as he knows the sale was made under the ordinary rules and that no privilege whatever was given to the purchasers except what was open to any applicant. Then comes the concluding statement that he unqualifiedly denies the existence of any improprieties or irregularity whatever. I submit first that if the right hon. Prime Minister had read this statement carefully before bringing it into the House he never would have read it to the House at all, and, secondly, that if he had considered the question as to the propriety of introducing that telegram he would never have introduced it and he would never have read it. I resent it very much indeed. I resent it as much as I would resent it if the hon. gentleman had been in his place. The right hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that the hon. member for Brandon would not have been allowed to have made the statements contained in the telegram if he had been in his place in the House. I would just again remind the House that there was not a statement made in the speech referred to which was made on my responsibility. On the contrary the statements which I made were entirely upon the authority of documents which were produced and read, and the principal document which was read was carefully compared with the original before it was read. Again I would say to the right hon. gentleman that he will find, at pages 13495 and 13500, the statement made by me that I am not responsible for any one of these statements but that every one is contained in a written document obtained from the Department of the Interior. Further, the statement denied by the hon. member for Brandon is a statement based upon a document which I took care, to carefully compare with the original in order that there should be no mistake. I therefore take the position, and I ask your ruling upon it, Mr. Speaker, first that the right hon. gentleman had no right whatever to read that statement to this House, and, secondly, that as to portions of that statement they should be retracted, that the reading of it was improper for the reasons given and that it should be expunged from the records of this House. In order to make myself clear with regard to the statement made by the right hon. gentleman and to contrast it with what I did say I will just read the letter itself to which I have alluded and which will be found at page 13495 of 'Hansard.'

Brandon, Manitoba, April 20, 1900.

J. A. Smart, Esq., Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—Re my application for timber land in Batchawana bay.

In my previous letter inclosing a letter from Mr. McAuley, I mentioned that the petition referred to in McAuley's letter meant a statement that the lands referred to were in most part unfit for settlement.

I find, however, by looking over my correspondence that he refers to a petition which he can get signed by all the settlers in the district asking the government that we be allowed to purchase the land. We can also furnish a statement sworn to by all the settlers in the district that the land in most part is unfit for settlement.

I wish you would give this matter your earnest attention as no time is to be lost in preparing for the season's operation as I will necessarily lose considerable time preparing to get away from my business here to attend to the erection of a sawmill, &c.

You will notice an application was put in by A. H. Gale dated July 25, 1899, covering all the lands in the district. This, however, will not interfere with my application as Mr. Gale is with me in the matter and we can work under either application. Mr. Sifton wished the application put in Mr. Gale's name at the time.

Please bear in mind that the license of the St. Maurice Lumber Company expires on the 30th of this month and will doubtless be called on to consider a renewal of same even though all pulpwood has been removed, and I trust you will consider its bearing on my application before doing so.

Yours truly,
W. F. WILSON.

That is the letter and that does not justify the statement made by the hon. member for Brandon through the Prime Minister from a distance of 1,500 miles. Any statement that was made in connection with that matter that the application was put in at his suggestion was made on the authority of that letter and I desire that this statement be withdrawn.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I just want to say a word in answer to my hon. friend (Mr. Boyce). I am sure that nobody will deny that if my hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Sifton) had been present when the charges were made against him he would have been at liberty to affirm, deny or qualify the statements which were made by the hon. gentleman. Not being here the hon. gentleman sent this telegram to me and I read it to the House just as it was. I place myself in the judgment of the House and in your judgment, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not know whether this matter is now properly the subject of a ruling on the part of the Speaker, but I would say, that, as a matter of fact, I think any

exception to the reading of the telegram should have been taken at the time and that it is too late now to take any exception to it. As to the question if exception could be taken to it I do not express any opinion at the moment, but I quite agree and was about to rule, in the terms suggested by the Prime Minister, that if the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) had been present, as this is a matter within his personal knowledge and refers personally to himself, he would have had a perfect right to have arisen in his place and to have made an absolute and unqualified denial of the statements. This would raise a question that is always a difficult one to decide as to one member averring something and another denying the allegations of that member, the member denyng however having a personal knowledge of the facts. I would rule as between two members under these circumstances that no doubt the member who made his denial ought to have his denial protected as it was something within his personal knowledge, and the statement of the other member who had asserted something which he had gathered from correspondence and read would have to be withdrawn. I consequently cannot make any such ruling as that which is requested by the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Boyce).

THIRTEENTH HUSSARS.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the House goes into Committee of Supply, I want to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden) to a matter that was brought to my attention some time ago and which I have been trying to get an opportunity of presenting to the minister in the House. It is in reference to the 13th Hussars of whom the minister has probably heard before, who saw service in 1866 and 1867 at the time of the Fenian Raid in the field, I think, largely in the matter of protecting some of the lines of railway, the Grand Trunk Railway being the chief one. What they have been asking for is to have the general service medal and it seems that up to the present time, for what reason I do not know, they have not been given that medal. I believe that a good deal depends upon the possession of the Canadian service medal as to the action which might be taken in Great Britain. I would like to press this strongly upon the attention of the minister so that if possible this general service medal should be given to these men.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. What is the name of the regiment ?

Mr. FOSTER. The 13th Hussars.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That will be an English regiment ?

Mr. FOSTER. I don't really know.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The only 13th we have is the 13th Scottish Light Dragoons.

Mr. FOWLER. That is the regiment of the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. FOSTER. I have a letter from one of the former members of that regiment, and he has written me several times. I press it upon the attention of the minister. Has he had the matter already before him.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I had before me the case of some English regiments one of which was a cavalry regiment but that is some time ago. If my hon. friend will be good enough to send me the papers I will take it up at once and after inquiring into it let him know what the ruling is.

Mr. FOSTER. I will prepare the papers and send them to the minister and ask him to look into the matter, and to send me a reply that I can forward to this gentleman.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I shall do so at once.

FRANCO-CANADIAN TREATY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I wish to direct the attention of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance to the following despatch from Paris which appeared in the newspapers on the 16th inst:

A despatch from Paris says the following explanation is being made of the delay in the approval of the Franco-Canadian convention:

When the Canadian parliament passed the new tariff law in 1906 it omitted to mention in the schedule of the most favoured nations and used as a basis in the negotiations the name of Switzerland, which enjoys such treatment under the treaty with Great Britain of 1865. The slip was not discovered until the convention had passed the chamber, when Switzerland brought her claim to the notice of England. The French deputies, being too late to do anything in their own house, worked upon the senators for the departments of Centre Jura, where the silk and watch-making interests are strong, and thus the opposition began. It is argued that these trades were among those for which concession had been most boasted of and how that Switzerland was to share the benefits the value of the concessions fell to the ground. Thereupon the powerful agricultural protectionist party arose in turn to reproach the government, saying if they had been silent against the large favours given to Canadian agriculture it was because other French industries were said to be benfited in return, but if there was to be no just equivalent elsewhere they also objected to the concessions.

The government is as anxious as ever to conclude the treaty with Canada, but it will hesitate to commit itself to conditions framed under a misconception, for which France is not responsible.

The 'Times'' Paris correspondent believes it is possible to overcome the opposition of

the protectionists and that the Franco-Canadian treaty will be ratified in October.

I do not understand some of the details set forth in this despatch, but it seems to imply some default on the part of this government in presenting the measure to parliament, or in the tariff of 1906. I would ask whether there is anything in the despatch, and especially whether there is anything in the suggestion that the delay in the ratification of the treaty is due to any default on the part of Canada.

Mr. FIELDING. I am not aware that the delay is in any respect due to any default on the part of Canada, nor am I aware that anybody claims such is the case. There is no doubt that the opposition which has been raised in the French legislative bodies to the treaty, is to some extent due to the special interests referred to which no doubt find that as other favoured nations have to receive the benefits of that treaty they do not get as much advantage from it as they would like to. But beyond that I do not quite see the meaning of the despatch. There is no doubt that the silk trade and possibly the watch trade would receive a greater concession if we could exclude other nations from the benefit of this treaty and give it to France alone. It is not in our power to do that and I have no doubt there is some foundation for the statement that the representations of these interests have had a good deal to do with the delay. I am not aware of anybody alleging that anything has been done on the part of Canada that has caused delay.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister has no doubt seen the despatch ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes I suppose it is the same despatch I have seen.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What I do not understand is that it refers to some omission on the part of Canada :

When the Canadian parliament passed the new tariff law in 1906 it omitted to mention in the schedule of the most favoured nations and used as a basis in the negotiations the name of Switzerland.

The language is not quite clear.

Mr. FIELDING. Our tariff Act does not profess to give a list of favoured nation countries. It has been more or less a matter of debate as respects some countries and we have not felt at liberty to give any list of them in the tariff Act. We have from time to time given the best list we could and sometimes the lists have not been absolutely in harmony. For some years there was some doubt about the position of Switzerland and I think it will be found that Switzerland did not in former years claim the favoured nation treatment. No case arose as to which she felt called upon to assert that position and it was difficult to determine for the time just exactly what was the correct list. When the treaty was being presented to this House we deemed it proper to ask from the imperial authorities—inasmuch as this obligation arose under old treaties they had made, and not under modern treaties in which Canada was consulted—we deemed it proper to ask from the imperial authorities a list of the favoured nation countries as they were determined on by the foreign office, and in that list Switzerland appeared, although in some of the previous lists I think Switzerland did not appear. The matter was not a subject of any special consideration and the tariff Act did not in itself purport to give any list of favoured nations.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has there been any discussion in the French chambers which would throw any light upon the question ?

Mr. FIELDING. I think there was an impression that Switzerland would not be entitled to favoured nation treatment. We were at one time under the impression ourselves—the point not having been directly raised—that Switzerland was not included. No doubt the fact that Switzerland was one of the favoured nations has something to do with the antagonism which has been raised in the French senate, but I am not aware that anybody alleges that it was due to any default on the part of the Canadian government.

Mr. FOSTER. What seems to be underlying it is that during the negotiation of the treaty the French negotiators had the idea that Switzerland was not on the most favoured nation list, and so would not participate. When it passed the chamber of deputies in France the same impression prevailed. But, when afterwards it came out, (probably when the application was made by Switzerland to Great Britain) that feature was imported anew into the ratification and because of that the treaty has not been ratified in the French senate.

Mr. FIELDING. That is quite possible. Of course, we ourselves had some doubts in regard to Switzerland, but the occasion had not arisen for us to come to a determination on the question. But I think it is safe to assume that the able members of the diplomatic staff in Paris were not dependent on any information they might receive from us in respect to the treaties. A moment's thought will suggest to my hon. friend that the very able men who look after these matters in the foreign offices in the courts of Europe are well furnished with copies of all treaties and with able persons to understand and interpret them. Although some persons may have had the impression that Switzerland was not in-

cluded, I cannot imagine that the diplomatic officers in Paris were in the dark on the subject. At any rate, they had access to every paper and document on the subject to which we had access.

UNITED STATES SHEEP QUARANTINE.

Mr. CHRISTIE. I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture in reference to a statement made in the House the other day that the quarantine regulations in reference to sheep going to the United States applies only to breeding sheep. There is a large trade in Ontario with sheep and lambs which are sent to Buffalo, and I would like to know whether the regulation applies to them.

Mr. FISHER. The information which we have received from the United States authorities distinctly states that the regulation applies to breeding sheep.

Mr. CHRISTIE. Only?

Mr. FISHER. It does not use the word only, but as it reads it does not seem to apply to any others. However, we are in communication with the United States authorities on the subject.

DEBATES OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. J. B. KENNEDY (New Westminster). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I would like to bring to the attention of the House a matter which should be of a good deal of interest to every hon member, as I know it is to the general public; that is, the amount of wind wasted here in long speeches. In the first session that I was in this House, I was struck by the fact that there was a great deal said that might better be left unsaid, as far as educating the general public or influencing the House was concerned, and I have been strengthened in that belief every session since, and more than ever this session. A short time ago, after the discussion on the Elections Act, I ran over 'Hansard' and calculated the number of columns which each member had spoken in the House, and gave the results to the House. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) said that the government side had been responsible for far more of the contents of 'Hansard' than the opposition side, and claimed that if we took the session from the beginning we would find that to be the case. Since then I have taken the trouble to go through the 'Unrevised Hansard' and figure out as carefully as I could the amount of space which each man has occupied from the beginning of the session to last Wednesday night. If I had continued the calculation for the days since that date, the result would look very much worse for the gentlemen on the other side of the House. I may say that I have not included any of the little questions asked across the House, which would not occupy more than an inch or so of 'Hansard,' but have only taken what might be termed set speeches. Where a speech occupied a number of columns with a little piece over, I dropped the little piece. Any one who looks through 'Hansard' will find that I have been as fair as I could possibly be. From my examination I find that since the beginning of the session to Wednesday night last the government are responsible for 4,004 columns of 'Hansard' and the opposition for 4,636, a difference of 632 columns against the opposition; and considering that there are only half as many men on the opposition side as on the government side, we shall have to give them credit for a great deal more longwindedness, versatility and loquaciousness than we on this side possess. I would not wish to hurt any one's feelings, but I am sorry to say that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) is by far the worst sinner of all. He is responsible for 624 columns. His leader comes next with 434 The five who contribute the most largely are the hon. member for North Toronto, with 624 columns, the hon. leader of the opposition with 434 columns, the Minister of the Interior with 388 columns, the Prime Minister with 269 columns, and the Minister of Finance with 266 columns. When we consider that the twelve cabinet ministers in the House have a great deal to answer——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. KENNEDY. I did not say to answer for; I said a great many questions to answer. It is true they have a great deal to answer for, and so have we all. But considering that they have all the government business to introduce and explain, and questions both wise and unwise to answer, I think it is rather strange that the twelve cabinet ministers have not occupied as much space as eight of the gentlemen on the other side of the House. I do not know that it would be of interest to the House that I should read this whole list, though I would like to see it go on 'Hansard.' As I went along I took note of those who had made the longest speeches of this session, with the following result: Dr. Roche (Marquette), 63 columns; Colonel Worthington (Sherbrooke), 50; Sir Frederick Borden, (Kings, N.S.), 41; Mr. Alcorn (Prince Edward), 41; Dr. Schaffner, (Souris), 41; Mr. Oliver (Edmonton), 40; Mr. Aylesworth (North York), 39; Mr. Miller (South Grey) 37; Mr. Crawford (Portage la Prairie), 36; Mr. Guthrie (South Wellington), 34; Mr. Foster (North Toronto), 35 twice; Mr. Monk, (Jacques Cartier), 34; Mr. Lewis, (West Huron), 33; Mr. Boyce (West Algoma), 33; Mr. Armstrong (East Lambton), 29; Mr. McCool (Nipissing), 29; Hon. R.

L. Borden (Carleton, Ont.), 28; Mr. S. J. Jackson (Selkirk), 28; Mr. Macdonald (Pictou), 27; Hon. Mr. Lemieux (Gaspé), 27; Hon. Mr. Fisher (Brome), 26; Hon. Mr. Graham (Brockville), 26; Mr. Northrup (East Hastings), 26; Sir Wilfrid Laurier (East Quebec), 25; Hon. Mr. Fielding (Shelburne and Queens) 25; Mr. Bristol (Centre Toronto), 25; Mr. Pringle (Stormont), 25; Mr. Galliher (Kootenay), 24; Sam. Hughes (Victoria and Haliburton), 24; Hon. Mr. Brodeur (Rouville), 23.

I did not go any further down on the list. Now, I hope we will all take this into our serious consideration and see if we cannot adopt some means by which every hon. member can place his ideas before the House in fewer words, throwing out a great deal of what is useless. For there is no doubt that, as every member of the House knows, a great deal that is said in this House might well be left unsaid. It does not convince anybody here, and it does not interest anybody outside. It would be greatly to the advantage of hon. members who have to sit here and listen and to the great, long-suffering public outside if speeches here were shorter.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Kennedy), I think, has given the best justification of the opposition that could possibly be given. What is the occasion of the hon. gentleman's speech this afternoon? The misdeeds of the opposition. And what is the occasion of the long speeches of the opposition? The misdeeds of the government. Well, as the misdeeds of the government exceed the misdeeds of the opposition a thousandfold, the opposition might well have extended their speeches to a much greater average than the hon. gentleman has given without laying themselves open to criticism.

Mr. JOHN BARR. I presume that this is the last dying speech and confession of the patriarch from British Columbia who has just addressed us. I think it would have been much more fitting if he had delivered this spech in a caucus of his friends and had endeavoured to persuade them to bring in the Bills which they foreshadowed in the speech from the Throne without waiting until the dying hours of the session. It would be more fitting if he were to warn them of the effects of bringing in such an obnoxious Bill as the Election Act amendment which we found necessary to fight at every stage, even to the extent of stopping the voting of Supply. This was the only power we could oppose to the overwhelming majority of the government and prevent the outrage upon the country that they were attempting.

Mr. SPEAKER. I suppose the hon. gentleman does not intend to discuss that Bill again?

Mr. KENNEDY.

Mr. BARR. I am replying to my hon. friend (Mr. Kennedy). I think I have a right to give reasons why we acted on the defensive in fighting these questions. The hon. member knows that we were obliged to fight that Bill from ditch to ditch until the last ditch was crossed. We compelled them to do justice to all except the province of Ontario. Though unsuccessful in preventing discrimination against Ontario, yet we accomplished good work. When the hon. member feels like lecturing the House I think he will find plenty of subjects on his own side. We were justified in taking every hour that we have taken in exposing and opposing the misdeeds of this government.

Mr. FOWLER. At the end of a parliament we always are confronted by the statistician who comes forward with his tables of figures as the hon. member (Mr. Kennedy) has done. But that is the last of the statistician. He never appears in another parliament. I think that the hon. gentleman will share the fate of his predecessors.

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

Militia and Defence—Chargeable to income—Annual drill—further amount required including Quebec review, $200,000.

Mr. FOSTER. I had intended, in company with two or three other hon. members, to take up a little more at length than I shall be able to do certain matters in connection with the Department of Militia and Defence. But at this time of the session, with almost everybody away, when my friends who were to have taken part in this discussion have been obliged to leave, I must content myself with saying much less than I should have done. In fact, I think all I can do now is to ask some questions. In the first place, I do not know whether the minister has explained to the House the transaction in lands at Niagara. If I am not misinformed, a considerable tract of land has been bought at Niagara for the purposes of a permanent camp. If the minister has already explained that transaction I am not aware of that explanation.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do not know that any reference has been made to this transaction. As every one knows, there is an old fort at Niagara which is one of the landmarks of Canadian history. Some years ago the question arose as to whether we should be able to continue to hold camp there, as we have been doing for years, because the camp ground was reported to be too small. The rifle range there is not sufficient for the modern rifle. Before constructing a rifle range it was thought desirable to look about and see whether we could not find a more suitable camp somewhere else. Several places were

examined, one in Simcoe was favourably reported upon. But when we tried to acquire the land the price was put up, and it was thought undesirable to go on with the purchase. Later on, the military staff of my department suggested the desirability of acquiring more land at Niagara adjacent to the lands already owned by us. I thought this a good idea. There is a very strong feeling in Ontario against abandoning the old historic grounds. General Lake kindly offered to take the matter in hand and had some correspondence, I believe with the authorities of the town of Niagara-on-the-Lake. If I remember correctly, the result of the correspondence was that the mayor of the town was able to procure an option on some 200 acres of land—I have forgotten the exact area: had I known that this matter was coming up I would have brought the papers with me. The price at which the land was offered was very low. A recommendation was made to council and the offer was accepted, and to-day we are the owners of that land. I have no doubt that it was secured at most favourable rates. It was done through the authorities of the town of Niagara-on-the-Lake, which town was naturally very much opposed to the withdrawal of the camp from the old ground and took every means possible to assist the department in procuring the necessary land at a favourable figure. I cannot tell my hon. friend what the price was, but I know it was a very fair price indeed.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the minister must be in a position to tell us what the price is. How long ago was this land bought?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I suppose three months ago, perhaps more.

Mr. FOSTER. Has it been paid for?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think so.

Mr. FOSTER. Out of what vote?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The vote of $1,300,000 for ordnance, rifles, lands, etc., capital account.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the minister know what the price was?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do not remember.

Mr. FOSTER. It seems extraordinary the minister would buy 200 acres of land and not remember approximately the price of the land.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I did not buy the land, it was bought by the officers of my department, or rather it was bought for us by the authorities of the town. I cannot carry those things in my mind, but it seems to me it was somewhere about $80 an acre, but I am speaking from memory.

Mr. LANCASTER. If the minister knew the names of the vendors I could give some idea of the value of the land.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. My estimates have gone through, and I have not the papers here; it was largely peach orchards. I am absolutely certain it was a great bargain.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not taking any exception to the buying of lands for military purposes if it is necessary and if it is properly conducted, but it seems to me a transaction of that extent—buying 200 acres at the rate of $80—is a pretty large transaction without parliament knowing anything of it. The vote is for the purchase of ordnance, arms, lands for military purposes, stores, clothing, etc. I have the same objection to this as I have expressed to other votes, that under this resolution the minister could spend a million dollars for lands without parliament knowing anything of it.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I shall get the information in ten minutes; I am anxious to give it.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand the minister has made a contract for the manufacture of bayonets in the country, for some 52,000, and that the contract has been made with the Ross Rifle Company. Has that contract ever been laid before parliament?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think so.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. It was before the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. FOSTER. It is the right of this parliament to have information with reference to such contracts. By what authority did the minister enter into a contract for a quarter of a million dollars without having brought it before parliament? All the information I have gained has been by means of questions in the House. But as it appears, without any discussion in parliament or any approval of the plan by parliament, the minister has entered into a contract with the Ross Rifle Company for the manufacture of 52,000 bayonets at $5.25 per bayonet complete. That amounts to over a quarter of a million dollars, and had it not been for some questions asked in the House parliament would have had no knowledge of what had been done. Does not the minister think that in entering into a contract for $250,000 he should have been specially authorized by parliament upon information detailed to the House? It is not a small transaction, it is a large transaction, and in this case has to do with the effectiveness of a force. If we look at current prices, I think I am entirely within the mark in saying that $5.25 is an extremely high price for bayonets. I find that the price of the bayonet and scabbard

complete at the War Office for use with the rifle of the British force cost 9s. 8½d., that is just $2.32.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. At what time?

Mr. FOSTER. In 1897.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. And at the present time I fail to find that the price of the bayonet is appreciably higher. I find the United States bayonet used by the United States troops and attached to their rifle costs even less than that.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. How does the hon. member arrive at the cost of the United States bayonet?

Mr. FOSTER. A statement by one of its military officers.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Manufactured by the United States itself?

Mr. FOSTER. Exactly, as this is manufactured at a factory for which we have provided every dollar of the working capital.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Not at all.

Mr. FOSTER. And in advance of making——

Sir FREDRICK BORDEN. We do nothing of the kind.

Mr. FOSTER. And in reference to this very contract, in which we advance 75 per cent of the total value of it before we get the bayonet. The very same article, if I am informed correctly, is in this contract as in the rifle contract, that we advance 75 per cent of the cost, which is three-quarters of $5.25.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We do not advance a dollar.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister need not say——

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The hon. gentleman need not misstate.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not misstating.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. He is absolutely misstating it, and he knows it. You know it perfectly well; you know you are stating what is not a fact. You are doing it deliberately.

Mr. FOSTER. I am stating what is absolutely the fact.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. You are not.

Mr. FOSTER. He has no right to speak to me in that way.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The hon. gentleman must not think he can talk to

people and insinuate and make improper and unfair statements, without getting his answer back.

Mr. FOSTER. Every time this year that any person has attempted to criticise this hon. gentleman he has been blackguarded by him for doing so, across the floor of the House. He does not stop criticism that way. Let him bring his contract and place it on the table of the House, and I think I will be able to show him out of the contract that he does exactly in this case what he did in the Ross rifle case, that he advances 75 per cent before the articles furnished to the department.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We do not advance in the case of the Ross Rifle contract, and that is what I say, and the hon. gentleman knows it. We give 75 per cent after 75 per cent of the work is done.

Mr. FOSTER. What I said, and the minister cannot crawl out of it in that way, is that before a single rifle was furnished to this government they had advanced 75 per cent of the contract price of the rifle, and he knows that is absolutely true.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, what the hon. gentleman said was that we supplied the working capital for the company, which is not correct; and he said that every dollar of the money was paid before any work was done.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Then how can the hon. gentleman say that we advanced the capital ?

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say before it was done. I said before the rifles were delivered. That is what I said, and the 'Hansard' will show it, and if the minister thinks it is not so we can refer to the 'Hansard' report.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Then there is nothing in your statement.

Mr. FOSTER. There is something in the statement, as I think, though my hon. friend may think there is nothing.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Nothing at all.

Mr. FOSTER. So I think it will be found that this is the condition, that the government is to advance the money expended on all bayonets, scabbards, parts thereof and materials therefor, to be delivered in any year up to 75 per cent of the price. That is exactly the wording of the contract in the case of the Ross rifle. Now in reference to the Ross rifle, what took place ? This state of things, that although an order was given at a certain time, the advances were thousands of dollars and hundreds of thousands of dollars over and against these rifles, before a single one, or at least before the sale of rifles called for in

any one contract, was delivered. I have the figures here, they have been so often placed before the House that it does not seem necessary for me to do it again, but if the minister makes it necessary, I shall read the record out of his own mouth.

I find that the first contract for the Ross rifles was given March 27, 1902, for delivery in the calendar year of 1903.

And the contract with the Ross Rifle Company only allows him to make an advance for the space of one year during which they are to be delivered. Here then is the date of the contract, March 27, 1902, for 12,000 rifles. Well, Sir, there was not a rifle delivered until August, 1905. Then 1,000; and in October 1905, 3,000; and in December, 2,000. And yet if you will take the companion statement given by himself you will find that on August 6, 1905, $506,000 had been paid out by this government to the Ross Rifle Company, and at that time he had not more than 1,000 rifles delivered.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We have got them now.

Mr. FOSTER. You have got them now, and that is the way the minister thinks a contract is kept. Now I say that the same reading is in the articles of the contract for bayonets as was in the article of the Ross rifle contract, the very same terms; therefore, we may look for the very same non-carrying out. Now does the minister want me to read any more of these figures as to the immense sums of money that were paid, first, before a single rifle was delivered, and afterwards, before one-tenth of the number practically called for by that contract, had been delivered. Now it appears that in this matter the minister has given the extravagant price of $5.25 for bayonets, that he has added to that the same condition that was in the Ross rifle contract, namely, that he can advance up to 75 per cent of the material and labour involved, before a single rifle bayonet is delivered.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. But after the work is done, and after the materials are there.

Mr. FOSTER. Not after the work is done, necessarily; after certain material is bought and after certain work is done, or before any work is done, if the material is there.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It is only on material.

Mr. FOSTER And that may be advanced to hundreds of thousands of dollars before he has a single finished rifle. These are the facts : That the minister gave orders, under the Ross rifle contract, for delivery of a certain number of rifles at various times; that the contract was not lived up to; that the minister advanced, for instance, in this case $506,000 before he had more than 1,000 rifles; that this contract is completed upon exactly the same plan; it takes power to advance in exactly the same way. Therefore what will take place in what took place in the other case, that you actually give into these gentlemen's hands a working capital for the contract you give them, and for which you pay them. Now I was going on to say that the price of the United States bayonet is $1.43, that is what it costs. When the minister says that it is manufactured in government works, what are these down here at Quebec? What did you give to the Ross Rifle Company ? You gave them in perpetuity almost nineteen and a half acres of government land on the Plains of Abraham. That is what he gave them, for $1 a year. That is, he gave them their site. What next did he give them? He gave them outside of what they get in the city of Quebec—that is their own matter, an exemption from taxation—he gave them this contract on which he advances 75 per cent, as I have stated.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I say we do not.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the minister had a single rifle made and delivered, this government had paid out nearly $500,000; and before he had more than 1,000, they had paid in actual cash $506,000. The very same thing went on. This means that you are giving them your working capital. Suppose the minister's contract was that he paid them for their rifles when they delivered them; then, for every dollar's worth of material they bought they would have to furnish their own capital, for every hour of labour they would have to pay for it out of their own capital and they would get no money from the government until they had delivered the goods. But, in this case they get $506,000 out of the government before they deliver one single rifle. Is that not furnishing the working capital ? Take that out of the contract and they would have to furnish all the capital, find all the material and pay all the labour.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. They did furnish it.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister furnished $506,000.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, paid it on account of work done.

Mr. FOSTER. That is shown by his own answer.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is not so.

Mr. FOSTER. And it is shown as well by the accounts. The minister knows the position that was taken by the Auditor General. In the course of time the Auditor General had to sit down on the minister and refuse to pay. He refused to pay because there was a constant advance of government funds before there was delivery of

the goods that were to be paid for, and he objected to it. The minister knows that and the minister knows that he had to go to council and get it to extend the time of the contract and so get payment in the end from the Auditor General. To sum up, first, a contract was made for $250,000 and this parliament does not know about it until to-day. In the second place the minister pays $5.25 for each bayonet when the bayonet supplied by the government of Great Britain is purchased for $2.92 and when the United States bayonet, made in the government works, it is said, costs $1.43.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I would need some better evidence than the hon. gentleman's statement as to that fact.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the minister say that the United States bayonet does not cost that ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do not believe it.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister does not ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, if the minister will ask his own officers he will find out that what I tell him is the fact.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The hon. gentleman has been around my officers ?

Mr. FOSTER. Around your offices ? Are they your offices ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Officers, I said.

Mr. FOSTER. Are they your offices or are they your officers ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. They are more mine than they are your's.

Mr. FOSTER. At present. I know you think you own the whole thing but I do not think you do. I have a perfect right to go to your offices.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Certainly and I have no doubt the hon. gentleman has been there just as he was in the Department of the Interior and the Department of Marine and Fisheries running around after the accountants to try to find out what is going on.

Mr. FOSTER. I absolutely deny such and both of these assertions and demand a retraction of them.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I will not retract them.

Mr. FOSTER. They must be retracted.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. They will not be retracted.

Mr. FOSTER. I have personal knowledge of the matter, I say that both statements are untrue and I demand a retraction.

Mr. FOSTER.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I will not retract.

Mr. FOSTER. I appeal to the Speaker. I will have this matter settled.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is customary to accept an hon. member's statement.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Certainly. I was informed and believed until this minute that the hon. gentleman had been doing what I have stated. I am bound, as I did on a former occasion, to accept the hon. gentleman's statement that he did not.

Mr. FOSTER. Then the hon. gentleman, having on a former occasion had to take back such assertions, ought to have learned something from his experience.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I may have something to say about the former occasion.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman wants to say something more let him say it now. Let him come right out with it.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Go on.

Mr. FOSTER. I have not done myself the honour of being in the minister's department. I do not know that I have been in it for four years, but if I wanted to go I would have a perfect right to go. The hon. gentleman has called them his offices. I do not think they are his.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. They are in occupation by me at the present time.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, unfortunately for this country they are.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. In your opinion.

Mr. FOSTER. That is my opinion. Now I was going on to say when I was thus rudely interrupted by the minister, for which interruption he has had to make a retraction, that if he did not know he should have known and that if he will ask his own officers I think he will——

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. My officers.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Oh, a few minutes ago they were not my officers.

Mr. FOSTER. They are your officers in occupation.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The hon. gentleman found fault with me for calling them my officers.

Mr. FOSTER. I will declare that they are his in occupation and humour him in that respect. However, if he will ask his officers—his by virtue of occupation for a short time only—he will find the records in his own department as to the price of the United States bayonet. I find here in

my notes, that, according to a letter from F. C. Ainsworth, Military secretary, acting secretary of war, August 25, 1906, and over his signature, the cost of the magazine rifle is given in the report of the Ordnance Department of the United States as $14.90, cleaning rod 24 cents and bayonet $1.42, the whole cost being $16.57. I base my statement as to the cost of the United States rifle on that authority. The minister says it is not true.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do not know what the hon. gentleman is reading from.

Mr. FOSTER. I am reading from my notes.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I thought so.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. A letter from Mr. Ainsworth ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, this is taken from a letter of Mr. Ainsworth.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. To whom?

Mr. FOSTER. To the department.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. To my department ?

Mr. FOSTER. By courtesy—your department.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Thank you.

Mr. FOSTER. There is an immense difference between that and a contract of this kind.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. In the first place the hon. gentleman finds fault with the fact that a contract has been entered into of $250,000 or thereabouts without the special authority of parliament. I may say at once in answer to the hon. gentleman that it has not been customary to lay contracts of this kind on the table or to ask the special permission of parliament for them. The hon. gentleman himself, in 1896, bought $1,000,000 worth of rifles and bayonets in England. He did not submit any contract, although I suppose they were bought on contract, to this House. He asked this House to vote $1,000,000 to enable him to buy rifles and bayonets.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I asked this House last year to vote $1,300,000 for the purpose of buying rifles and bayonets and various other things. In 1903 or 1904, I came to this House and stated the policy of the government with reference to the building up of the reserve of arms, ordnance, clothing, and all the various things required for the militia and I stated that that vote would be repeated probably for five years in succession. That vote has been repeated and out of that vote the materials, arms and other things have been bought exactly as stated to parliament at the time, and in each year, in the Auditor General's Report and in the militia report, a full account has been given of what has been done. In regard to this contract there was no secret. Information was asked in this House months ago and was given. The contract was entered into on May 4, and a statement was made in the House. I thought a copy of the contract had been laid on the table, but if not I am sorry as I intended it should be. The authority of parliament had been given quite as much in this case as in the case in which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) purchased a million dollars worth of rifles and bayonets. The hon. gentleman states the price is altogether too high, and as authority he quotes a letter from somebody to the department stating that the price of the United States bayonet is $1.43. I doubt that. He says it is made in the ordnance factory in the United States, and if so, that represents the bare cost and not the cost as it would be if manufactured in a business establishment by a business concern. That is well known both in the United States and in England. I find that the hon. gentleman himself purchased bayonets in England in 1896 and a portion of the rifles and bayonets he bought were bought from the War Office direct and another portion through the War Office from the trade. The portion purchased from the trade in England in 1896 cost 15 shillings and 5 pence halfpenny, including all expenses, or $3.71. Applying the duty which is now imposed on bayonets to that price the cost would be $4.46. I find that at the time the hon. gentleman made his purchases he happened to go into the market at a very favourable moment, and that he got a reduction of about 12½ per cent below the regular prices. When a factory begins the manufacture of armament of any kind there is always added to the estimated cost an estimate to cover initial expenses at the outset of manufacturing. It so happens that at the time General Lake made these purchases for the hon. gentleman in England the time had passed during which that 12½ per cent was maintained, and he got a reduction upon his rifles and bayonets of about 12½ per cent. Therefore if you add that 12½ per cent to the $4.46 paid you will see that the price will be considerably higher than the $5.25 upon which this contract is based. That is called the initial expense which is reckoned for in all contracts of this kind. $5.25 being the contract price, $4.46 being the cost which the hon. gentleman paid for the bayonet; it would give 79 cents to cover the initial cost of expenditure to provide for manufacture. I think the hon. gentleman is misinformed as to the cost of the bayonet at the War Office to-day, because I have here the latest quotation of the price of bayonet and scabbard in England and the cost of 25,844 bayonets according to ord-

nance factories account—that is at the ordnance not the trade outside—is $2.02, and the cost of 688 scabbards, 3 shillings and 3 pence halfpenny or 80 cents, making $2.82; the departmental expenses, 15½, freight 14, making a total of $3.11½ cents, and applying duty to this you will get about $4. The ordnance factories, prices for bayonets and scabbards given above do not include initial expense. The average difference between ordnance factories price and the price to the trade paid by the British government is approximately 35 per cent. This does not include any charge for initial expenditure. If you add that on it will bring it to $5.02½ cents which leaves 22½ cents per bayonet and scabbard for the initial expense on a contract for 52,000, equal to $11,700, which I think is not an extravagant allowance for the initial expense in a matter of this kind. In the case of rifles it is different, but in the case of bayonets the government is absolutely the only customer the contractor has so that when this contract is finished that is the end of it and unless some provision is made to the contractor for initial expense he would be very likely to make a loss, a thing which I do not think anybody desires. But the department took the precaution to ask somebody else. They asked the only other people in Canada who could do work of this kind. They asked the Ottawa Car Company to tender on this contract and the Ottawa Car Company did tender and if I remember correctly their tender was $5.45 so that the contract was given to the lowest tenderer. I believe that from all points of view the contract was a fair one. As to the quantity ordered—52,000 rifles are under order from the Ross Rifle Company, and it was therefore necessary to have 52,000 bayonets and a contract was entered into for the delivery of that number within three years.

The hon. gentleman will see that it is not $260,000, or whatever the amount of the contract may be, in one year; but it is spread over three years. So that it is not such an alarming thing; and of course it is absolutely necessary that we should have the bayonets in order that the rifles may be distributed to the troops as early as possible. The hon. gentleman has taken exception to this contract on the ground that it is similar to the Ross rifle contract, in authorizing advances up to 75 per cent.

We had that matter very fully threshed out in this House when the Ross rifle was under discussion. I stated then, and I repeat now, that in a contract of this kind, encouraging a new industry in this country, it was absolutely necessary that reasonable encouragement should be given to the contractor. He had to put up an expensive building and put in expensive machinery, and it was only fair that reasonable advances should be made to him as the work progressed. In England payments are always made in advance. The war office itself, if we gave them an order, would require the whole or nearly the whole of it to be paid for in advance. It does not seem to me to be unreasonable that this company should be paid, not in advance—I do not know that the hon. gentleman wished to misstate the fact, and if I gave the impression that I thought he did, I apologize; but I understood him to say that we paid this money in advance and supplied the company with its working capital. That is not true. What is done is this. After materials have been bought, after work has been done, a reliable man, a chartered accountant approved of by the Auditor General, goes and takes stock and examines all the vouchers and all the bills for all the material, and the books showing the labour expended, and upon that data furnishes the department with a statement on which 75 per cent of the value of the rifles is paid. The hon. gentleman makes a great point of the fact that considerable money at one time was advanced before any rifles were received. That is quite true. There were difficulties in the matter of the construction of the rifle and the delay was quite as much due to the officers of the department as to the company itself. The company was anxious to deliver a satisfactory rifle. The inspector was anxious that a satisfactory rifle should be delivered, and the inspector representing the department on the one hand and the officers of the company on the other hand worked together with a view to making certain changes in the mechanism to bring about the desirable result of delivering to the department and the country a first-rate rifle. This caused a certain amount of delay. I think for nearly a year there were no deliveries, but the work was going on. Four or five hundred men were working. We had the evidence of the chartered accountant before the Public Accounts Committee that out of $1,100,000 expended, $900,000 or about that sum was upon labour employed in the factory. So, in view of the fact that this was a new industry employing 500 men, and that it was in accordance with the policy laid down by the War Office that we should be as independent as possible in matters of this kind, it seems to me that there should be no serious complaint made against the department for extending reasonable leniency. The hon. gentleman says that we violated the contract. The hon. gentleman ought to know better. We did not violate the contract. My late deputy was a lawyer of good standing, and he passed these different demands for advances as they came in, and it never occurred to him, nor to anybody else but the Auditor General, that these payments should be limited to a given year. The Auditor General took a different view. It was quite proper for him to do so if he chose; he did it conscientiously. At my suggestion the matter was submitted to the Department of Justice, who ruled that the action of my department was in accordance with the contract. Then

it was that the Auditor General said : Then I must ask council to approve of the extension of time ; and that was done. It was perfectly proper. It ought to have been done before, and I do not see that the department is liable to any very great censure for that.

Mr. FOSTER. When was the contract entered into ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. On the 4th of May, 1908.

Mr. FOSTER. When are the first bayonets to be delivered ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I will read the contract.

Memorandum of agreement made in duplicate this day of one thousand nine hundred and eight, between Sir Charles Ross, Baronet, of Balnagown, Scotland, hereinafter called the contractor of the first part, and His Majesty the King, represented by the Hon. Sir Frederick W. Borden, Minister of Militia and Defence, of the Dominion of Canada, hereinafter called the minister which expression as herein used includes also the successors in office of the said Minister of Militia and Defence; His Majesty so represented being hereinafter referred to as the government, of the second part.

Whereas, it is considered in the general interests of Canada that the bayonets and scabbards for the rifle manufactured at present by the contractor for the government therein called the Ross rifle required by the government for the purposes of militia and defence should be manufactured in Canada.

And whereas the contractor has proposed by himself, or his assigns to undertake the establishment and operation of a suitable factory in Canada for the manufacture of such bayonets and scabbards and to supply the government with the bayonets and scabbards so required, manufactured, at the said factory and delivered to the government.

This agreement therefore witnesseth, and it is agreed by and between the contractor and the government as follows:

1. The contractor is to establish and operate in Canada a factory for the manufacture of bayonets with the necessary plant.

2. The contractor undertakes to deliver to the government, within three years after the delivery to the contractor, by the minister, of an approved standard pattern bayonet and scabbard and specifications and drawings therefor, 52,000 bayonets and scabbards manufactured in Canada at the said factory, and corresponding and equal in every respect to the said standard pattern bayonet and scabbard and in accordance with the said specifications and drawings therefor; such bayonets and scabbards to be delivered by monthly even quantities as nearly as may be, deliveries to begin within one month of the completion by the contractor of the necessary machinery fixtures and gauges; such completion by the contractor to be carried out with all due diligence, and to be immediately notified in writing to the minister.

4. All the said bayonets and scabbards hereby contracted for are to be inspected before delivery, with reasonable promptness and diligence, by the inspector of small arms, or other inspector duly authorized by the government; and if, upon such inspection, the said bayonets and scabbards are found equal to the standard pattern and in accordance with the specifications and drawings as aforesaid, delivery shall be taken as complete at the factory; otherwise they shall not be accepted nor shall payment therefor be made. But in case they are not accepted by the inspector, his reasons for non-acceptance shall, on request, be given by him to the contractor.

6. The government shall pay for all bayonets and scabbards delivered under the contract at the rate of $5.25 for each bayonet with scabbard complete. Payment therefor shall be made upon delivery; provided, however, that after the establishment of the said factory in good running order and the installation of all necessary plant, the contractor, in any year, during the continuance of this contract, if and so long as he is not in default with respect to the delivery of bayonets and scabbards under this contract——

These words were not in the Ross rifle contract.

—shall be entitled, in advance of delivery, to payment of moneys actually expended upon all bayonets and scabbards or parts thereof, to be delivered in that year; such payment to be made upon the contractor's certificate of the amount so spent attested by the signature of the government chartered accountant, who shall first satisfy himself of the fact of such expenditure; such payments in no case to exceed 75 per cent of the price of such bayonets and scabbards, the contractor undertaking whenever such advances are made to insure and keep insured the said bayonets and scabbards, and parts thereof, against loss or damage by fire, for the benefit of the government to the extent of such advances, and the contractor agreeing that to the extent of such advances the government shall have a lien upon the said bayonets and scabbards and parts thereof.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there any provision for importation of parts ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, these are to be all made in Canada. Of course, the steel must be imported.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the factory yet been started? If so, what progress has been made?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Some progress is being made, and I think the work is to be carried out in connection with the rifle factory, some addition being made.

Mr. FOSTER. When does the minister expect the first delivery?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I understand they are actually at work, so that it is hoped early delivery will be made.

Mr. FOSTER. Has any advance been made?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I cannot speak with certainty—so far as I know, none, and if there has been any I think it would have been brought to my notice.

Mr. FOSTER. The manufacture of 52,000 practically exhausts the manufacture of bayonets.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That number covers the number of rifles under order. About 44,000 rifles have been delivered out of 52,000. But, in future, when additional orders are given for rifles, additional orders will be given for bayonets of course. But it will be open to the government to terminate this contract and make a new one, or readjust the terms when this contract for 52,000 terminates. It might be also that the next lot of rifles would be of a somewhat different pattern, and so the bayonet pattern would have to be changed. The 52,000 rifles are of the same pattern. These are the considerations upon which the number was fixed at 52,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the pattern been adopted?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes. Twenty bayonets were manufactured more than a year ago and submitted to the military members of my department and sent to the Petewawa camp to be tested there during the exercises of last year. They were thoroughly tested, I believe, and found to be entirely satisfactory.

Mr. FOSTER. And have the drawings and specifications been prepared?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Are they in the hands of the contractors yet?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think so.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister will remember the delay that occurred with reference to the Ross rifle——

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We have learned by experience.

Mr. FOSTER—And a very costly teaching it happened to be in that case.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Not so.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand the minister to say that in this case the pattern has been adopted and the specifications made and placed in the hands of the contractors?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not see any force at all in the minister's calculation as to the matter of duty——

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Why would not the hon. gentleman give the same privilege to a manufacturer who is making material for the government that he would to a manufacturer who is making material for the public? Why should not the manufacturer of bayonets, for instance, have the benefit of this provision as to duty as well as the woollen manufacturer, the cotton manufacturer or the sewing machine manufacturer?

Mr. FOSTER. In the first place, the minister will see there is a great difference. The government treats no woollen manufacturer as it treats this manufacturer of rifles and bayonets. It does not give them a free site in perpetuity——

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. But towns do.

Mr. FOSTER—and it does not give them an advance on the price of goods, which advance, in this case, amounted to a very large sum before a single rifle was delivered. Let us reason that out for a moment. The general manufacturer has to select his material and buy it, to select his labour and pay it. He has to go through the whole process from the raw material up to the finished article. He then has to have that pass inspection, he ships it and the delivery is made. Then he gets his payment and not before. By this bayonet contract the man who manufactures buys the material and hires his men, but he pays for that material and for that labour out of the advance of 75 per cent and that is actually, to that extent, working capital which is provided for him by the government. He buys his material for a certain consignment of rifles or of bayonets and he puts his labour on it. He buys his material for two or three months, whatever are the terms, he puts his labour on that and he works it up and all the time his labour is working on it and bringing it towards the perfected instrument whatever it is, the bayonet or the rifle, he is receiving 75 per cent of the contract price which is, I think we will all admit, very close to the actual cost of the finished article, leaving the other 25 per cent for profit to the manufacturer. Therefore it is plain enough that whatever you may call it the man is really getting by his advance the working capital that is necessary for him to buy his material and employ his labour. You can always buy from the war office. The war office would be very willing to accommodate themselves to and work in co-operation with the government of Canada or any other colony. When we bought war material it was made what we call a rush order as sometimes has to be done. We wanted that $1,000,000 worth or more as quickly as possible. The war office provided us with one-half of those rifles and the small arms factory at Birmingham supplied the remaining half. Arrangements could have been made just as well, to-day as then with the British government by which the rifles and bayonets as well could have been provided, in whole or in part, by the ordnance department and perhaps in part by the dif-

ferent factories of small arms in Birmingham and other places. It is true that the outside manufacturer charges more than the imperial government does. It is also true that when the imperial government requires the installation of additional machinery for making ordnances for itself it allows, for a certain period of time, a little larger price. I think the allowance was about 10 shillings in the case of the small arms company at Birmingham.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, it is about 20 shillings.

Mr. FOSTER. No, it is exactly 10 shillings and that 10 shillings was given because of the expense for added machinery. But at a certain time that cut was made at least it was cut down when we bought, so that when we come to the average price of the rifles which we paid in 1896 and 1897, whereas we paid £3 8s. 5d. to the war office, we paid £4 13s. 2½ to the small arms factory at Birmingham and the average of the two amounted to about $20.77. There was added to that 5½ per cent for inspection and care of the department, which is I imagine always put in.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The war office rifles cost £2 17s. 3d., or with the pull through, oil bottle, &c., £2 18s. 6d., and the trade rifles cost £4, just as I said.

Mr. FOSTER. And what I said is exactly true, that with the whole thing complete it was £3 8s. 5d. for the war office and £14 18s. 2½d. for the private companies.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is not my statement. It was £3 18s. 9d. for the war office and £4 7s. 5d. for the others.

Mr. FOSTER. It is still less then as I have added 5½ per cent to make the total.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is added here too.

Mr. FOSTER. The difference between us is not great. The average then according to the minister's paper would be less than my average, $20.77½ for the 40,000. There is no doubt the minister could have made very much the same kind of an arrangement with the British war office and with the manufacturers of arms, and I do not think you will find there has been a very large appreciation in the price. What does the minister's Ross rifle cost him ? It costs him without the bayonet, about $28 to $29 per rifle.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. $26.90.

Mr. FOSTER. No, he has to take in everything in connection with the cost. There is the amount he has paid for changes and other improvements, that is he has undertaken to experiment upon a rifle which it has taken him from 1902 to 1908 to get into what he thinks just now is a pretty complete condition and he has had to pay for that experimentation.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It is not fair to charge that to the rifle.

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There may be 100,000 more rifles.

Mr. FOSTER. There may be but that is what these rifles have cost up to the present time, and that need not have been added to the cost if the minister had bought in Great Britain. He has had to pay $30,967 for changes and improvements, $76,580 for inspection, rentals, &c., and $26,237 for gauges so that the total payment for the 40,000 rifles, according to his own answer, is $1,138,784 which brings the cost up to $28.47. Then he has no bayonet. If he adds the price of the bayonet $5.25 and there will be inspection and other charges for this, he will have $33.72 which his rifle and bayonet will cost him, whereas from the war office, the whole thing complete cost us $20.77½ each for 40,000 rifles. The difference between $20.77½ and $33.72 represents just about the difference in the price that we have to pay. The same arrangement could, I think, have been made and the same relative saving.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. By buying in England?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Then why not buy woollens and cottons there?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think you can ever go on the same system and rule with reference to the manufacture of arms by a government as you can in respect of the general trade and manufactures of the country ; you may force that argument in, but I do not think it is altogether a fair way of putting it.

With reference to the bayonets, the same thing takes place. The minister could go to the British War Office and buy his bayonets for 9s. 8½d., adding some cost which would bring it up a little, or he could buy them from the small arms factories for about 13s. 2¾d. There may be some little cost added to that. Suppose he got the orders about equally placed for that 52,000, it would make an average in the vicinity of $3 per bayonet. Now he is paying $5.25 per bayonet. It seems to me it would have been a far better policy in the manufacture of both bayonets and rifles to have kept ourselves in exact unison with Great Britain. They have certainly had the greater experience in the manufacture of arms; they have the knowledge and the expert skill ; they are as interested in getting the very best arm for the British service, more interested than probably any other country in the world—certainly they are as much

interested as we are. We would have had the benefit of uniformity in arms and of the experience and skill and the cost of experimenting by the British government itself. The main argument that has been advanced in favour of the present system is that you wanted to be independent. But the fact is you are not independent now, in the manufacture of the Ross rifle you bring into this country from the United States manufactured parts. In the manufacture of the Ross rifle you bring in from the United States certain manufactured parts. I think we would have been just as independent if we had kept up the connection with the British War Office. Great Britain has command of the sea, and will keep it as long as she is a strong and permanent empire. I do not think there is much doubt as to our being always in a position to get our supplies of arms in that way from Great Britain. We would then keep side by side with the British government in all its improvements, and we would have a uniform arm. Instead of that, the minister went to work and undertook to manufacture a rifle, and it took him years to know what kind of a rifle he wanted. It may have been that the Ross rifle, as Ross brought it here, was a better rifle than it is to-day after it has gone through these experimentations.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. It is rather late in the session to go over that question.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think the hon. gentleman will see that it is hardly fair to repeat this whole debate over again. I have discussed the question here for an hour or more. It is hardly fair to me; it is hardly fair to the House at this hour, within a few hours of prorogation, to precipitate the debate anew. All that he has said has been said two or three times already during this session. Every one of these statements he is making has been answered. I appeal to the hon. gentleman as to whether this is the sort of thing we would expect from an old parliamentarian on the eve of the prorogation of parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. I am making my statement with reference primarily to the bayonet contract, and I am arguing from the Ross rifle contract to the bayonet contract.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. There is just one point. Reference was made to the primary rifle being better than the present rifle. I may tell him that the rifle that is now in the hands of the soldiers, and which has been condemned, has come through the severest test any rifle has ever passed through, and has proven itself equal to any rifle in the world. It is a question of test.

Mr. FOSTER. After all, you are dependent upon the rifle factory here, which is not manufacturing bayonets, and you are paying $5.25, when I am certain you could have got those bayonets made by the War Office and by the other companies in Great Britain at a figure somewhere in the neighbourhood of $3 to $3.50 each. As to independence in the matter, why, if war came to-morrow, or any time within two years, or even three years, if it came of a sudden, the factory here could not supply you, it is not able to do it. You would have then to go to the British government and get your supplies in the old country.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. For the third or fourth time I must repeat, as briefly as possible, what I have said before as a justification for undertaking to encourage the manufacture of arms in this country. Let me preface that by asking the hon. gentleman: Why did the government to which he belonged encourage the manufacture of ammunition? It could have been procured more cheaply in England. Why did he do that? When I came into the office the factory established by the hon. gentleman was manufacturing some 600,000 or 700,000 rounds of ammunition a year. I am happy to say that quantity has been increased from 600,000 to about 10,000,000 or 12,000,000 rounds. The hon. gentleman says we can always get what rifles we want in England. Well, we could not. In the year 1900 I tried to get 10,000 and we could not get 2,000. We did not know what was going to happen in 1900. We had sent 7,000 troops to South Africa armed with 7,000 of our own rifles and had reduced our stock. We wanted more; we tried to get 10,000, and we could not get 2,000 the very moment we wanted them. The hon. gentleman's argument would apply to any manufacture in Canada. I am surprised that an old national policy advocate should stand up here at this day and recommend that we should go on in this manner, being absolutely dependent upon the supply to come from the mother country. The same argument that applies to any manufacture in this country applies with greater force in this case, because this is a question of defence; it is a vital question, both to this country and to the empire at large. I read the other night—the hon. gentleman was here and heard me—from the blue-books laid before the imperial authorities a year ago, and what did it say?

No review of the strategical conditions of the British empire, even when such a review is limited to the purely military aspects of the question, can be undertaken without admitting as a first and fundamental principle that the maintenance of the empire rests primarily upon supremacy at sea.

Suppose that supremacy was interrupted, as it might be, even temporarily, and communication were cut off between this country and the mother country. It might

happen, it would be very likely to happen, it is possible, it is probable, if a union of any two great powers took place against Great Britain. I do not believe it would be permanent, but it might continue long enough to place us in the greatest peril, and absolutely imperil the connection between this country and the mother country. What did this blue-book say further ?

It is most desirable that the area of supply of the warlike store under reference should be as wide as possible, and therefore the colonial governments should be urged to arrange for local manufacture and provisions, rather than to rely on the resources of the United Kingdom.

There is the answer to the hon. gentleman. If we are to carry out our policy, do our part in defence of this empire, we must be prepared to manufacture, not only the rifles, but the ordnance and ammunition of all kinds, in our own country. That is the best way, no matter what it may cost. The cost must be kept within a reasonable amount. But it cannot be done yet as cheaply as it can in England. The department will carry out that policy so far as the manufacture of ammunition is concerned. We are already manufacturing ammunition in this country as cheaply, after twenty years of experience, as it can be done in England. The time will come when we may be able to manufacture rifles and ordnance as cheaply, but it will be many years. We must pay higher prices in the meantime ; labour is dearer. The hon. gentleman says : Oh, but it is not manufactured in Canada after all, you have to get the material outside. That argument would be just as sound and just as strong against almost any factory in Canada. Why, even agricultural implements are manufactured to a considerable extent from materials imported, and have to be. Carriages manufactured in this country are manufactured from imported material. We must creep before we walk. On the policy which the hon. gentleman lays down we would be content to remain in the condition we were in under his administration, and never be able to manufacture for ourselves. I do not believe that is a policy which the people of this country will endorse. I am quite content to leave this contract and to leave the policy in the judgment of the people to say whether it has been wise or whether it has been unwise.

With reference to the Niagara property about which the hon. gentleman asked, I have a memorandum which says : the total amount of money involved in the purchase was $31,000 or $120 an acre. The payment was made through the Department of Justice after negotiation by General Lake with the mayor of Niagara-on-the-Lake. The valuations obtained from an independent valuator were the same as the purchase price. The memorandum says that the registry is closed and full particulars cannot be obtained.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose we will have the report on Monday.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I will bring down all the papers.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this our last item of Supply ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the Speaker of the House, if there have been any additions made to salaries of officers of the House within a late period ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes. The salary of Mr. McCord, law clerk of the House of Commons, has been increased from $3,500 to $4,000. This increase has been under consideration for some time. In fact, the former Minister of Justice, about the time he was leaving office recommended that as Mr. McCord was doing what was called parliamentary counsel work his salary should be increased by $500. We had the matter up for consideration last year and again this year and we thought the increase was warranted. I may say that all these increases have been recommended by the clerk of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. What does Mr. Speaker mean by parliamentary counsel ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I suppose it is in connection with advice on Bills. I do not know what the extra duties are but it has been maintained by Mr. McCord for some years that he was doing this work and was entitled to be paid for it, and the former Minister of Justice recommended it. Then, Mr. Laplante, the clerk assistant of the House, has been increased from $2,800 to $3,500. The assistant clerk has been for one or two years pointing out that as compared with the former assistant clerks and as compared with those occupying similar positions in other legislative assemblies his remuneration was not at all adequate.

Mr. FOSTER. When was Mr. Laplante appointed ?

Mr. SPEAKER. 22nd March, 1897.

Mr. FOSTER. At what salary.

Mr. SPEAKER. It was formerly $2,800 but it was reduced to $2,000 when he took office.

Mr. FOSTER. When did it go to $2,800?

Mr. SPEAKER. In 1903 or 1904. Having regard to the very onerous work Mr. Laplante has to do at all hours during the session, we thought this was only a proper recognition of his services. The salaries of the 'Hansard' staff have been dealt with by a resolution, and they have been in-

creased to $2,500. Mr. Boyce, the assistant to the chief reporter, has been increased from $1,200 to $1,600. The salary of the translators of debates has been fixed at $2,100 as compared with $2,000.

Mr. FOSTER. How many of them are there ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I cannot say exactly but I will get the information.

Mr. FOSTER. What comes next?

Mr. SPEAKER. The two official stenographers of the committee of the House are getting $1,500 each and they made representations to us that when they accepted a salary of $1,500 they had no conception that the session would be anything like eight months in length. They claimed an advance in salary and a special allowance for this year. We decided on the whole to recommend that $100 be allowed as compensation for the present session and that they be given a permanent advance of $100 making their salaries $1,600. Mr. Howe, a second-class clerk, clerk of the Public Accounts Committee, has been promoted to a first-class clerkship. I need not point out how much work is being done, session after session, in the Public Accounts Committee. He is given a first-class clerkship at a salary of $1,600 a year.

Mr. FOSTER. What is he getting now ?

Mr. SPEAKER. $1,400 and he gets an advance of $200.

Mr. FOWLER. What did the translators formerly get?

Mr. SPEAKER. $2,000. They are getting an advance of $100. Then, Messrs. Clapin, Tessier, Paradis and Briand, of the translators' branch of the House, are promoted from second-class clerkships at the following salaries: Clapin and Tessier, $1,700; Paradis and Briand, $1,500, the two former having been longer in the service and having had more experience than the two latter.

Mr. FOSTER. What were they getting before?

Mr. SPEAKER. Clapin and Tessier were getting $1,500.

Mr. FOSTER. And Paradis and Briand ?

Mr. SPEAKER. $1,350.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the Speaker tell us what their duties are?

Mr. SPEAKER. They are permanent translators. I think Briand does some proof-reading work also.

Mr. FOSTER. Are they sessional clerks?

Mr. SPEAKER. They are permanent clerks.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the Speaker be kind enough to tell us what they do?

Mr. SPEAKER. They translate blue-books and all that class of work. Some of it is very technical and requires careful work. They translate all the sessional papers practically.

Mr. FOSTER. How long are they at work?

Mr. SPEAKER. All the year around with the exception of a reasonable vacation. Then there is Mr. Tremblay and Mr. Quéry. Mr. Quéry has been here since 1874, and he is increased from $1,700 to $1,900. Mr. Tremblay came in 1882 and he is increased from $1,700 to $1,900.

Mr. FOSTER. What do Mr. Tremblay and Mr. Quéry do?

Mr. SPEAKER. They are also permanent translators.

Mr. FOSTER. Doing the same work as those above?

Mr. SPEAKER. Practically the same work. Then there is Mr. Naubert, who is increased from $1,000 to $1,100. He is an assistant in the stationery office. Mr. Chapleau, the chief clerk of the French Votes and Proceedings, has found that his work is becoming very onerous. He is a very old and efficient officer of the House and he has found it absolutely necessary to have assistance. In fact he has been utilizing the services of an assistant to some extent to keep up with his work and he made an application for a permanent assistant in his office as translator and assistant clerk. The board decided, on the recommendation of the clerk and myself, to take power to appoint an additional man who has not yet been selected. They also decided to recommend that he be appointed a second-class clerk to start at a salary of $1,200. It will require an experienced, careful and competent man and it will hardly be possible to get any one who is fitted to do that work at a less salary than that. Lionel Dansereau is increased from a second to a first-class clerkship and the salary is fixed at the minimum of that class, $1,500.

Mr. FOSTER. What is he getting now?

Mr. SPEAKER. $1,400.

Mr. FOSTER. What does he do?

Mr. SPEAKER. French journal clerk. Then Mr. Deacon, second-class clerk who is curator of the reading room, is promoted from a junior second class to a second. I have had a conversation with the accountant, who has some supervision over his work in connection with the newspapers, and he recommends him as a very competent careful officer who is very closely occupied and who thinks that this increase is justifiable.

Mr. FOSTER. What salary was he formerly getting?

Mr. SPEAKER. He was getting $1,100 and he is increased to $1,200. Then there was, from the Joint Committee on Printing, a recommendation to the board a copy of which I have here and which I will read.

12. That the following schedules of salaries and grades as recommended by the Joint Committee on Printing be adopted by the board as a suitable scale for the officers of that branch and that the other recommendations of the joint committee be adopted as far as practicable in that connection having regard to the provisions of the proposed Civil Service Act.

The recommendation of the joint committee is as follows:

The committee recommend that, inasmuch as no permanent authorized scale of salaries, or rule as to promotions, exist in the case of employees of the Joint Committee on the Printing of Parliament (serving in the distribution office of the Senate and House of Commons), and it is expedient that a permanent schedule in that regard be established similar in principle to that in force in the civil service and the House of Commons, the following schedule be adopted as a proper scale as to salaries and rule as to promotions in that branch of the service:

Designation of Official.	Present Grade.	Present Salary.	Yearly Increase.	Maximum Salary.
			$ cts.	$ cts.
1. Supt. of Distribution	Chief Clerk	$1,900. First appointment, 1897.	50 00	2,500 00
2. Assistant Supt. of Distribution	Second Class Clerk	$1,200. First appointment, 1896.	50 00	1,500 00
3. Second Assistant Supt. of Distribution	"	$1,200	50 00	1,500 00
4. Clerk of Distribution	Junior Second Class Clerk.	$800. First appointment, 1900.	50 00	1,100 00

The above increases of $50 each to begin from April 1, 1908.

13. That the salaries of Messrs. George Smith, bank messenger, and of Mr. George Holder, senior night watchman, be increased to $800 each.

Mr. FOSTER. What are they getting now ?

Mr. SPEAKER. $700 each. This puts them at the maximum of that class—(reading) :

That the salaries of Messrs. Charles R. Stewart, Thomas Ebbs, Louis P. Moreau and A. Boutet be increased to $700 each; that Mr. St. Louis, barber, have the same rate of pay as if he were a sessional messenger, and that the pay of sessional bookkeepers, H. C. Vaughan and G. Turner in the messenger staff be increased 50 cents per diem from the beginning of the present session. That Sessional Doorkeeper Williams have an increase of 25 cents per diem.

14. That as soon as possible a suitable room be set apart for the receipt, care, issue and distribution to the members of the House of Commons of the blue-books and other public documents formerly stored and distributed from the post office of the House, and that a permanent clerk to be a junior second class clerk at the minimum salary of that grade be appointed to assist Mr. Hollingsworth, of the post office, at present in charge of the work.

Mr. FOSTER. Will that be a new appointment ?

Mr. SPEAKER. That will be a new appointment. We are promoting one of the messengers to that position. The question of the distribution of blue-books to the members has been a source of annoyance to my knowledge for the last four years. It has never been satisfactory. It formerly encumbered the post office. This year a change was made, and the distribution was made from a small room off one of the corridors. As the blue-books are very large in number, we contemplate using one of the rooms in the new extension for this purpose, and assigning to some one the constant supervision of the matter, which I think will work out satisfactorily. This is the recommendation of the clerk and I think also of Mr. Mills, the postmaster. (Reading) :

15. That the appointment of Mr. Speaker of W. A. Lalonde, promoted from a permanent messengership, as a junior second class clerk be confirmed, it being understood that he is to be assigned to the above duty.

All these increases, except those of the Debates staff, are to take effect from the beginning of the present fiscal year. The increases of the Debates staff take effect from the beginning of the session.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the Speaker tell us out of what moneys he is paying for these increases ?

Mr. SPEAKER. They will have to be voted.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the Speaker making these appointments and these increases, commencing with the beginning of this fiscal year, and waiting till next session for a vote to authorize them ?

Mr. SPEAKER. That is the intention.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that the usual way ? It seems to me that we have been usually

getting the vote first and making the appointments afterwards. May be under the new deputy we are going to adopt a different system.

Mr. SPEAKER. We think there will be enough money for the purpose.

Mr. FOSTER. But the money was not appropriated for this.

Mr. SPEAKER. It was appropriated for the general salaries of the House. In the meantime we put this on the minutes of the Board of Internal Economy as our recommendation to the government. Of course, the matter will have to be dealt with in the ordinary way.

Mr. FOSTER. Have you included in these increases all the officials in connection with the House ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I would not like to say that we have included all. We have included quite a number, but not all. Some of these cases have been standing for a year or two, and others have come up this session. In other cases, the officials have not applied for an increase this year.

Mr. FOWLER. That makes a difficulty, where some have been selected for an advance and others have not, and I do not think that a man should suffer for his modesty. If a man is too modest to request an increase of salary, that ought to be counted to him as an advantage. I would give the modest man a larger amount than the fellow who is always pressing for an advance.

Mr. SPEAKER. The clerk has gone over these matters very carefully, and has recommended them.

Some resolutions reported.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

House proceeded to consider resolutions reported from Committee of Supply.

Grant towards the erection of a monument at Brantford, to commemorate invention of telephone, one-fourth of cost not exceeding $7,500.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I wish to move an amendment to that item. The total appropriation for this purpose, of course, was $10,000, one-quarter of this vote having been concurred in with the others. It has been brought to my notice that the vote in its present form will hardly cover the purposes of the promoters of this movement. It makes provision only with regard to a 'monument.' The committee having the matter in charge may wish to purchase the old Bell homestead which may be made a part of the memorial. I propose to amend the resolution to make it read :

Grant towards a memorial at or near Brantford to commemorate the invention of the telephone.

That will allow the committee to use the money, if they wish to do so, partly for a monument and partly for a memorial in some other form. Both will be covered by the word 'memorial.'

Motion agreed to and item amended, and, as amended, concurred in.

Public Works, chargeable to income—harbours and rivers—Nova Scotia—South lake, Lakevale—opening channel from lake to St. George's bay, inclusive of protection work, $5,625.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). That estimate was made some time ago and progress has been made, so that so large an amount is not required. I propose to reduce the item to $700, and move that it be amended accordingly.

Amendment agreed to. Item as amended concurred in.

Mr. BLAIN. Is the Minister of Public Works making any special provision for more rapid progress on the work in connection with the Geological Survey building? I understand that some of the minor contractors for heating, lighting, &c., are rather slow at their work and that the general work of the building is being interfered with.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is not the case. The contractor for the building, Mr. Goodwin, is pushing it very rapidly, but the contract for the heating, lighting, fittings, &c., has not yet been let. I stated in the House that I would ask for tenders for the heating, lighting and fittings, but since then representations have been made urging me to push the work forward and I have a proposal from the contractor with reference to the heating, lighting and fittings. The matter is now under consideration. Everything will be done to push forward the building and the progress so far has been as rapid as it possibly could.

Mr. BARR. How long before the building will be completed ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. If arrangements can be made so that the subsidiary work of heating, lighting, fittings, &c., can go on concurrently with the main work of the building, I am informed it may be possible to provide for a large number of the specimens in the present museum even during the coming winter. I expect the whole building will be completed next year.

Mr. STEWART. Apart from the necessity of protecting the specimens at the geological museum, any one who enters the present museum must see that if a fire

should break out there is great danger of loss of life. A considerable portion of the present museum is made up of buildings attached to the stone building. This shows the necessity of pushing the completion of the geological museum as rapidly as possible.

Mines Branch—investigation of ore deposits and economic minerals; of fuel values of coals and peat of Canada; examination and delimitation of peat bogs, $35,250.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the Minister of Mines (Mr. Templeman) what provision, if any, he has made for Dr. Bell, who, after the death of Dr. Dawson, took on the work for a number of years which Dr. Dawson had done, on the salary that he was getting at the time that Dr. Dawson died. I think that Dr. Bell received no addition at all for the extra work he did from the time of Dr. Dawson's death until the appointment of Mr. Low. It seems to me that Dr. Bell's service, the length of time in which he has been employed by the department, his world-wide reputation, and the very fact that most of the work which has been done since in the way of publication and, I am not sure, but most of the work of exploration, has been based upon the work of Dr. Bell previous to that. Anyway, it seems to me that a man who was neither appointed as director nor definitely told that he would be appointed as director, but who, for a number of years, did the work, and it is somewhat onerous work, ought to have had some recognition. I am not sure whether anything has been done in the way of an increase of salary or by an appropriation for the difference in the salaries, or provision in any other respect. I would like to ask the minister if he would inform the House in reference to that ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. He was acting Director of the Geological Survey for some years.

Mr. FOSTER. How many?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Probably four or five years. At the time of the death of Dr. Dawson his salary as geologist was $2,400. Dr. Bell was never made director of the survey for reasons that I am not aware of. I would suppose that the minister of that day did not think Dr. Bell possessed the strength and abilities which would fit him to be the permanent director of the survey. At all events, he was not appointed. He was acting director and he received, during that time, the salary of his position as geologist of the survey, $2,400. While he was acting director he declined, I understand, to accept the annual increase of salary appertaining to the position of geologist, claiming, I am advised, that during that time he should receive the salary of director. The minister did not see fit to accede to that claim. Mr. Low was appointed director, probably three years ago, Dr. Bell being at that time advanced to the position of chief geologist, a name created especially for the purpose of giving him a distinctive position in the survey.

Mr. FOSTER. Did that carry an increase of salary?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. That carried an increase of salary up to $3,000. Dr. Bell has received $3,000 practically for three years, and on the 1st of June last he accepted superannuation, being given six months' leave of absence. He receives a superannuation allowance of a little over $2,000 a year. I am aware of the fact that Dr. Bell does claim the difference between the $2,400 per annum that he received as acting director and the present salary of director.

Mr. FOSTER. Which is?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. $3,000. Mr. Low, who occupies the position of director, is also the head of the department, and his salary has been going up since by annual increases of, I think, $100. Dr. Bell, in my opinion, has been very fairly dealt with. He is receiving a superannuation allowance of over $2,000. He was not, in the opinion of the ministers who have administered the department for the last ten years, just the person that they would care to put into the position of director for reasons I do not need to go into. He is an old official of the department; I believe he has been over fifty years in the service. I do not believe it is accurate for the hon. gentleman to say that the whole or any portion of the work in the way of the publication of reports or surveys since Dr. Bell has retired from the service is due to the work of Dr. Bell further than that, of course, the surveys made by the Geological Survey during his administration annually have been published as the reports of the department. The principal part of the work done by the Mines Department during the last few years has been conceived and carried out by Dr. Low, the Director of the Geological Survey, and by Dr. Haanel, Director of the Mines branch. I understand that Dr. Bell does make some claim for compensation for the five years during which he has been acting director. That matter was presented to me a few weeks ago, and it has not been disposed of.

Mr. FOSTER. I was taking the statement that the minister has made last. A geologist is a technical officer, and Dr. Bell has gvien some fifty years' service to Canada. When that fifty years was pretty well up to its limit, he was getting only $2,400 a year. Dr. Bell is a geologist of note, and it

does seem to me that there is every ground for treating him as an old scientific man, and one who has been so long in the service, a little better than to keep him down to $2,400 when he was doing the work of director as well as it would have been done if he had been appointed director. The fact that he did not receive any annual increment for five or six years is also a consideration that weighs. Then you made him chief geologist at the very modest salary of $3,000. Within the last two weeks you have made salaries of $4,000 and $5,000 for gentlemen who have not spent fifty years in the service of the country, and are not scientific men or technical in any sense. It does seem to me that the minister has a very good reason for giving to Dr. Bell the difference between his salary and what would have been the salary of the director if there had been one during the period referred to. The minister says Dr. Bell gets a superannuation of $2,000; but why does he get it? Because he has given fifty years of service, not because of the very large salary on which he was retired. If a man has given fifty years of service, it is hardly right to cast into his teeth the fact that he gets $2,000 now, when he has earned that superannuation on a very modest salary. I cannot help saying that other cases, and many of them, men without his abilities have been treated much more liberally. I think the minister would be doing a wise thing if he would make the proper readjustment in this case.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would not be inclined to take the view which seems to have impressed itself on the Minister of Mines with regard to Dr. Bell. If Dr. Bell was not competent to discharge the duties of director, those duties should not have been imposed upon him for a period of five years. I do not understand from the statement of the minister that there is any difference between the duties of a director and the duties of an acting director. For five years those duties were imposed on Dr. Bell, and during that time he did not receive the salary which ordinarily pertains to that office. The Minister of the Interior was unfair either to the country or to Dr. Bell. If Dr. Bell was not competent to fill that position he should not have been invested with the duties of that office for five years, or for five months. On the other hand, if Dr. Bell was competent to discharge the duties of the office for five years, I see no reason why he should have been asked to do that without the salary he would have received if he had been formally appointed director. I was not impressed with the argument of the minister.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I made no argument. I simply stated facts.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman stated that Dr. Bell had been very fairly treated, giving as a reason that his salary had been increased for the last three years of his service. Suppose his salary had been increased for ten years to $3,000, that argument would fall to the ground, and Dr. Bell would have been in a much better position. I have the impression, from a debate which took place in the committee of supply two or three years ago, that on a previous occasion a gentleman had been allowed the salary of director during the period in which he fulfilled as acting director the duties of the office. That is a precedent which it seems to me should not be departed from without very good reason. I do trust that the minister will take this matter into consideration, and give to Dr. Bell, who is a scientist of great repute, the treatment which I think the country can well afford to him after fifty years of faithful service.

Mr. ROBERT STEWART. I hold in my hand a computation of the amount of difference between the salary which Dr. Bell drew as acting director and the salary that would have been paid to a director for the five years from the 1st of March, 1901, when he was appointed acting director. The difference amounts to $4,591. I agree with what has been said as to the advisability of doing something for Dr. Bell, who has been in the service for so long a time. It appears to me that the minister has a precedent for remunerating Dr. Bell for the services rendered by him, in the case of Dr. Dawson, who was paid an extra $1,000 as acting director for one year in 1896, when Dr. Selwyn was absent in Europe. I hope the minister will see his way to consider favourably the suggestion to remunerate Dr. Bell for the time he acted as director.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. With regard to Dr. Dawson, he was one of the most eminent scientists Canada ever produced and one of the most successful directors of our geological survey. I do not understand that it is customary, where an official acts for another in a superior position, as, for instance, where a chief clerk acts for a deputy minister, to pay him the salary of the superior officer.

My knowledge of the salaries of acting deputy ministers is very limited, and I speak subject to correction. I agree with the remarks made by the hon. member for North Toronto in regard to the inadequacy of the salaries not only of the acting director of that day and of the acting director of this day, but of the officers of the Geological Survey generally. We have men in the survey who have been twenty or twenty-five years in the service and who are receiving now less than $2,000. I do not think that is creditable. I hope that, under the reorganization of the department, the technical men will get a certain standing and advance more rapidly than in the past and the whole department be put on a better footing in this respect. With regard to Dr.

Bell, I have very little to say. While he was acting director he received his old salary. He refused to accept the annual increment of $50 or $100 whichever it was, because as he then claimed, and has since claimed, he should receive the salary applicable to the position. No doubt he is fairly entitled to the annual increment. Whether he should or should not receive the salary belonging to the office at the time I am not prepared to say. We have had an acting director, Mr. Brook, for the last year who is receiving only $2,300.

Mr. FOSTER. He has not been fifty years in the service.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. No, but he has been ten or fifteen years in the service. But that does not effect the principle. He has been receiving for the last year, not the salary of the director, but the salary he was receiving before as geologist of the department, $2,300. I put a sum in the estimate to bring his salary up to $2,800 because he is a capable acting director. I am sorry to say that Mr. Low is not in a position to return to the department. He is director and deputy head and is receiving the salary of the position. But he is now away on sick leave. He is not entitled to superannuation; he is a very superior man and most efficient director, and we hope he will return to his duties soon. But Mr. Brock is not receiving $3,000 but is being treated the same as Dr. Bell. As long as Mr. Low is away Mr. Brock will receive simply the salary paid him as geologist of the department, which this year, will be $2,800. In making the change from Dr. Bell to another, who is permanent director, I believe that the interest of the public service has been promoted.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not wish to be understood as suggesting that when a chief clerk, in the case of the temporary absence or license of the deputy head, performs the duty of that office for a short time, he necessarily should be paid the salary of the office for that period. But the case to which I have alluded was not a case of that kind. The office had become vacant and for a period of five years an official of the department was charged with the duties of the office. It seems to me that a case of that kind stands upon an entirely different plane and that some consideration at least should be given to the fact that for so long a time and under such circumstances he did perform the duties of the office to the best of his ability, and the country received the benefit of his services in that capacity.

Dominion of Canada assay office—maintenance of assay office, Vancouver, British Columbia, $13,500.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to have some information from the minister as to what is being done in the assay office in Vancouver —as to the results, say, for the past year.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I regret to say that I have not read the report of last year. But I was advised by the Director of Mines branch, Dr. Haanel, that the receipts of gold at Vancouver assay office during the last two months had been far in excess of any previous term of similar length. The receipts for the six months were about $4,000,000. Extra help was required for the handling of the gold. I am glad to say that the utility of the assay office has been demonstrated more clearly than ever.

Geological Survey branch—explorations and surveys; printing and publishing reports, maps, &c.; wages of assistant explorers, draughtsmen, clerks and others; purchase of specimens, books, instruments, stationery, mapping materials, maintenance of offices and museum, laboratory apparatus, chemicals, miscellaneous expenses, &c., $45,000.

Mr. FOSTER. I desire to say just a word as to what appears to me to be the questionable plan of having the officers of the Geological Survey branch, sometimes in the department and sometimes out of it. From information we have had, it seems that these officers, when out of the department, take part in what might be called private explorations, that is, exploration work for private parties or corporations, being used in such a way that it is quite possible the private parties or corporations may avail themselves of the special knowledge the officer has gained while under pay of the Dominion and be greatly profited thereby—I do not mean by his general knowledge as geologist or expert of any kind, but by his knowledge of the richness of localities. Does the minister think it good policy to have these officers for a time in the department, then working for private corporations, then back again doing exploration work for the Dominion? I understand that one of the officers of the department is going across the water, we paying his salary and expenses, though the work he will do is absolutely in the interest of a speculative company. I think that refers to a company in New Brunswick, in which Mr. Lodge of whom we have heard in the House, is interested. I think this is making a very different use of the officers of the department from what one would think correct. I understand that quite a number of officers in the hon. gentleman's department are like the revolving lights, at one time flashing in the department, then obscured to the department and flashing somewhere else, then returning to light up the department again.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The point raised by my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is a very important one. There is a good deal to be said on both sides of that question. The hon. member speaks as though many of the officials were appearing in and disappearing from the survey to do work for private parties. I think there are very few instances of that kind on record alto-

gether. This year there have been only two so far as my recollection serves. With reference to sending Dr. Ells to Glasgow to watch the process of the extraction of oil from the shales of New Brunswick, that is wholly in the interest of the public. It is not in the interest of the company or the individual, it is entirely in the interest of the Geological Survey. He has knowledge of the existence of shales and their extent and knows something of the probability of oil extraction therefrom, but he will acquire information as to the extraction by watching the operation, will make a report to the Geological Survey and that report will be published in the interest of the people of the country. It is not in the interest of the New Brunswick company, except in a general way, through the information that will be made public. I think in that respect it was perfectly proper and fair to pay his expenses which I was informed would not be more than $500.

Mr. FOSTER. This shale is being cruushed in the old country, and the object is to find out how much oil it will produce and if it is economical and commercially valuable in that way. You send Dr. Ells, as a member of the Geological Survey, to watch the operation and make up his mind as to what value there is in those shales. Does that seem to be the object of the formation of the Geological Survey? Would their duty not be more to locate generally the existence and extent of these shales? This would seem to be rather a malversation.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. There are two branches of the Department of Mines, the Geological Survey, which is technical and scientific, and the Mines branch, which is practical and economic. Dr. Ells is an economic geologist, but he was sent to Scotland by Dr. Haanel, of the Mines Branch, to obtain information of importance in respect to these shales. This is absolutely along the lines of our action in regard to the peat deposits of Ontario. We sent a member of the Mines Branch to Europe last year and he has published a very valuable and useful report on the peat deposits and the manufacture of peat into fuel in Europe. At the time of the discovery of the nickel deposits at Sudbury the department pursued the same policy, and the report of the official then sent there was of great value in the inauguration of the mining industry at Sudbury. It must be remembered that one of the great difficulties we have in connection with the work of the Geological Survey is the scarcity in Canada of men qualified for the work of the department.

Mr. EMMERSON. It was my privilege some few years ago to be brought in contact with one of the most distinguished geologists in the United States, Professor Shaler, who has enjoyed an international reputation. One of the strongest criticisms made at that time in respect to the Geological Survey of Canada was that they did not pay enough attention to the economic side of geological research. It has been well known by geologists and others that we have in Canada large shale deposits. They are to be found in Nova Scotia in the vicinity of Stellarton and in Westmoreland, New Brunswick, while there are mountains of shale in the country of Albert, New Brunswick. They are found in Ontario and are known to exist in Alberta. There are similar deposits of shale in Scotland, and for many years a profitable industry has been carried on there in distilling the oils from these shales.

The profit does not arise so much from the oil product, but from the by-products, and so great is the industry that those who are engaged in it in Scotland have been bringing from New Zealand, for a number of years, the shales to be found in large deposits there. A question arose as to whether the shale deposits in Canada could be profitably developed and exploited. They have been known to exist, but have been dormant for many years and have no practical value for Canada. There has been no process discovered whereby they could be utilized and made contributory to the commercial interests of Canada. Now, as has been stated by the Minister of Mines, there is to be an experiment by these Scotch manufacturers, or those who are engaged in the industry in Scotland; an experiment is to be carried on in Scotland by exploiting or using the shales from the deposits in the province of New Brunswick, and if it is found that these shales can be thus utilized and made profitable, certainly it will be of immense benefit to Canada. If they can be utilized, then those in Nova Scotia can be utilized and made profitable, and so with respect to Ontario and the west. Mr. Speaker, I would certainly congratulate the Minister of Mines upon the advance step he is taking in this direction. I understand that this experiment is to be carried on in the presence of two very distinguished scientific men, one from the United States and another from Great Britain. It will be of great advantage to Canada, I am sure, if it is found from the report of Dr. Ells that those shales have a commercial value and can be mined and utilized from that standpoint. At present they are practically valueless. Many years ago, previous to the discovery of the petroleum oil wells in Pennsylvania, the shale deposits in Albert county were manufactured into what was know as paraffin oil at that day, and there was quite an industry. They used to produce comparatively large quantities, which sold at that time at $1 a gallon These shales, which are practically oil in

a congealed state, are distilled into oil and then refined, and it made a superior kerosene, much superior, as I am told by experts, to the water white kerosene oil of to-day, the best kerosene oils that are produced from the crude petroleum of Pennsylvania. Of course, when petroleum was discovered in Pennsylvania in such large quantities, when gusher wells were discovered, it simply drove this shale industry out of existence in the province of New Brunswick. At that time they were mining what was known as albertite coal, nothing more or less than a congealed oil, and many millions of dollars were brought into the province of New Brunswick from the sale of this albertite. Contemporaneous with that industry, and near to it, was this industry of mining and quarrying the shale and distilling it into petroleum and then refining it. But that industry was, as I say, abandoned by reason of the cheaper process discovered of drawing petroleum in its crude state from the earth and then refining it. The cost of the process was much less, and the production, of course, could be put on the market at a much less price. Now it is found, and I hope it may be so, that the oil shale of New Brunswick and of other provinces of Canada can be utilized in this way, if the petroleum can be distilled successfully in the same way that the Scotch shales are, it will be of immense economic value to Canada, and I am sure that if it were to cost five times $500 to get this information through the medium of Dr. Ells' report, it would be money well expended on behalf of the mining industries of Canada. I commend the Minister of Mines on the step he has taken, and I am sure if he will only keep his gaze steadily turned towards the economic side of our geological researches, he will confer a great boon upon the commercial and material interests as well as other interests of Canada.

House of Commons—sessional clerks—additional, $15,600.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to emphasize what I said this afternoon, that I do not see anything in the past practice of this parliament which authorizes increases in special salaries out of a general vote or what may be left over from a general vote. No department, because it has a general vote which it has not used up, can out of that vote go behind parliament and raise the salaries of a dozen or twenty clerks. The universal practice has been that before you can raise the salary of a clerk whose salary has been voted by this parliament, you must come to parliament and get the money for doing that; and I do not see how it is possible, in the case of the House of Commons any more than in the case of a department, to raise the salaries of a number of clerks without parliamentary authority, and to raise them from a period which antedates the time of the action. I am not saying this because I want to bar the increases to the officers of the House, but I am expressing a principle which I think is absolutely clear and definite, and I would be very sorry to see the House of Commons itself break one of the fundamental rules of parliament.

Mr. FIELDING. There seems to be some question as to the proper procedure in the matter. I am not sure that this is without precedent, though I am not sure that it is a wise practice to pay such increases out of general votes. I have not had the point brought before me before, and I will look into it. There is no desire to depart from sound rules in the matter.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think there is, and I mention it in the same spirit in which the Finance Minister refers to it. I would be very sorry if there were.

Department of Finance and Treasury Board—To provide for the appointment of J. G. Artz as second-class clerk at a salary of $1,350 per annum, $900.

Mr. FOSTER. Might I be allowed to call the attention of the Finance Minister to this ?

Mr. FIELDING. Mr. Artz is a gentleman whose services we could not obtain without this vote. He is a chartered accountant, a gentleman of considerable experience, the sort of man likely to be useful in the department, and we have had to take this special vote to give him an adequate salary. He has passed the civil service examination.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this gentleman to be the actuary?

Mr. FIELDING. No, I contemplate making Mr. Grant the actuary. As a chartered accountant and a man of considerable experience, Mr. Artz could not be expected to enter the service at the ordinary salary, and we have had to fix his salary at this rate, which is a very moderate rate, to secure his services.

Resolutions concurred in.

PAYMENT OF COUNSEL, HODGINS COMMITTEE.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD moved :

That as it appears by their printed proceedings of Tuesday, June 23, 1908, that the special committee appointed to investigate the charges made by Major A. E. Hodgins, unanimously passed a resolution to the effect that proper and reasonable fees should be paid to the counsel employed before the committee, the clerk of this House and the law clerk are hereby authorized to tax the fees and expenses of such counsel, and to pay the amounts when so taxed, out of any moneys voted by parliament for expenses of committees.

He said: This resolution was prepared by Mr. Todd, the secretary of the committee, who advises me that this is the proper method of carrying out the terms of the report of the committee.

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Ways and Means.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee.

Mr. FIELDING. According to the usual practice, the officers of the House having collected these various items, and the House having concurred in them, I now beg to move:

Resolved, that towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending March 31, 1909, the sum of $57,976,870.41 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Motion agreed to, resolution reported, read the first and second time, and agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 220) for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending 31st of March, 1909.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first and second time, and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is the Bill in precisely the ordinary form?

Mr. FIELDING. The Bill has been prepared by the clerks in the usual form.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I see a marginal note with regard to some special time.

Mr. FIELDING. That is the usual clause with regard to the Northwest whereby they are allowed more time for closing up their accounts. Such clauses are in all the Supply Bills.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate sending certain amendments to Bill (No. 115) to amend the Dominion Elections Act, to which they ask the concurrence of this House.

Amendments read the first time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What are the amendments?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The only amendment made to this Bill appears to be in the provision as to the date when the county judges in Manitoba shall be called together to appoint committees of their number. The provision in the Bill as it left this House was that the several judges of the county court should constitute a board, and that that board should during the month of July in each year meet in the city of Winnipeg on a day to be named. The amendment consists in substituting for the words 'during the month of July' the words 'between the 1st of July and the 15th day of August'; that is extending for two weeks the period during which the judges may meet. It does not occur to me that there is anything in the amendment to which objection should be taken, and I beg to move concurrence.

Amendments read the second time and agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING. I thought we might have completed our business and arranged to meet on Monday at 11.45 with a view to have prorogation at noon. As there are several Bills to come from the Senate, we had better meet at the usual hour. I beg to move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it arranged that prorogation shall take place at noon on Monday?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, July 20, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PROROGATION.

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

Ottawa, July 18, 1908.

Sir,—The right honourable the Chief Justice of Canada, acting as the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber on Monday at twelve o'clock for the purpose of proroguing the present session of parliament.

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

The Hon.
The Speaker of the House of Commons.

INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION FOR PEACE—MEETING IN OTTAWA, 1909.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following from the Senate :

The Senate,
Speaker's Chambers.

Hon. Gentlemen,—I am in receipt of a letter from the chairman of the German group of the Inter-Parliamentary Union for Peace, Mr. Richard Eickhoff, a member of the Reichstag, who desires to know how many members of the Canadian parliament will attend the Inter-Parliamentary Congress which will sit this year from the 10th to the 13th of September in Berlin, so that they may be provided with cards entitling them to free transportation on the German railways to and fro.

The Reichstag and the city of Berlin are preparing official receptions for the delegates to that congress.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). By your leave, Mr. Speaker, and with the consent of the House, I have the honour to present a motion which, I hope, will meet with the ready assent of this House. This motion which will be seconded by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), is as follows .

That the Inter-Parliamentary Union of Peace, which is striving to establish better relations between nations by furthering the principle of arbitration in the settlement of all international disputes, be invited to hold its annual meeting in the capital of the Dominion in August, 1909.

The association here referred to was established about twenty years ago. It is composed of members of the legislative bodies of civilized nations great and small. It has met now yearly for several years past. It is not too much to say that the creation of the Hague tribunal is largely the result of their efforts. Whilst it is true that the creation of that tribunal has not, perhaps, accomplished all that was in the mind of the association, and while it may be said also that it is not vested with such plenary powers as we might wish, it must be acknowledged that its formation has been an immense step in the direction of the highest civilization, and, no doubt, its very creation has tended largely to diminish causes of wars among nations. This interparliamentary union is meeting this year in the city of Berlin. The German government gives it special privileges. The members of the British group of the association have expressed the thought or desire that it would be gratifying to the association that its next meeting should be held in the city of Ottawa. That is the wish, and for my part—and in this I have the support of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition—we readily agree ; we can well believe that if this association does meet in Ottawa next year, not only would it be an excellent move on the part of Canada in promoting a noble cause, but it would afford the people of the world generally a better conception than they have of our country. Therefore, I have much pleasure in presenting this resolution.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton). I have much pleasure in seconding the motion made by the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). This union is a step, even though but a slight step toward the realization of the 'parliament of man.' These things cannot but be for good, and, though we may not realize in the immediate future the cessation of war, nevertheless we cannot doubt that the efforts of this union, composed of leading men from all the civilized nations of the world will undoubtedly strongly make for the promotion of peace and harmony among the great nations of the earth. I entirely agree that it is fitting that we should ask this interparliamentary union to hold its next meeting in the city of Ottawa in 1909. I trust that the invitation may be accepted and that we may have the honour and pleasure of the meeting here of this union, in the city of Ottawa, the capital of this Dominion.

Motion agree to.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION—HON. MR. FOSTER.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to be permitted to refer to two statements made by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) on Saturday, merely by way of correction of my own position as taken on two points. One is as to the item of interest. I do not remember exactly the date of the meeting in Hamilton at which I spoke, but I remember that on Friday December 6, in answer to a question of mine the Minister of Finance made certain statements. I asked :

3. What overdrafts, if any, have been current since July 1, 1906, at what banks and at what rates?

To which the Minister of Finance replied :

According to the last account received our overdraft in London is £301,619-5-1. The arrangement respecting such overdrafts is that they bear the current Bank of England rate, whatever it may be.

On that information, and as the bank rate was 7 per cent, I did make the statement in Hamilton that the minister was paying 7 per cent. With reference to the 2⅞ per cent according to my recollection, what I said with reference to that was that that was the lowest rate of interest that Canada had ever had on a loan placed upon the market. Of course, I did not state that I had made a loan at that rate. The Minister of Finance said also :

In a speech at Hamilton, shortly after the opening of the session, I find him reported as follows in the 'Mail':

'They, the government, have marched up to a point where a debt of $100,000,000 must be paid in two years and Mr. Fielding has made no provisions to meet it.'

My first point in reply is that my hon. friend magnified the debt which is maturing to an enormous degree. He does not seem to think it necessary to speak on these grave matters with that sense of responsibility which should attach to him as a former Minister of Finance. A very much less sum will have to be met.

If the Finance Minister will turn to his own report, page 81 of the Public Accounts, he will find the amounts of debt maturing between the date of the publication of this report and the end of 1910. Altogether those amount to $97,056,594. The sinking funds applicable to those amount to $37,507,375. The total amount falling due up to the end of 1910 will be found to be $104,356,594. Subtracting the sinking fund applicable to this, of $37,507,375, we have left $67,449,117 which will be the net amount to be met. There may be some sinking fund applicable to the loan which falls due April 1, 1908. I am not certain as to that, I have not it marked as having any sinking fund applicable to it but it is possible there may be. The minister has at the present time in current loans some seventeen or eighteen millions. That would make eighty-five millions which is pretty close up to the one hundred millions, and before the end of 1910 there will be large loans necessary for the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific. Under those circumstances I think it well to put the facts before the House so that I might not lie under the imputation, as the minister's words would leave me, of not taking care with reference to those maturing debts and stating the figures as accurately as possible.

One word with reference to the statement by the Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden) which he afterwards retracted and to which I would not now allude were it not for the fact that I would not like the least chance of any suspicion to remain that I had been doing what the minister stated I had been doing, although he afterwards retracted it, not as between the minister and myself, his retraction is quite sufficient in that respect, but as to the officials who might be affected. We have heard threats of what would be done to officials who happened to be Conservatives. With reference to the accountant of the Marine and Fisheries Department, I might state that I never had any conversation with the accountant of the Marine and Fisheries Department, either private or public, in the office or anywhere else, with reference to any single transaction in connection with the Marine and Fisheries Department since I have been a member of the parliament of 1904. If any person has that suspicion it is wrongly placed and I hope it will not in any way influence whatever course may be taken with reference to that accountant. The same is absolutely so with reference to the accountant of the Department of the Interior. I do not know at present the name of that accountant; I do not know whether I know him personally or not; but I have had no conversation or communication with him of any kind whatever, in the same years as those I alluded to in reference to the Marine and Fisheries Department. This statement I would not have made except to relieve those two accountants from any suspicion, if anybody entertains such a suspicion.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). With regard to the statement as to threats, I do not quite understand what the hon. member means. As far as I am concerned, I am not aware of having made any threats against any person in my department.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say you had, I said threats had been made.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The hon. gentleman was addressing himself to a statement made by me, and I understand now he did not intend to apply that statement to me in any way, that any threat had been made by me to any officer connected with my department.

Mr. FOSTER. No, I had not the least intention. These threats had been made in the House and in committees and so on, and I have never heard that the Minister of Militia and Defence ever made such a threat. I had no intention of saying that.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance.) With regard to the payment of 7 per cent interest, the point I endeavoured to make in the few words I said on that subject was that if my hon. friend thought proper to refer to that rate of interest it would have been only fair to have said that that high rate of interest was payable by virtue of an arrangement which he himself had made. That was the point I wished to emphasize. He did not say so. With regard to the question and answer to which he has referred, it is true that he put a question in the House as to our temporary loans, and that I stated a certain balance overdrawn in London was subject to the Bank of England rate, whatever it might be, and the Bank of England rate at that time was 7 per cent. If therefore my hon. friend had stated the case in Hamilton with that fair explanation of the circumstances under which it arose, I could not have complained, but he repeated the statement in his remarks on the occasion to which I was replying and said that we were paying 7 per cent. In the meantime an important incident had occur-

red that my hon. friend appears not to have noticed; that is that at a later stage of the inquiry in this House I stated that while the arrangement gave the bank the right to 7 per cent, that being the current Bank of England rate, I had been able to arrange with the bank a rate of only 6 per cent. I stated that in the House and therefore the government never paid 7 per cent, and when the hon. gentleman repeated his statement the other night and again said we were paying 7 per cent he had overlooked the correction I had made. As respects his Hamilton statement I would find no fault when he spoke of the excessive rate of interest, as at that time the arrangement of 6 per cent had not been made, but he should have explained the circumstances under which the 7 per cent arrangement was made. He sought to make a point against the government in respect to that, when in reality it was an arrangement made in the day of my hon. friend and a fair arrangement.

As to the other point, had I been aware that my hon. friend desired to call attention to it, I would have had the notes at hand from which I spoke the other day. I know my hon. friend stated at Hamilton that within two years $100,000,000 would have to be provided for. He now endeavours to explain by amending it and giving the figures for a period of three years. I do not think that any answer to my statement. I did not dwell upon it, I mentioned it in passing and simply said that a very much less sum than my hon. friend mentioned would provide for all our obligations in two years, but he now gives a statement for three years as if that was meeting the case. I did not make any statement for three years, I stated the amounts for two years. I made a passing reference, which was absolutely true, that a very much less sum would have provided for our maturing obligations. I think that now he is carrying into his statement of obligations some things that are not obligations at all. Take the loan of £5,000,000 which will mature either in 1909 or 1934, just as we please. The loan is not due until 1934. We have the option of paying it off if we like in 1909, but it is not due until 1934. There is another loan of the same character due in 1910 and I am inclined to think that my hon. friend has carried both of these into the obligations that we must meet in 1909 and 1910.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. FIELDING. They are not due until 1934 or 1935, but if we see fit to pay them in the meantime, if the money market is favourable and if we wish to pay them, that is all right, but they are not obligations which this government is bound to pay until 1934 or 1935. Then, having regard to this, my hon. friend's statement as respects these two years was an erroneous one. As to the rate of interest my hon. friend will find that while I said it was seven per cent I explained at a later stage that the rate we actually paid was only six per cent.

Mr. FOSTER. I have the arrangement which was made with the Bank of Montreal by my own report. The minister states that I should have been fair enough to have said that the seven per cent, if paid at all, was paid according to my own arrangement.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. The arrangement made with the bank was an arrangement by which, if they did such and such, they were to be paid such and such.

Mr. FIELDING. That does not cover the whole transaction.

Mr. FOSTER. It did not bind us to make our loans or get our advances through the Bank of Montreal, but if we did get them through the Bank of Montreal it stated the terms, and I think it is just as well to read them.

Mr. FIELDING. That does not deal with temporary loans.

Mr. FOSTER. (reading):

On the issue of new loans a commission of one quarter of one per cent will be paid to the bank—(all brokerages, stamps and advertising to be paid for by the government of Canada.)

For the management of loans, including payment of interest and dividends, transfer and inscription of stock, investments for and management of the sinking fund, (except brokerages and stamp duties) £150 per million pounds per annum will be paid.

For discounting treasury bills, outside Bank of Montreal, a rate not to exceed one-eighth of one per cent will be paid.

For the sale of stock one-eighth of one per cent.

Should the government at any time require special exertions to market the stock an additional rate of one sixteenth of one per cent will be paid.

In case of redemption, no charge therefor will be allowed to the bank provided it has the issuing of a loan to retire the bonds redeemed, but if no loan is issued by it, one-eighth of one per cent is to be paid the bank for redemption.

Should the government require the Bank of Montreal to associate another bank with it in the issue of a loan, the rate to be paid to the Bank of Montreal for the issue will be one-half of one per cent.

The government is to pay the cost of stock inscription books, which are to be the property of the government.

The above arrangements are to continue in force for a fixed period of ten years from the 1st of January, 1893, then or thereafter to be terminated on twelve months previous notice in writing from either side.

That arrangement was entered into on December 6, 1892. I do not find anything in reference to the matter of advances.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend is reading from an agreement with respect to the floating of loans. The question of overdrafts is not covered by that. There is no written contract on the subject, but I am informed in the department that in the case of overdrafts or advances that are not supposed to be for a long time, not represented by permanent loans or by treasury bills, the understanding is that the current bank rate should obtain. It is a fair arrangement and I find no fault with it.

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly. It would not be included in the permanent arrangement.

Mr. FIELDING. No.

TIMBER AND PULPWOOD LANDS IN KEEWATIN.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to ask the Minister of Finance, in the absence of the Prime Minister, whether the policy that has been announced to the House as to the disposal of timber and pulpwood lands, is to be observed. The reason of my inquiry is that information has come to me of an application which is said to be now under consideration by the government, for a very large grant or concession of timber and pulpwood lands in Keewatin, amounting to some millions of acres. As I understand the policy of the government as set forth in the regulations, and as announced in this House, these lands are not to be disposed of by private concession but by sale at public auction after due advertisement. This information came to me in such a circumstantial manner that I thought it desirable, and even necessary, to bring it to the attention of the government in order that we might have some statement from them as to whether there is any foundation for the rumour.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I am not sufficiently acquainted with the matter to justify me in making a statement on behalf of the government. I will call the attention of the Prime Minister and of the Minister of the Interior to my hon. friend's remarks. I have not sufficient knowledge of the subject to justify me in making a statement. Any announcement that was made by the Prime Minister or by the Minister of the Interior as to the policy of the government in that matter, I take it for granted, will be carried out.

PROROGATION.

A message from the right hon. the Deputy of the Governor General by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod.

Mr. Speaker,—His Honour the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of this House in the Chamber of the hon. the Senate.

Mr. FOSTER.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House, went up to the Senate chamber.

In the Senate Chamber, His Honour the Deputy of the Governor General was pleased to give, in His Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills:

An Act respecting the Phœnix Assurance Company, Limited.
An Act for the relief of Hattie Spratte.
An Act for the relief of Edith May Gilmore.
An Act for the relief of Catherine Ann Cannon.
An Act for the relief of Ada Katurah Stewart Paulding.
An Act for the relief of Mary Alexander.
An Act respecting certain patents of the General Chemical Company.
An Act respecting the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company.
An Act to amend the Prisons and Reformatories Act, in so far as the same affects the province of Nova Scotia.
An Act respecting a certain issue of Dominion Notes.
An Act to incorporate the Shuswap and Thompson Rivers Boom Company.
An Act to authorize the payment to the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta of part of the Assurance Fund under the Land Titles Act, 1894.
An Act to amend the Inspection and Sale Act.
An Act to amend the Chinese Immigration Act.
An Act respecting the Standard Mutual Fire Insurance Company to change its name to the Standard Fire Insurance Company.
An Act respecting the government guaranteed bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.
An Act to amend the Yukon Placer Mining Act.
An Act to amend the Bank Act.
An Act respecting the Court of Appeal of British Columbia.
An Act to amend the Yukon Act.
An Act to encourage the construction of Dry Docks.
An Act respecting the Belleville, Prince Edward Bridge Company.
An Act to amend the Post Office Act.
An Act to amend the Naturalization Act.
An Act to amend the Boards of Trade Act.
An Act respecting Juvenile Delinquents.
An Act respecting the sale and marking of manufactures of Gold and Silver, and Gold and Plated Ware.
An Act to incorporate the Alberta and British Columbia Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Railway Company.
An Act to amend the Customs Act.
An Act to amend the Timber Marking Act.
An Act respecting the payment of bounties on lead contained in lead-bearing ores mined in Canada.
An Act respecting the Dominion Guarantee Company, Limited.
An Act respecting the Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Company.
An Act to provide for the payment of bounties on Crude Petroleum.
An Act respecting the salary of the Superintendent of Insurance.

An Act to assist in maintaining an independent and efficient service of telegraphic news from Great Britain for publication in the Canadian press.

An Act respecting the office of the Auditor General.

An Act respecting a certain patent of William B. Smith.

An Act for the relief of Arthur James Townsend.

An Act respecting certain patents of the Metal Shingle and Siding Company, Limited.

An Act to authorize the sale to the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada of a portion of Major's Hill Park, in the city of Ottawa, as a hotel site.

An Act to restrain the use of tobacco by young persons.

An Act to authorize the construction of a branch line of the Prince Edward Island Railway from Harmony, on the Souris branch, to Elmira.

An Act to amend chapter 38 of the statutes of 1907 in amendment of the Railway Act.

An Act to amend the Judges' Act.

An Act to amend the Northwest Territories Act.

An Act to amend the Railway Act with respect to Telegraphs and Telephones and the jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners.

An Act to incorporate the Synod of the Diocese of Keewatin.

An Act to amend the Inspection and Sale Act, as regards grain.

An Act to amend the Manitoba Grain Act.

An Act to authorize the issue of Government Annuities for Old Age.

An Act to amend the Railway Act as respects the constitution of the Board of Railway Commissioners.

An Act to amend the Criminal Code and to repeal section 415 of the Railway Act.

An Act to amend the Canada Shipping Act.

An Act to amend the Canada Shipping Act.

An Act to authorize the sale or other disposal of certain ordnance lands in the cities of Toronto and Montreal.

An Act respecting the National Battlefields at Quebec.

An Act to amend the Canada Temperance Act.

An Act to authorize a bounty to volunteers who served the Crown in South Africa.

An Act respecting Proprietary or Patent Medicines.

An Act to consolidate and amend the Acts respecting the public lands of the Dominion.

An Act to amend the Civil Service Act.

An Act to prohibit the importation, manufacture and sale of opium for other than medicinal purposes.

An Act respecting certain aid for the extension of the Canadian Northern Railway.

An Act respecting aid for the extension of the Edmonton-Yukon and Pacific Railway.

An Act to authorize the granting of subsidies in aid of the construction of the lines of railway therein mentioned.

An Act respecting the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Dominion Elections Act.

An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial year ending March 31, 1909.

To these Bills the Royal Assent was pronounced by the Clerk of the Senate in the following words :

In His Majesty's name, His Honour the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General doth assent to these Bills.

Then the hon. the Speaker of the House of Commons addressed His Honour the Deputy of the Governor General, as follows :

May it please Your Honour:

The Commons of Canada have voted the supplies required to enable the government to defray the expenses of the public service.

In the name of the Commons, I present to Your Honour the following Bill:

An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial year ending the 31st of March, 1909. to which Bill I humbly request Your Honour's assent.

To this Bill the Clerk of the Senate, by His Honour's command, did thereupon say :

In His Majesty's name, His Honour the Deputy of the Governor General thanks his loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence and assents to this Bill.

After which His Honour the Deputy of the Governor General was pleased to close the fourth session of the tenth parliament of the Dominion with the following speech :

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I am glad to be able to relieve you from further attendance on this long protracted session, and I thank you for the assiduity and care you have given to the unusually large number of important subjects that have been submitted for your consideration. It is, however, satisfactory to note the many excellent measures that have been passed, and which it is hoped will prove beneficial to the people of Canada.

Among other Acts, attention may be called to the Manitoba Grain Act and the Grain Inspection Act which, while protecting the high standards of western grown grain from inferior mixtures, secures to the farmer the increased value attaching to those standards.

In response to an advanced public opinion, appointments and promotions to the civil service will be made henceforth only after a competitive examination in which those who excel will receive the reward of merit; and, while the operations of the Act are limited to the service at the seat of government its provisions may later on be extended to the service throughout the Dominion.

The Act revising and consolidating the laws and regulations affecting the disposition of the public lands will it is believed meet with the hearty approval of the western provinces more immediately interested. One of the

principal features of the Act is the permission to take up a second homestead within a limited area, and also the right of a homesteader to acquire by purchase the adjoining quarter section. It is intended that the proceeds of these sales shall in the first place be set apart as a fund for the construction of a railway to Hudson bay.

The amendments to the Bank Act allowing, under certain restrictions, an expansion in the circulation of notes of the banks during the period of the year while the crops are being moved, will, it is considered, facilitate the quick transport of the products of the farm to the markets of the world.

Important amendments have been made to the Act respecting elections which it is confidently believed will more effectively protect the rights of the voters and guard against the exercise of undue influence in electoral contests.

The proposal to make a free grant of land as a bounty to the volunteers who rendered valuable service to the empire in the South African war will meet with hearty approval.

The reduction of the duty on dropped letters in cities and certain towns, and the enlargement of the area within which the postage on certain classes of newspapers may be carried free, will I feel be much appreciated.

The amendments made to the Inland Revenue Act, whereby the discrimination against Canadian grown tobacco created by distinctive labels used in cigars and tobacco will no longer exist; it is confidently believed that those amendments to the Act will have the effect of improving and encouraging home grown tobacco and prove of great benefit to that portion of our agricultural population engaged in that industry.

The increasing demands for improved transportation facilities in a country so widely extended and so sparsely settled as this Dominion, warrants public aid in the construction of railways, and the experience of the past amply justifies the liberal subsidies in the Act that has been assented to.

The placing of the telegraph and telephone systems under the jurisdiction of the Railway Commissioners will meet with the hearty approval of all classes in the Dominion. The rapidly increasing number of applications to the Board of Railway Commissioners involves the necessity for the appointment of additional members on the board.

The extension of the time for the payment of a bounty on lead ores, and the enlargement of the conditions under which the bounty may be earned will, it is believed, stimulate the growth of an important industry in the province of British Columbia.

The physical and mental degradation following from the too free use of opium have long been recognized, and efforts have been made in all countries boasting of advanced civilization to stamp out its use, except when prescribed for medicinal purposes. The increasing consumption of this deleterious drug in Canada has prompted the adoption of the Act to restrain its use except when authorized by medical men.

The issue of government annuities for old age will, it is confidently believed, encourage habits of thrift and economy, securing to the holder some provision for declining years.

The subject of immigration from Japan has received much attention during the year, and it was deemed desirable to send one of my ministers to Japan to discuss with His Majesty's ambassador at Tokio, and with the Japanese authorities, the advisability, in view of the local conditions in this country, and other reasons, for restricting such immigration. I am glad to know that a satisfactory arrangement has been effected, and I feel assured that the terms of the agreement will continue to be faithfully carried out.

An arrangement with regard to immigration from India having also become desirable, a representative of the government was sent to England to discuss the question with the authorities of the United Kingdom, and in this case also with results that promise to be entirely satisfactory.

In both these cases it has been the desire of my government that while caring properly for the interests of the Dominion, the welfare of the empire at large should also be regarded.

The Gold and Silver Marking Act will stimulate the manufacture of a superior quality of those articles composed of the precious metals, and at the same time will protect the public from fraudulent representations.

The Act respecting juvenile delinquents will enable those societies that have for their object the reformation of children living under the influence of criminal tendencies, to more efficiently accomplish their purpose, and thus save the innocent little ones from the evil influences of vicious environment.

The Act restraining the use of tobacco by young persons will, it is hoped, check a growing habit that is seriously affecting the health of many Canadian boys.

When parliament opened in November last a serious financial depression prevailed throughout the adjoining republic the effect of which was far reaching, involving in a limited de-

gree all those countries having business relations with the United States. The crisis in the money market that followed, coupled with the diminished value of the crops in the prairie provinces, seriously affected the yearly increasing prosperity which Canada had enjoyed during the preceding eight years. The present hopeful outlook for an unusually large crop of the cereals and other products of the soil, will, it is believed, mark the beginning of another long series of years of plenty and prosperity.

It is very gratifying to observe the patriotic enthusiasm that has been aroused not only in all parts of the Dominion but throughout the empire, at the approaching celebration of the founding of the city of Quebec three hundred years ago by the heroic French navigator, Samuel de Champlain. To add to the glory of the occasion His Gracious Majesty the King has deputed His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales to represent him at the interesting pageants that will be presented in commemoration of the event. The presence also of representatives from France and the United States at the ceremonial will be hailed with intense pleasure by the people of Canada, and will be accepted as an evidence of friendship on the part of the citizens of those two great republics.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

I thank you for the liberal provision you have made for the public service.

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate :

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

Let us earnestly hope that when we meet again the present bright prospects for a bountiful harvest in all parts of the Dominion will have been realized, prompting an additional reason for expressing our heartfelt thanks to a kind Providence for the many blessings we enjoy in this favoured land.

The Speaker of the Senate then said :

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate :

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

It is the will and pleasure of His Honour the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General, that this parliament be prorogued until Saturday, the twenty-ninth day of August next, to be here holden, and this parliament is accordingly prorogued until the twenty-ninth day of August next.

INDEX

FOURTH SESSION—TENTH PARLIAMENT, 1907-1908.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following:—1°, 2°, 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist; *, without remarks or debate; Accts., Accounts; Adjn., Adjourn; Adjd., Adjourned; Amt., Amendment; Amts., Amendments; Amalg., Amalgamation; Ans., Answer; Ass., Assurance; B., Bill; B.C., British Columbia; Can., Canada or Canadian; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway; Com., Committee; Co., Company; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence; Consd., Conside; Consdn., Consideration; Cor., Correspondence; Deb., Debate; Dept., Department; Depts., Departments; Div., Division; Dom., Dominion; Govt., Government; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General; Hse., House; H. of C., House of Commons; Incorp., Incorporation; Ins., Insurance; I.C.R., Intercolonial Railway; Man., Manitoba; Mess., Message; M., Motion; m., moved; Neg., Negatived; N.B., New Brunswick; N.W.T., North-west Territories; N.S., Nova Scotia; O.C., Order in Council; Ont., Ontario; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island; P.O., Post Office; Par., Paragraph; Prop., Proposed; Q., Quebec; Ques-Question; Recom., Recommit; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference; Rep., Report, Reported; Reps., Reports; Res., Resolution; Ret., Return; Ry., Railway; Rys., Railways; Sel., Select; Sen., Senate; Sp., Special; Stmnt., Statement; Sup., Supply; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary; Wthdn., Withdrawn Wthdrl., Withdrawal; Y.N., Yeas and Nays; Names in Italics and parentheses are those of the mover.

ADAMSON, Mr. A. J., *Humboldt.*

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s (B. 82) 1°*, 1732 (i); in Com., 4996 (iii); on Senate Amts., 10511 (iv).

Northern Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 7) 1°*, 231 (i).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 8583 (v).

Timber Limits, Leasing, of, &c., Com. of Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2276 (ii).

ALCORN, Mr. G. O., *Prince Edward, Ont.*

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4401 (iii).

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7670 (iv), 8552 (v).

Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5955; Section of House of Commons Act (read) 5955 (iii).

Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on M. for Sup., 1843 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 80) 1° m., 1671 (i); 2° m., 5228 (iii).

——— B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 7890 (iv), 11753 (vi); in Com., 11812, 11840, (amt.) 11846, 11927 (vi); in Com., 12939 (vii); on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 3°, 13254 (vii).

Immigration Agent A. G. McDonald, Payments *re* Placing of Immigrants (M. for cor.*) 4773 (iii).

Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12402 (vii).

ALCORN, Mr. G. O.—*Con.*

McDonald, Albert G., Commission paid *re* Immigrants, &c. (Ques.) 8617 (v).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7231; on M. for 3°, 7222 (iv).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9498 (v).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11998 (vi).

Ry. Connections, &c. (remarks) 434 (i).

SUPPLY—

Immigration (agents, &c.) 9969; (relief to settlers) 9985 (v).

Indians, Ont and Que. (land sales) 12735 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries (patrol boats) 4750 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (obstructions) 3213; (tidal services) 3215; (wrecks) 3202 (ii).

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5528 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Cumberland) 10865 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10899 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8530 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax, customs) 7163; (Halifax, military) 7144; (Shelburne) 7177 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Guelph armoury) 7680; (Kincardine) 7699; (Kingston gun shed) 7701; (London military) 7708; (North Bay) 7713 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Museum) 1498 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 8594 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Bronte) 12092 (vii); (Point Edward) 5713; (Stanley island pier) 5722 (iii).

ALCORN, Mr. G. O.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Railways—I.C.R. (St. Cyrille diversion) 12757 (vii).

Yukon Act (Govt.) Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10544 (vi).

AMES, Mr. H. B., *Montreal, St. Antoine.*

Accountants, Payments to by Dept. of Justice (Ques.) 3233 (ii).

Advertisements for Tenders of Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4716 (iii).

Albert Development Co., Control of Coal Lands (M. for ret.*) 6241 (iv).

All-Red Line, Mr. White's Duties in England (Ques.) 694 (i).

Arsenault, Mr. Auguste, Emplymt. in Customs, Montreal, Charges against (Ques.) 1347 (i).

Boyle Concession, Memorials from Dawson Legislature (Ques.) 509, 562, 681 (i).

Census Map, Publishing of (Ques.) 4406 (iii).

Central Ry. of Canada, Charter Grant, Deposit *re* (Ques.) 4767 (iii).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10744 (vi).

Cloutier, J. E., Payments to by Govt. (Ques.) 8380 (v).

Coal Areas, Agents for Applicants, &c. (Ques.) 5469 (iii).

—— Agency of M. McKenzie and J. H. Moss, Applications, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5476 (iii).

—— Held by F. E. Keniston, Cor., Papers, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5476 (iii).

—— Name and Address of Agents *re* Applications, &c. (Ques.) 5789 (iii).

Coal Lands, Applicants, Names, Price, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3434 (ii).

Coal Lands in Alberta and Sask., Total Area sold, &c. (Ques.) 9278 (v.)

—— Royalty Fees, &c., Sale or Lease of (Ques.) 11019 (vi).

Coal Lands, Disposed of by Govt., Original Applicants, &c. (Ques.) 3232, 3480 (ii).

—— Purchase Price, &c., on Section 16, 20 and 21, &c. (Ques.) 10512 (vi).

—— sold, or assigned, &c., since March, 1907 (M. for ret.*) 698 (i).

—— Sale of through J. W. Bettes, &c. (M. for ret.*) 6242 (iv).

—— sold by P. E. Lessard (M. for ret.*) 6241 (iv).

—— Sale by McGivern & Hayden (M. for ret.*) 6241 (iv).

—— in Sections 2, 4, 9, 15, 17 and 28, First Applicants, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3850 (ii).

—— in Section 13, First Applicants, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3851 (ii).

AMES, Mr. H. B. —*Con.*

Coal Mining Privileges in Sections 11, Applications, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 3850 (ii).

Coal Mining in Sask. and Alberta, Returns made to Govt., &c. (Ques.) 10257 (v).

Customs Frauds, in Montreal, Complaints *re* Compromises (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9558 (v).

Documents in Depts., Access to Original Papers (M. for ret.) 1132; (reply) 1196; Amt. neg. (Y. 51; N. 86) 1201 (i).

Documents, Original, Examination of by Public Accounts Com. (remarks) 3853 (ii).

—— Production to Members, on M. for Sup., 1775, 1806 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11817; (amt.) 11821 (vi).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11137; in Com., 11189, 11423 (vi).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4678 (iii); in Com., 10761 (vi).

Favoured Nation Treatment, Conventions *re* Commercial Relations, &c. (Ques.) 846 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 1408 (i).

Franco-Canadian Treaty, Canadian Products enjoying benefit of Minimum Tariff, &c. (M. for ret.) 851 (i).

—— Correction of Question *re* Sir Charles Tupper's Expenses, 1424 (i).

—— Favoured Nation Clause; and Foreign Powers, &c. (Ques.) 845 (i).

—— German Surtax, Effect, &c. (Ques.) 844 (i).

—— Imports from U.S., Exclusion of, &c. (Ques.) 845 (i).

—— Preferential Tariff, Names of Countries, &c. (Ques.) 844 (i).

Fishing Privileges granted in Clearwater, &c., Lakes, Cor., &c. (M. for ret.*) 555 (i).

—— on Lesser Slave Lake, Date of Lease, Protest, &c. (Ques.) 6398 (iv).

Gaetz Brothers, Payments to (Ques.) 10514 (vi).

G. T. P. Guarantee Bonds B. 171 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10772 (vi).

G. T. P. Prohibition Zone, Reduction of, &c. (Ques.) 516 (i).

Grazing Leases, Application of Messrs. Woods, Fleck and Finnie (Ques.) 238 (i).

Homestead Application of Mr. John C. Haddock, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 181, 11197 (vi).

Homestead Entries in Man., &c., Total Acreage (Ques.) 6920 (iv).

Homesteading in Section 18, Extension *re* Allowance, &c. (Ques.) 8381 (v).

AMES, Mr. H. B.—*Con.*
Hough, Campbell and Ferguson, Sales of Lands to, &c. (Ques.) 364, 568 (i).
Immigrant Bonuses, Increase to Agents, &c. (Ques.) 3429 (ii).
Irrigation Act Amt. B. 99 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4673 (iii).
Lake Megantic Public Works, Total Cost to date, &c. (Ques.) 11299 (vi).
Land Grants to Rys., Selection, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 4766 (iii).
See 'Rys.', &c.
Lands leased by Govt. in Section 11, Twp. 8, Original Grantee, &c. (Ques.) 3234 (ii).
Land Patents, Section 8, Twp. 53, &c., Occupation of Present Owner, &c. (Ques.) 3430 (ii).
McGuire, ex-chief Justice, Superannuation of, &c. (Ques.) 10514 (vi).
Mining, Surface or Timber Rights, on Section 8, Applications, &c. (M. for copies*) 3850 (ii).
Montreal Examining Warehouse, Valuations, Reps., Cor., Expenditure, &c. (M. for ret.*) 698 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 3319 (ii).
Patent and Proprietary Medicines B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) on M. for 2°, 10553 (vi).
Peace River Colonization and Land Development Co., Surveys, Reps., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9996 (v).
Quarantine Lands, Sask., Sale of, &c. (Ques.) 3481 (ii).
Ry. Charters and Land Grants, Renewals of (Ques.) 9271 (v).
—— Amounts and Names of Cos. (Ques.) 9271 (v).
Railway Land Grants in Man., Sask. and Alberta, Total Acreage, &c. (Ques.) 6920 (iv).
See 'Lands.'
Ry. Subsidies in Land, Areas for 1892-6 (Ques.) 8613 (v).
Returns, Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv., 4662 (iii).
See 'Documents.'
Robbins Irrigation Co., Amount expended to Date (Ques.) 4763 (iii).
—— (M.) for Papers, 5210 (iii).
St. Andrews Rapids Improvements, Land Grant to Great Falls Power Co. (Ques.) 238 (i).
Sessional Paper No. 167b, brought down April 26 (M. for ret.*) 555 (i).
Sessional Paper No. 207 *re* Fishing Leases (M. for ret.*) 6241 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Customs—Inspectors (salaries) 9538 (v).
Dom. Lands (surveys) 9996 (v).
Marine (ice breakers) 1895 (i).

AMES, Mr. H. B.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Dominion arsenal) 7434; (Montreal, barracks) 7408; (Montreal examining warehouse) 7424; (Montreal, post office) 7410; (Montreal, station B) 7419; (Montreal, station C) 7420; (Nicolet) 7428; (Pointe St. Charles) 7419; (St. Rochs) 7439 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Generally (repairs, &c.) 11693 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Caraquet wharf) 11686; (Madawaska) 11696 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. Lake Ainslie) 11228; (McPherson's Cove) 11229; (Margaree) 11229; (Middle River) 11229; (New Glasgow) 11257; (Oyster Pond) 11258; (Parker's Cove) 11258; (Parrsborough) 11259; (Porter's lake) 11260; (Port Hilford) 11267; (Port Hastings) 11266; (Port Hood) 11268; (Pugwash) 11280; (Round Hill) 11281; (Tancook island) 11230 (vi).
Taché, J. C., Emplmt. in Public Works Dept. (Ques.) 8180 (iv).
Timber Berths, Leasing, &c., Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2269 (ii).
Timber Berths, 1046, &c., Original Applications (M. for ret.*) 4247 (iii).
—— No. 1100, Area, &c. (Ques.) 364 (i).
—— No. 1168, Area, &c. (Ques.) 363 (i).
—— No. 1279, Applications, Cor., &c. (M. for ret.*) 555 (i).
Timber Lands, Sale or Lease subsequent to Ret. of April, 1907 (M. for ret.*) 555 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 3580 (ii).
Timber Leases, *re* Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., on M. (Mr. Turriff) 8711 (v).
Timber Licenses in Man. and N. W. Ters., Renewals, &c., Total Areas, &c. (Ques.) 691 (i).
Timber Licenses issued in Man. and N. W. T. during 1896-7 (Ques.) 2396 (ii).
Timber Limits, Disposal of Ques. of Priv., *re* Mr. Turriff's Charges, 2309 (ii).
Timber Permits to Settlers *re* cutting, in Twp. 39, Range 11 (Ques.) 11495 (vi).
Water-power Privileges in Alberta, &c., Sale or Leases (Ques.) 8378 (v).
Yukon Act Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10535 (vi).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E., *Lambton, East.*
Absinthe and Brandy Importations, Total Amount, &c. (Ques.) 689 (i).
Address, The, 335, 366; (amt.) 380; Neg. (Y. 54; N. 103) 505 (i).
Advertisement for Tenders, for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4735 (iii).
Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3878 (ii).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*

'Arctic' Str., Cruise in Northern Waters, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4030 (ii).

Atlantic Steamers Mail Service, Cost per Annum (Ques.) 5656 (iii).

Barlow, Dr. A. E., Emplymt. in Geological Survey (Ques.) 5205 (iii).

——— Payments *re* Temagami District, 5787 (iii).

——— Survey *re* Temagami District (Ques.) 5473 (iii).

Bayfield, &c., Ret., Inquiry for, 6223 (iv).
See 'Docks,' &c.

Brewster and Park Hill Mail Route, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 6404 (iv).

Brock, Mr., Emplymt. *re* Geological Survey (Ques.) 5204 (iii).

Budget, The, 6046; (M.) to adjn. deb., 6054; rsmd., 6062 (iii).

Campaign Literature, sent by Ry. Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10343 (vi).

Canada and France Ocean SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6164, 6196 (iii).

Cattle Embargo in G. B., Action of Govt., Cor., &c. (M. for ret.*) 2795 (ii).

——— Removal of, Action by Govt. since 1896 (Ques.) 2167 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 6223 (iv).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12879 (vii).

——— Par. in Montreal 'Gazette,' 13081 (vii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5124 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11371 (vi).

Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9168 (v).

Cold Storage Shipments, Number for year ending March 1, 1908 (Ques.) 6403 (iv).

Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 11314 (vi).

Customs Officers at Niagara, Fort Erie, &c., Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 6980 (iv).

Daley, Mr. R., Emplymt. in Geological Survey (Ques.) 5204, 5473 (iii).

Digby to Westport Mail Contract, Name of Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 7203 (iv).

Docks, Piers, &c., constructed at Bayfield, Grand Bend, &c., Cor., &c., *re* (M. for copies*) 2397 (ii).
See 'Bayfield,' 'Grand Bend.'

Documents, Original, Production of to Members, 1878 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8645 (v); in Com., 12971 (vii).

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5023 (iii).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*

Dowling, Mr. D. B., Emplymt. in Geological Survey (Ques.) 5206 (iii).

——— Emplymt. by German Development Co. (Ques.) 5564 (iii).
See 'German.

Exhibitions outside of Canada, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 4584 (iii).

Experimental Farms, Total Receipts from Sales, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 4585 (iii).

Farnell, Gordon, Contractor for Halifax Mails, &c. (Ques.) 7731 (iv).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3605, 3637 (ii).

Fruit and Dairy Divisions, Separation of, &c., (Ques.) 2166 (ii).

Fruit Marks Inspection and Sale B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 10554 (vi).

German Development Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10580 (vi).
See 'Dowling.'

German Goods imported under Preferential Tariff, Investigation *re* (Ques.) 689 (i).

Geological Survey Department, Total Expenditure from 1896-1908 (Ques.) 6402 (iv).

Geological Survey Yacht, Use of (Ques.) 11231 (vi).

Grain Inspection in 1906, Total Expenditure, Receipts, &c. (Ques.) 4586 (iii).

Grand Bend Pier, Final Estimate of Chief Engineer Lafleur (Ques.) 8892 (v).

Grand Bend Wharf, Contract *re* (Ques.) 5085 (iii).

——— Ret., Delays, &c. (remarks) 4408 (iii).

G. T. R. Hotel, Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 12062 (vii).

G. T. P., Guarantee Bonds B. 171 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10772 (vi).

——— Supplies to Prince Rupert via American Routes (remarks) 9025 (v).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10375 (vi).

'Graphite,' Cost of Publication, Total Value, &c. (Ques.) 5081 (iii).

Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Political Interference (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6651 (iv).

Hay and Straw Embargo by G. B., &c. (Ques.) 4765 (iii).

Immigrant Passages to Canada, Number rejected by SS. Companies (Ques.) 5468 (iii).

Indian Dept., Extravagant Management, on M. for Sup., 11022 (vi).

Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale of, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13127 (vii).

Indian Lands and Islands owned by Indians, Sale of, &c. (Ques.) 5078 (iii).

——— Number of Acres sold since 1896, Total Receipts, &c. (Ques.) 4586 (iii).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*

I. C. R., Concrete Pipe, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 6640 (iv).

——— on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4428 (iii).

Jamestown Exhibition, Canadian Exhibits, Permission *re* (Ques.) 5079 (iii).

'Lady Evelyn' Str., Date and Place of Wintering, &c. (Ques.) 7936 (iv).
See 'Rimouski.'

Literature, &c., distributed through Mails (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9095 (v).

Mail Matters, Fradulent Weighing, Inspection of (Ques.) 4827 (iii).

Mail Matter mutilated in Transmission, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 2214 (ii).

Mail Service in B. C., Improvements *re* (remarks) 3754 (ii).

Mail Steamer, Purchase of (Ques.) 4827 (iii).
See 'Lady Evelyn.'

Mail Subsidies to Steamships, Total Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 689 (i).

Meat Inspection Act and Packing Houses, Cor., Reps., &c. (M. for copies*) 4589 (iii).

Montreal Postal Service, Irregularities of, &c. (Ques.) 9274 (v).

Montreal Post Office, Extra Clerks, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9113 (v).

Newspapers, Postal Arrangements, &c.(Ques.) 6460 (iv).

North East Harobur Wharf, Total Length (Ques.) 11019 (vi).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10850 (vi).

Patent Medicines Inspection B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 6216 (iii).

Postal Arrangements between U.S. and Canada, Cor., &c. (M. for copies) 3885 (ii).

——— on Stmnt. (Mr. Lemieux) to Com. of Sup., 3161 (ii).

——— (remarks) 3040 (ii).

Postal Note Business, Commission, Expenditure *re* Maintenance, &c. (Ques.) 9279 (v).

Postal Rates on N. S. Weekly Newspapers, Tel. *re* (Ques.) 3484 (ii).

Postal Regulations *re* Weekly Newspapers, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 5201 (iii).

Postal Service, Complaints *re* Inadequacy (Ques.) 352 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 559 (i).

——— (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 7257 (iv).

——— Improvements in, &c. (Ques.) 8891 (v).

——— Irregularities in Western Canada (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8873 (v).
See 'Rimouski.'

Postal Service Printing, Tenders *re*, &c. (Ques.) 5472 (iii).

Postal Service Return, Inquiry for, 4832 (iii).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*

Post Office Act (postage) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 10705 (vi).

Post Office Returns, Number, &c. (Ques.) 6405 (iv).

Quebec Bridge, Change of Plans *re* Height of Span (Ques.) 5202 (iii).

Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4969 (iii).

——— (telephones) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10640 (vi).

Red Head Wharf, N.S., Total Expenditure (Ques.) 11019 (vi).

Returns, Inquiry for, 2024 (ii).

——— Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv., 4664 (iii).
See 'Documents.'

Rimouski, Dredging, &c., *re* Landing of Str. 'Lady Evelyn,' &c. (Ques.) 7727 (iv).
See 'Lady Evelyn.'

Rimouski Mail Contracts, Payments to Str. 'Rhoda' (Ques.) 8176 (iv).

Round Bay, N.S., Removal of Post Office (Ques.) 11297 (vi).

Royal Mint, Amount of Silver and Gold Coins, &c. (Ques.) 8612 (v).

St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.'s B. 98 (Mr. Blain) in Com., 4580 (iii).

St. Joseph's Wharf, Ont., Tenders, &c., *re* Construction (Ques.) 8890 (v).
See 'Bayfield,' &c.

Sandy Cove, N.S., Mail Service, Tender *re* (Ques.) 8891 (v).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3786 (ii); in Com., 12622 (vii).

South Huron, By-Election, Amounts paid Returning Officer, &c. (Ques.) 9270 (v), 11935 (vi).

Spry Bay Wharf, Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 2391 (ii).

Steamship Subsidies and Subventions, Total Amount paid for five years, &c. (M. for ret.*) 853 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 671 (i); (dairying, &c.) 10399 (vi); (census, &c.) 674 (i); (exhibitions) 10577 (vi); (fumigating stations) 12879; (Meat and Canned Foods Act) 12894 (vii); (seed branch) 5500 (iii); (Year Book) 678 (i).

Canals (Port Colborne) 10312 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries, &c.) 623; Mines (salaries) 646 (i); Post Office (clerical assistance) 8873 (v); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 651 (i).

Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9227 (v).

Geological Survey (oil borings) 13163 (vii).

House of Commons (Library of Parlt.) 10504 (vi).

Indians—Generally (destitute, &c.) 5762 (iii); Ont. and Que. (land sales) 12748

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies, rents, &c.) 5039; (aids to navigation) 5040, 5774; (Thunder Bay Ice-breaker) 5041 (iii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson bay patrol) 4030, 4133 (ii).

Marine, &c.—Public Works (ship channel) 5035 (iii).

Militia (annual drill) 5749 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Japanese riots, B.C.) 5783 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 5764 (iii); (ice-breakers) 2942; (wrecks) 3149, 3209 (ii).

Post Office (inspectors) 9094; (stamps, &c.) 9111 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vernon) 10872; (Victoria immigration) 10875 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10886, 10887 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg hospital) 10966 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 7135 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Markham) 7711; (North Bay) 7712, 7812; (Renfrew) 7825; (St. Mary's) 7826; (Sarnia) 7829 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (heating, &c.) 11009; (lighting) 11011 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Cookshire) 7282; (Knowlton) 7290; (Lévis) 7295 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 8586; (Prince Albert penitentiary) 8601 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (St. John) 12020 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Gore's Landing) 12101 (vii).

Railways (extra clerks) 10343 (vi).

Railways—G.T.P. (inspection) 10392 (vi).

Railways—I.C.R. (rolling stock) 5552 (iii), (supplies) 10193 (v).

Railways—Ry. Commission (legal expenses) 10375 (vi).

AVERY, Mr. M., *Frontenac.*

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5123 (iii).

Hawkeye, Mr., Emplymnt. as Returning Officer (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10992 (vi).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7251 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5529 (iii).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2489, 2662 (ii).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10696 (vi).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. A. B. (Minister of Justice) *North York, Ont.*

Accountants, Emplymt. and Payment by Dept. of Justice (Ans.) 3233 (ii).

Admiralty Jurisdiction Act Amt. (B. 122) prop. Res., 2881 (ii); in Com. on Res., 4835; 1°* of Bill, 4867 (iii).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. A. B.—*Con.*

Anti-Cigarette Bill: *See 'Tobacco.'*

B. C., Appeal Court (B. 165) prop. Res. 8185 (iv); in Com. on Res., 8465; 1° m., 8466 (v); 2°*, in Com., 10863 (vi).

——— M. to withdraw Res., 7992 (iv).

Badgley Island, Trespass of T. H. Jackman, Claims *re* (Ans.) 2218 (ii).

Belgian Syndicate, Commission *re* Investigation (Ans.) 842 (i).

Bills of Exchange Act Amt. (B. 142) 1° m., 6054 (iii); in Com., 6520 (iv).

Binder Twine, Purchasers' Names and P.O. Addresses (Ans) 9715 (v).

Blunden, Frederick, Trial and Conviction, on M. (Mr. Ward) for Cor., 3467 (ii).

——— in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 12909 (vii).

Brantford Stove Works Strike, Interpretation of Criminal Code (remarks) 9027 (v).

——— Cor. with Justice Dept. (Ans.) 10016

C. P. R. Taxation Cases, on Inquiry for Ret., 5049 (iii).

Cigarette and Tobacco Restraint Bill: *See 'Tobacco.'*

Cimon, Mr. Justice, Apptmt. to Quebec District (Ans.) 2978 (ii).

——— Jurisdiction of Justice Dept. *re* Residence (Ans.) 2545 (ii).

——— Payments to *re* Travelling Expenses &c. (Ans.) 2978 (ii).

——— Residence *re* District (Ans.) 2218 (ii).

Civil Service Commission, Instructions to Judge Cassels, on Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 7505 (iv).

See 'Marine.'

Criminal Code (Ry. mortgage) Amt. (B. 212) 1° m., 12919; on Senate Amts., 13316 (vii).

See 'Ry. Act.'

Dominion Elections Act Amt. (B. 115) 1° m., 4566 (iii); 2° m., 7835 (iv), 11755; in Com., 11796, 11827 (vi), 12919; 3° m., 13229; on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13238; on Amt. (Mr. Sproule) 13255; on Senate Amts., 13579 (vii).

——— (B. 115) Adjnd. debate, 11707 (vi).

Doukhobors, Tels. *re* Pardon by Justice Dept. (Ans.) 6983 (iv).

Doukhobors at Yorkton, Violation of Laws, &c. (remarks) 7624 (iv).

Drysdale, Hon. Mr. Justice, Date of Accepting Appmt. (Ans.) 4768, 5084 (iii).

Employees of Parliament, Religion, &c., on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Ret., 5486 (iii).

Essex County Junior Judgeship, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 1940 (i).

Exchequer Court Act Amt. (B. 116) 1° m., 4576 (iii); in Com., 8401 (v).

Forbes, Mr. Justice, Personal Status, Apptmt., &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., &c., 899 (i).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. A. B.—*Con.*

Forbes, Mr. Justice, Professional Status, &c. (Ans.) 3840 (ii).

——— Qualifications *re* Apptmt. (Ans) 2390 (ii).

——— on Inquiry for Ret., 1861 (i).

Fraser, A. W., Emplymt. as Counsel for Purchase of Sussex St. Property (Ans.) 3478 (ii).

——— Payments *re* Legal Services, &c., (Ans.) 2979 (ii).

Gillis, Release from Penitentiary, (Ans.) 510 (i).

Govt. Officials as Political Partisans at Elections (remarks) in Com. on B. 115, 11903 (vi).

See 'St. Vincent de Paul.'

G. T. P., Commissions issued to Inspectors (remarks) 9716 (v).

——— Liquor, Prohibition of Sale, on Inquiry for Ret., 2024 (ii).

——— Madawaska Right of Way (remarks) 12661 (vii).

——— Policy *re* Police Patrol (remarks) 7997 (iv).

Hogg, Mr. W. D., Payments to since 1896, &c. (Ans.) 2981 (ii).

Japanese Immigration Acts, Disallowance of (Ans.) 6642 (iv).

Judges Salaries in Man. and Ont. (B. 206) prop. Res., 12392; in Com. on Res., 12551; 1° m., 12554; in Com., 13048 (vii).

Judges in Quebec Prov., Insufficient Number, Pets. from Bar (Ans.) 842 (i).

Juvenile Delinquents (B. 190) 1°*, 10915 (vi); 2°, and in Com., 12399 (vii).

Kun, Agnes B., Release of (remarks) 9580 (v).

——— Letter laid on Table, 9710 (v).

Lacoste, Sir Alexander, Amount of Pension, &c. (Ans.) 1935 (i).

Legal Agents in Mar. Provs., Names, &c. (Ans.) 4768 (iii).

——— for Govt. in P.E.I., Names, &c. (Ans.) 4764 (iii).

Lord's Day Act Violations at Ottawa, *re* Horse Racing on Sunday (remarks) 3753 (ii).

MacIlreith, Mr. R. T., Payments to for Legal Services (Ans.) 696 (i).

McGuire, ex-Chief Justice, Superannuation of (Ans.) 10514 (vi).

Magee, Hon. Mr. Justice, Delay in giving Judgments (Ans.) 2594 (ii).

Man. Appeal Act: *See* 'Winding-up Act.'

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt of Counsel, for Commission, on M. (Mr Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7360 (iv).

——— Counsel Fees (Ans.) 8838 (v).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. A. B.—*Con.*

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Letter of Instruction to Mr. Watson laid on Table, 7621 (iv).

See 'Civil Service.'

Metlakatla and Songhees Indian Reserves, Opinions of Dept. of Justice, on M. for Copies (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5477 (iii).

Montreal Circuit Court Judges, Increase in Salary (remarks) in Com. on B. 206, 12553 (vii).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 180 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 11990 (vi).

Northwest Territories Act Amt. (B. 210) 1° m., 12650; 2° m., in Com., 13051 (vii).

Ouimet, Hon. J. A., Retirement of (Ans.) 516 (i).

Pardoning Power *re* Criminals released since 1896, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 2825 (ii).

——— Ret. (remarks) 9579 (v), 13081 (vii).

See 'Blunden.'

Prisons and Reformatories Act (Halifax) Amt. (B. 166) 1°*, 8604 (v); 2° m., 10690; in Com., 10691 (vi).

Prisoners released, &c.: *See* 'Pardoning Power.'

Queebc Superior Court, Apptmt. of additional Judge (Ans.) 1288 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. on B. 206, 13048 (vii).

Ry. Act Amt. (B. 28) M. to wthdrw., 3579 (ii).

Railway Act (Commission, Ass't Chief) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4966 (iii).

Ry. Act (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10637; on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to M. for 3°, 11590; Amt. (Mr. Macdonell) moved in Com., 11632 (vi).

Ry. Act (mortgages) Amt. (B. 204) 1° m., 12549; 2°*, in Com., 13046 (vii).

See 'Criminal Code.'

Revised Statutes, Completion of French Edition, &c. (Ans.) 6983 (iv).

St. Louis, Mr. H., Emplymt. in Justice Dept. (Ans.) 1347 (i).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Officers and Municipal Elections (Ans.) 2791 (ii).

——— Holidays for Officials (Ans.) 2792 (ii).

Saskatchewan Legislature Acts, Reports *re* (Ans.) 6401 (iv).

——— Disallowance of (Ans.) 6644 (iv).

School Statutes, *re* Saskatchewan Prov., on M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) to adjn., 6858 (iv).

Shepley, Mr. G. F., Payments to (remarks) 1112 (i).

Sudbury Court Judges, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 12413 (vii).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. A. B.—*Con.*

Supreme Court Act Amt. (B. 121) 1° m., 4826; 2°*, in Com., 5497 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Justice (Dominion Police) 5509; (Exchequer Court) 5505; (printing, &c.) 5508 (iii); Supreme Court (contingencies) 12917 (vii); (registrar's uniform) 5507 (iii).

Penitentiaries—B.C. (land purchase) 12918 (vii); Generally (maintenance) 5515 (iii); (St. Vincent de Paul) 12918 (vii).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint (B. 173) 1° m., 9021 (v); 2°*, and in Com., 10693; 3°*, 11235 (vi); on Sen. Amts., 13044 (vii).

Winding-up Act (Man. Appeals) Amt. (B. 102) 1° m., 3477; 2°* in Com., and 3°*, 3933 (ii).

——— (B. 144) 1° m., 6142 (iii); 2°* in Com., 6523 (iv).

Yukon Concession Cases, Appeal from Supreme Court (Ans.) 10301 (vi).

Yukon Sunday Observance Law and Instructions to N.W.M.P. (Ans.) 565 (i).

——— Papers laid on Table, 841 (i).

BARKER, Mr. S. *East Hamilton.*

Address, The, 519, (amt.) 530, Neg. (Y. 50; N. 96) 552 (i).

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4712 (iii).

Atlantic Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s Bridge Construction, in Com. on Res., 13308 (vii).

Bank of Hamilton incorp. (B. 56) 1°*, 1207 (i).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4387 (iii).

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7671 (iv).

Bills of Exchange Act Amt. B. 142 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6521 (iv).

British Columbia Bank incorp. B. 49 (Mr. Sloan) on M. for 2°, 1470 (i).

Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. Hse., 5888 (iii).

Civil Service Employees, 1905-6-7, Dates of Apptmts., &c. (M. for ret.*) 558 (i).

Coal Lands, O.C., Regulations, &c., *re* Disposal (M. for copies*) 4246 (iii).

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1162 (i).

——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1655 (i).

——— on M. for Sup., 1793 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com.., 11837, 11851; (amt.) 11865 (vi).

Dom. Elections, Forms, Writs, Instructions, &c., issued in 1907 (M. for copies*) 555 (i).

BARKER, Mr. S.—*Con.*

Fire Extinguishers File, Cor. quoted by Min., Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7775 (iv).

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 8133 (iv).

G. T. P., Eastern Limit Mountain Section, Establishment of (Ques.) 9265 (v).

——— Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 12361 (vii).

——— and National Trans. Ry., Disputed Questions (Ques.) 6235 (iv).

——— Protests *re* Land Acquisitions (Ques.) 6640 (iv).

——— Ry. Sections B and F, Contracts, Amounts paid, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5211 (iii).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3706, 3743 (ii).

Hillsborough Bridge Contract, Claims of M. J. Haney, O.Cs., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 1690 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3042, 3690 (ii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 768 (i).

Land Titles Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6519 (iv).

Moncton Car Shops, Lease, &c., O.C., &c. (M. for copies*) 1690 (i).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11995 (vi).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Bristol) 5056 (iii).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Burning of Papers, Ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4072 (ii).

Petit Rocher Breakwater, Incomplete Return (remarks) 5726 (iii).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3138 (ii).

——— Meetings, &c. (remarks) 1441 (i).

Public Works, Estimated Cost, &c., Extravagant Expenditure, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7148 (iv).

Quebec Bridge Disaster, ref. to in debate on Address, 519 (i).

——— Commission's Report (remarks) 3901 (ii).

Quebec and N.B. Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13293 (vii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3780 (ii).

Supplies purchased by Govt., Apptmt. of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5833 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Welland (Port Maitland piers) 5682 (iii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4072 (ii).

BARKER, Mr. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (North Bay) 7716 (iv); Ottawa (Mint) 1477; (Museum) 1492 (i); Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (St. John) 12019 (vi).

Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor. (amt.) 921 (i).

BARR, Mr. J. *Dufferin.*

Address, The, 276 (i).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4525 (iii).

See 'National.'

Campaign Literature, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10350 (vi).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6208 (iii).

Cattle Embargo in G.B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12884 (vii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5100 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 11361 (vi).

Debates of the House, Time occupied by Members (remarks) 13539 (vii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11831 (vi).

Doukhobors, Destitute, Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5012 (iii).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co's. B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13209 (vii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3611, 3647 (ii).

Geological Museum, Progress *re* Construction (remarks) in Com., 13568 (vii).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6272 (iv).

Home Guards, N.W.T., Issue of Scrip for Services (Ques.) 2161 (ii).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10501 (vi).

Inland Revenue Seizures, 1906-7 in Cornwall, Toronto, Ottawa, &c. (Ques.) 3846 (ii).

——— (M. for ret.*) 3851 (ii), 4247 (iii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7236 (iv).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9491 (v).

National Battlefields (lands) Amt. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 13501; in Com., 13502 (vii).

Office Specialty Co., Fittings, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7481 (iv).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4696 (iii); in Com., 10858 (vi).

BARR, Mr. J.—*Con.*

Patent and Proprietary Medicines B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) on M. for 2°, 10553 (vi); in Com., 12624 (vii).

Posters, Prohibition of Indecent Bills, Enforcement of Tariff Regulations (Ques.) 6461 (iv).

Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4978 (iii); in Com. on Res., 3907 (ii).

——— (wires, &c.) Amt. (B. 43) 1° m., 840 (i); 2° m., 5212 (iii).

Ry. Tracks, Crossing by Water Mains, Application to Board (Ques.) 1109 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 1294 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3768 (ii); in Com., 12608 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (seeds) 12893 (vii); (seed branch) 5504 (iii); (Year Book) 677 (i).

Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 978 (i); Post Office (clerical assistance) 8876 (v).

Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9227, 9450 (v).

House of Commons (Library of Parlt.) 10504 (vi).

Immigration (agents) 9869 (v).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4082, 4151 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 10297 (v).

Penitentiaries (maintenance) 5511 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Vernon) 10872; (Victoria immigration) 10881 (vi); Man. (Dauphin) 8520; (Emerson) 8534 (v); (Winnipeg hospital) 10958 (vi); Ont. (Dom. renewals) 7483; (Glencoe) 7488; (Guelph armoury) 7682 (iv); Ottawa (Mint) 1452, 1481 (i); Sask. (Battleford) 8577 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Collingwood) 12097 (vii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11088 (vi).

Telephone Wires, Applications to cross Ry. Tracks (Ques.) 690 (i).

See 'Railways,' &c.

Wheat Transportation from N. W., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2198 (ii).

BEATTIE, Mr. T., *London.*

Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13296 (vii).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6489 (iv).

Moir, Private, Shooting at Wolseley Barracks (remarks) 7322 (iv).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12600 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Militia (provisions) 12151 (vii); Public Works—Generally (armouries) 10895; Man. (Winnipeg hospital) 10966 (vi).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6124

BEAUPARLANT, Mr. A. M., *St. Hyacinthe.*

Criminal Code (libel) Amt. (B. 161) 1° m., 7307 (iv).

Exhibitions, Amount of Subsidies paid to (Ques.) 4406 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 3°, 4356, 4372 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4171 (ii).

BELAND, Mr. H. S., *Beauce.*

Anthracite Coal, Quantity imported from U.S., and other Countries (Ques.) 1510 (i).

Cotton, Raw, Imported from U.S. in 1905-7, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 1511 (i).

Debates, French Edition, Delay in Distribution (ques. of priv.) 3486 (ii).

Diseases and Public Health Bureau, on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2579 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Treaty, Distribution to Members (remarks) 605 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3552 (ii).

Pulp Wood, Export Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 4808 (iii).

Pulp Wood, Exported to U.S., Quantity, Value, &c. (Ques.) 1511 (i).

Rehm, Fred. and Frank Patent Relief (B. 110) 1°*, 3896 (ii).

BENNETT, Mr. W. H., *East Simcoe.*

Adams, Lake, Construction of Dam, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 5798 (iii).

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4728 (iii).

Architects on Public Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7122 (iv).

'Arctic,' Str., Cruise in Northern Waters, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4014 (ii).

—— Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4143 (ii).

Badgley Island, Trespass by T. H. Jackman, &c. (Ques.) 1937 (i), 2217 (ii).

Binder Twine Seizures, Payments to A. Smith (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 653 (i).

Birnie and Noble, Advances to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 986 (i).

Blood Indian Reserve, Lease to McEwan Cattle Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12739 (vii).

Boone, C. S., Co., Amounts paid for Dredging (Ques.) 4244, 5083 (iii).

—— (M. for ret.*) 5476 (iii).

Brockville-Ottawa Ry. Service (remarks) on M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn., 190 (i).

Canadian Timber used in Public Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11208 (vi).

BENNETT, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Canadian Towing and Wrecking Co., Payments *re* Contracts, &c. (M. for copies*) 3241 (ii).

'Castle,' Tug, Removal of Wreck, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 6641 (iv).

Chicoutimi Dredging, Tenders *re*, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 7203 (iv).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11397 (vi).

Civil Service Commission Report (remarks) 5623 (iii).

—— Investigations, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Power, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7599 (iv).

See 'Marine,' &c.

Colonial Conference, Travelling Expenses of Ministers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1048

See 'Travelling.'

Committee Meeting, Rep. in Toronto 'Globe,' Ques. of Priv., 2382 (ii).

Documents in Dept., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1151 (i).

—— Production of Originals, Announcement *re* (remarks) 1425 (i).

——Production in Committees, 1427 (i).

—— taken from Pub. Accounts Com. (remarks) 2305, 2308 (ii).

Dokis Indian Reserve, Negotiations *re* Surrender of Title (remarks) 3850 (ii).

—— Commission to Mr. Ryan (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12732 (vii).

—— Protests *re* Sale (remarks) 10918 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11830, 11859 (vi), 12995; on M. for 3°, 13247 (vii).

Draper, P. M., Candidate for Municipal Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 612 (i).

Dredging Contracts, O.C. *re*, Inquiry for, 6853, 6927 (iv), 8696 (v).

—— Investigation *re* (remarks) in Com., 5924 (ii).

—— Renewal without Tenders (remarks) 6633 (iv).

Dredging at Fort William, Amounts paid to Great Lakes Dredging Co., &c. (Ques.) 8839 (v).

See 'Boone,' &c.

Dredging at Midland, &c., Tenders *re*, Advertisements for (remarks) 7195 (iv).

—— O.C. *re* Renewal, &c., 6741 (iv).

See 'Midland.'

Dredging in Quebec Harbours, 1907, Tenders, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 3240 (ii).

Dredges registered in Canada, &c. (Ques.) 11497 (vi).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4677 (iii); in Com., 10767 (vi).

BENNETT, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Eclipse Co. of Ottawa, Payments to (Ques.) 6461 (iv).

—— Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7469 (iv).

Fisheries Regulations, Violations of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5782 (iii).
See 'Birnie,' &c.

Foresters Order, Charges in 'Le Canada,' Ques. of Priv., 6005 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3614 (ii).

Gelinas, Mr., Repayment of Travelling Expenses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 654 (i)

Georgian Bay Fisheries Commission, Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 980

—— Report from Mr. Birnie (remarks) 5729 (iii).
See 'Birnie.'

'Golspie' Str., Payments *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1084 (i).

G.T.Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res 2254 (ii); in Com., 12062 (vii).

G.T.P., Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12676 (vii).

Griffith Island, Georgian Bay, Sale of, &c (Ques.) 1508 (i).

Hay Shipments to S. Africa, Claims against Dept. of Agriculture (Ques.) 5791 (iii).

Holland River Dredging, Contract with Lake Simcoe Dredging Co. (Ques.) 2980 (ii).

—— Divisional Engineer, &c. (Ques.) 4767 (iii).

—— Name of Inspector, &c. (Ques.) 3037 (ii).

Hunter, Mr. J. B., Apptmt. as Dep. Min. of Pub. Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1459 (i).

Inspector of Public Works, Apptmts. of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5678 (iii).

I. C. R., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4423 (iii).

Johnston, Mr. W. J., Extra Remuneration, Leave of Absence, &c. (Ques.) 5201 (iii).

Lacas, Mr., Payments to, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 640, 1037 (i).

Marine and Fisheries, Book-keeping, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4003 (ii).

—— Investigation, Defalcations of Mr. Roy, &c. (remarks) 10741 (vi).

—— Investigations, Evidence (remarks) *re* Printing, 10916 (vi).
See 'Sorel.'

Matchedash Bay, Dredging at Fesserton Amount expended, &c. (Ques.) 566 (i).

Midland Dredging Co., Statement *re* Mr. McMullen (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5714 (iii).

BENNETT, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Midland Harbour Dredging, Tenders, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 3239 (ii), 8893 (v).

Midland, Tiffin and Victoria Harbours, Expenditure *re* Dredging, 1907 (Ques.) 8181 (iv).

—— Tenders *re* (Ques.) 3428 (ii).

Midland Towing and Wrecking Co., Contract *re*, Cor. (M. for copies*) 3241 (ii).

Noble, Mr. James, Conviction *re* Fishery Regulations (Ques.) 5650 (iii).
See 'Georgian Bay,' &c.

Office Specialty Co. and Eclipse Mfg. Co., Amounts paid to (Ques.) 3039 (ii), 4244 (iii).

—— (M. for ret.*) 3242 (ii).

—— Inquiry for Ret., 3581 (ii), 5785 (iii).
See 'Eclipse.'

Official Cars, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10335 (vi).

Oromocto Shoals, Contract *re* Dredging (Ques.) 11496 (vi).

Otonabee Power Co., Amount of Payment *re* Horse-power (Ques.) 5471, 5656 (iii).

—— Incorrect Answer (remarks) 5566 (iii).

Owen Sound Dredging Co., Payments to (Ques.) 2792 (ii).

—— Inspector Telford, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 3038 (ii).

Owen Sound Public Building, Contract *re* Extension (Ques.) 3039 (ii).

—— Inspector, Apptmt. of Mr. Foster (Ques.) 3039 (ii).

—— Sub-letting of Contract by Leslie (Ques.) 3039 (ii).

Port Arthur and Fort William Dredging, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 8617 (v).
See 'Dredging,' &c.

Port Colborne Elevator and Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12211 (vii).

Postal Arrangements between Canada and U.S., on Statement (Mr. Lemieux) to Com. of Sup., 3161 (ii).

Postal Service, Delays, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 7259 (iv).

Pound-net Licenses, Granted in 1905, Cor. with A. E. Dyment, &c. (M. for copies*) 2795 (ii).

P.E.I. Ry., Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration re M. J. Haney's Claims (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2747 (ii).

Prohibition Vote in Quebec (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 660 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Production of Original Documents (remarks) 1383 (i).

—— on M. to conc. in 3rd Rep., 2160 (ii).

—— Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3082 (ii).

Public Buildings, Erection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7189 (iv).

BENNETT, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Public Works Estimates, Preparation of, &c. (remarks) in Com., 5924 (iii).

Public Works in Harbours and Rivers, Ont., Tenders, Amounts, &c. (M. for ret.*) 559 (i).

Ry. Act (commissioners) Amt. B. (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., Notice of Amt., 3751 (ii).

Registrar of Grey County, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Telford) 11303 (vi).

Returns, Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv., 4667 (iii).

See 'Documents.'

St. John, N.B., Contracts with Dom. Dredging Co., &c. (Ques.) 11700 (vi).

——— Dredging Contracts, Payments, &c. (Ques.) 11496 (vi).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8562 (v).

Sorel Public Works, Investigation *re* Pay Rolls, &c. (Ques.) 4767 (iii).

———Allegations against Mr. Roy (remarks) 8295 (v).

——— Final Rep. (remarks) 10794 (vi).

——— Irregularities *re* (remarks) 5408 (iii).

——— Ref. to Judge Cassels (remarks) 7938 (iv).

See 'Marine,' &c.

'Speedy' Str., Purchase, Services, &c. (Ques.) 565 (i), 3844 (ii).

Stoney Lake, Damage Claims (Ques.) 5565 (iii).

Stoney Lake Dock, Construction by Govt. (Ques.) 5564, 5649, 5786 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10584, 10615 (vi).

Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 12224; Trent (Buckhorn dam) 12227 (vii); (surveys) 10338 (vi); Welland (Port Colborne) 12211 (vii); (Port Maitland piers) 5678 (iii); (surveys) 12210 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 980; Printing and Stationery (salaries) 612; (Ass't. Dep. Min.) 1459 (i), 5699 (iii); Public Works (salaries) 639 (i), 5699 (iii); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 648 (i).

Fisheries (protection steamers) 13326 (vii).

Interior—Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5759 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Lime Kiln crossing 13323; (pensions) 13324 (vii); (salaries) 4756 (iii).

Marine and Fisheries (dredging plant, &c.) 4754 (iii); (Hudson Bay patrol) 3989 (ii); (patrol boats) 4750; (Lake St. Peter piers) 4752 (iii).

Marine (hospitals) 5782 (iii).

Militia (salaries and wages) 12147 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 1079 (i), 5766 (iii); (ice-breakers) 2947, 2952; (obstructions) 3211; (removal of obstructions) 3156; (wrecking plant subsidies) 3221; (wrecks) 3151, 3205 (ii).

Penitentiaries (maintenance) 5512 (iii).

Post Office (boots for letter carriers) 8878 (v); (North Bay inspectors) 13152 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings, B.C. (Chilliwack) 13338; (Cranbrook) 13338 (vii); (Cumberland) 10865; (Fernie) 10866 (vi); (Grand Forks) 13338; (Greenwood) 13338 (vii); (Ladysmith) 10867; (Quesnel) 10868 (vi); (Revelstoke) 13339 (vii); (Vernon) 10872 (vi), 10339 (vii); (Victoria immigration) 10874 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10886 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings, Man. (Dauphin) 8519 (v); (Elmwood) 13335 (vii); (Emerson) 8534 (v); (Neepawa) 13336; (Portage la Prairie) 13336 (vii); (Selkirk) 8550 (v); (Souris) 13336 (vii); (Winnipeg hospital) 10959 (vi); (Winnipeg warehouse) 8571 (v).

Public Works—Buildings, N.B. (Grand Falls) 13328 (vii); (St. John, military) 7186 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings, N.S. (Antigonish) 7122; (Bridgewater) 7135; (Glace Bay) 7139; (Halifax) 7140; (Halifax customs) 7162; (Inverness) 7172 (iv); (Parrsboro') 13327 (vii); (Shelburne) 7173; (Westville) 7179 (iv); (Wolfeville) 13327 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings, Ont. (Dom., renewals) 7467; (Glencoe) 7489 (iv); (Mitchell) 13332; (North Bay) 13332; (Park Hill) 13332; (Peterborough) 13332; (Port Arthur) 13332; (Sarnia) 13333; (Seaforth) 13332; (Simcoe) 13333; (Sudbury) 13333; (Tilsonburg) 13333; (Uxbridge) 13333; (Walkerville) 13333; (Waterloo) 13333 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (improvements, &c.) 5707 (iii); (Mint) 1458; (Museum) 1489 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—P.E.I. (Georgetown) 7183 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Arthabaskaville) 13329; (Grand Mère) 13329 (vii); (Grosse Isle) 7290 (iv); (Joliette) 13329 (vii); (Knowlton) 7290 (iv), 13329; (Lachute) 13329 (vii); (Lévis) 7296 (iv), 13329; (Magog) 13329; (Megantic) 13330; (Plessissville) 13330; (Point St. Charles) 13330; (Roberval) 13330; (St. Thérèse) 13330; (Shawenegan) 13330 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. and Alta. (Battleford) 8577; (Edmonton) 8579 (v); (Estevan) 13336 (vii); (Humboldt) 8585 (v); (Lethbridge) 13336 (vii); (Maple Creek) 8600 (v), 13337 (vii); (Medicine Hat) 8601 (v); (Moosejaw) 13336 (vii); (Prince Albert penitentiary) 8601; (Saskatoon) 8603 (v), 13337; (Strathcona) 13338 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (commissioner's house) 10884 (vi).

Public Works—Dredging—B.C. (North Thompson River) 13352; Que. and Ont. (generally) 13351 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Lower Newcastle) 11695; (St. John) 12013 (vi); (St. John improvements) 5708 (iii).

BENNETT, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis) 11207; (Baddeck) 11219; (Barachois) 11224; (Bay St. Lawrence) 11224; (Big Lorraine) 11224; (Breton Cove) 11224; (Charlos Cove) 11225; (Church Point) 11225; (Cow Bay) 11225; (vi); (dredging) 13341 (vii); (McPherson's Cove) 11229; (Parrsborough) 11259; (Port Hood) 11277; (Port Joli West) 11279; (Pugwash wharf) 11280; (Round Hill wharf) 11282 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Georgian Bay survey) 13326; (Lakefield) 13350; (Meaford) 12103; (Michipicoten) 13350; (Midland and Tiffin) 12103 (vii); (Point Edward) 5714 (iii); (Port Arthur, &c.) 12144; (Port Colborne) 12146; (Rainy River) 12136; (Roche's Point) 12136 (vii); (Tiffin dredging) 5709 (iii), 13351 (vii); (Tobermory) 13351 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse à la Barbe) 12028; (Batiscan) 12029; (Bic) 12030; (Bonaventure) 12036; (Cap St. Ignace) 12030; (Chateauguay) 12030; (Clarke City) 12031; (Lake Aylmer) 12032; (Lake Megantic) 12033; (Lake St. Francis) 12033; (Lake St. John) 12033; (Lavaltrie) 12033; (Lotbinière) 12033; (Malbaie) 12034; (Matane) 12034; (Nicolet) 12034; (Notre Dame de Portage) 12034; (Ouelle Rivière) 12037; (Piché Point) 12035; (Richelieu) 12038; (Rivière du Lièvre) 12037; (Rivière du Loup) 12036; (Rivière Maskinonge) 12037; (St. Alphonse) 12041; (Ste. Anne de Monts) 12041; (St. Francis) 12041; (St. Louis) 12040; (St. Maurice) 12041; (Saguenay) 12040; (Yamaska dredging) 12043 (vi); (Yamaska river) 5708 (iii).

Public Works—Marine Dept. (gratuities) 13321 (vii).

Public Works—Transportation Facilities (Georgian Bay surveys) 12145 (vii).

Railways—I.C.R. (rolling stock) 5552 (iii).

Sussex Street Property Purchase, Payment to Jos. Riopelle (Ques.) 3844 (ii).

Tenders, Advertisements, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7478 (iv).

Thessalon Post Office, Charges *re* Postmaster (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 660 (i).

Tiffin Dredging, Tenders *re* Owen Sound Dredging Co. (Ques.) 8892 (v).
See 'Dredging.'

Timber Limits, Disposal of, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2730 (ii).
See 'Documents.'

Travelling Expenses of Minister at Colonial Conference, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3989 (ii)
See 'Colonial.'

Trent Valley Canal, Holland River Dredging, Advertisements, &c. (M. for copies*) 3241 (ii).
See 'Holland.'

Vautelet, Mr., Payments to, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 641 (i).

BENNETT, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Victoria Harbour, Tenders *re* Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 8893 (v).
See 'Dredging, &c.'

Wiarton Dredging, 1907, Tenders, &c., (Ques.) 6236 (iv).

——— Payments to Mr. Bowman, &c. (Ques.) 6407 (iv).

Winfield Basin Dredging, Tender, Inspection, &c. (Ques.) 6461 (iv).

Woodstock, N.B., Postmaster L. C. Smith, Interference in Elections, on M. for Sup., 2888 (ii).

Yarmouth, N.S., Dredging Contracts, Tenders, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 11500 (vi).

BERGERON, Mr. J. G. H., *Beauharnois.*

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4722 (iii).

Architects on Public Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7125 (iv).

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 10921 (vi).

Beauharnois Canal, Investigation by M. Dupuis, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 3038 (ii).

——— Lease to McIntyre and Robert Syndicate (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13175 (vii).

——— (remarks) 13475 (vii).

——— Water-power, Copy of New Lease (remarks) 946 (i).

——— (M. for copies*) 1131 (i).

——— Inquiry for Copy, 1740 (i).

Becancour Harbour Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 2392 (ii).

——— Commencement of, Payments, &c. (Ques.) 7212 (iv).

Budget, The, 5357 (iii).

Campaign Literature (French) distributed in Prov. of Que. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10352 (vi).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6162, 6173, 6203 (iii); in Com., 6426 (iv).

Canada and Germany Treaty (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10601 (vi).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12867 (vii).

Canadian Newspapers, Drawback *re* American Surtax (Ques.) 5203 (iii).

Canadian Press Association Subsidy B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 12842, 12848 (vii).

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6870 (iv).

Cattle Embargo in G.B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12882 (vii).

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11251 (vi).

BERGERON, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*
Charlemagne and Terrebonne Dredging, Expenditure *re*, &c. (Ques.) 685 (i).
——— (M. for ret.*) 853 (i).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10744 (vi).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 10717, 10727; in Com. on Res., 11360 (vi); in Com., 12177 (vii).
Civil Service Commission Report, Translation into French (remarks) 6222, 6925 (iv), 11312 (vi), 13477 (vii).
Civil Servants, Increases, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12913 (vii).
Clerks of Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7119 (iv).
Colonial Conference, Travelling Expenses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1044 (i).
See 'Intercolonial.'
Côté, Boivin & Co., Amounts paid to by Govt. (Ques.) 12650 (vii).
Cotton Strikers, Disputes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13156 (vii).
Debates, French Edition, Delay in Distribution, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Beland) 3492 (ii).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. *re* Salaries (remarks) *re* Conc., 12504 (vii).
——— (translators) 4th Rep., on M. (Mr. Monk) to ref. back to Com., 10245 (v).
——— Conc. without Notice (remarks) 8897 (v).
See 'Hansard.'
Denis, Mr. Gaspard, Postmaster at St. Michel des Saints, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 9474 (v).
Documents in Dept., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1180 (i).
——— (remarks) on M. to adjn. debate, 1849 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 80 (Mr. Lewis) on M. for 1°, 1682 (i).
——— B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 1°, 4573 (iii); on M. for 2°, 8681 (v); in Com., 11824, 11831, 11857 (vi), 13010 (vii).
Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5013 (iii).
Dredging in Ont. and Quebec, Tenders, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 9276, 10008 (v).
Dredging in St. Lawrence, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 2896 (ii).
See 'Riviere la Graisse.'
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13278 (vii).
Farnham Post Office, Vote *re* Improvement of (Ques.) 6399 (iv).
Fort William Terminals Co.'s B. 101 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6223 (iv).

BERGERON, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*
French Canadian Ministers, Attack *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4200 (ii).
Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for Com. on Res., 1223 (i); in Com., 3582, 3636 (ii).
——— Ratification by French Senate (remarks) 13083 (vii).
See 'Can. and France.'
French Translation of Govt. Statutes, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3179 (ii).
Gaudette, Victor, Employmt. by Govt., Payments to (Ques.) 515 (i).
Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3634 (ii).
Georgian Bay Canal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10312 (vi).
——— Rep. of (remarks) 12836 (vii).
G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2238 (ii).
Halifax Garrison, Discontent *re* Pay, &c. (remarks) 5660 (iii).
'Hansard,' Extra Copies, Distribution of (remarks) 9128 (v).
See 'Debates.'
Immigration from France and Belgium, Premiums paid to Clerical and Lay Agents, &c. (Ques.) 6922 (iv).
Ingonish Island Lightkeeper, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 8618 (v).
Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6901 (iv).
Insurance Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 835 (i).
Intercolonial Conference in London, Total Expenditure (Ques.) 13225, 13511 (vii).
See 'Colonial.'
I.C.R., Employees Provident Fund Act Amt. B. 117 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°, 4577; in Com., 4995 (iii).
I.C.R. and P.E.I. Rys., Change of Name to Govt. Rys., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6246 (iv).
——— Ste. Monique Gates, Number to be made (Ques.) 11936 (vi).
——— Sunday Cars, Instructions *re* (Ques.) 10734 (vi).
——— Talbot, Mr. Evariste, Employmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 6400 (iv).
Irrigation Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 968 (i).
Judges of Man. and Ont., Salaries (B. 206) (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13048 (vii).
Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12401 (vii).
Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13287 (vii).
'Labour Gazette,' Cost of Printing, &c. (Ques.) 6407 (iv).

BERGERON, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*

Lacas, Mr., Payments to, by Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1037 (i).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11248 (vi).

'Le Soleil, Par. *re* Voting by French Members, Ques. of Priv., 7992 (iv).

Letter Carriers, Contract for Boots, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8873 (v).

MacIlreith, Payment to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7178 (iv).

Manchester, Dr., Misappropriation of Moneys of Mr. Walter Dick (Ques.) 11936 (vi).

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Appmt. of Counsel for Commissioners, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7327 (iv).

—— Investigation by Minister, &c. (remarks) 6636 (iv).

—— Mr. Perron's Duties (Ques.) 10743 (vi).

—— Officers under Suspension (remarks) 6847 (iv).

—— Proceedings, &c. (remarks) 7321 (iv).

—— Translation of Evidence (remarks) 11204 (vi).

Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3026 (ii).

Matane River Fishing, Complaints (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5775 (iii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7252 (iv).

Montreal Post Office, Addition, Tenders *re* Construction (Ques.) 6922 (iv).

—— Defalcations, Investigation *re* (Ques.) 7197 (iv).

Monuments to McGee and Brown (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13352 (vii).

New York Central Ry., Complaints *re* Discrimination (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10328 (vi).

Nicolet Post Office, Completion of, Postmaster's Name, &c. (Ques.) 11498 (vi).

—— Emplymt. of Mr. S. Rivard (Ques.) 11702 (vi).

Nicolet River Dredging, Emplymt. of Narcisse Jutras (Ques.) 11936 (vi).

Nipigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13289 (vii).

Notre Dame du Portage, Expenditure *re* Wharf (Ques.) 6400 (iv).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4701 (iii).

Order Papers, French and English Editions (remarks) 6853 (iv).

O'Shaughnessy, Mr. John, Emplymt. on I.C.R. (Ques.) 11498 (vi).

—— Emplymt. *re* Nicolet Post Office (Ques.) 11702 (vi).

—— Issue of Pass to travel on I.C.R. Express (Ques.) 11936 (vi).

BERGERON, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*

Owen Sound and Meaford Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13288 (vii).

Pacific and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 138 (Mr. Dyment) in Com., 8610 (v).

Pardoning Power *re* Criminals, &c., released since 1896, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 2854 (ii).

Patent Medicines Inspection B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 6216 (iii).

Patent Medicines Bill, Govtl. Intention *re* (Ques.) 356 (i).

—— (remarks) 608 (i), 2594 (ii).

—— Committee of Inquiry (Ques.) 3899 (ii).

—— (remarks) *re* Apptmt. to Com., 10689 (vi).

Post Office Act (drop letter) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 7933 (iv).

Priv., Ques. of, Par. in 'Citizen' *re* Pamphlet by Jesuit Priest, 10427 (vi).

Provincial Subsidies, Amounts paid before and after Adjustment (Ques.) 8616 (v).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3142 (ii).

Quebec Judges, Additional, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 206, 13048 (vii).

—— Apptmt. of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 12190 (vii).

—— Apptmt. to Superior Court (remarks) 11825 (vi).

Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s B. 128 (Mr. Michaud) in Com., 6225 (iv).

Ques. of Priv., Anti-Catholic Article in 'Leader,' 8604 (v).

Railway Act (commission, ass't chief) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4965 (iii).

—— (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10638; on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to M. for 3°, 11608 (vi).

Railway Subsidies B. 215 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13286 (vii).

Restaurant of H. of C. and Senate, on M. (Mr. Pugsley) for Joint Com., 13224 (vii).

—— on 1st Rep., 13510 (vii).

Returns, Inquiry for, 3319 (ii), 13081 (vii).

Ricard, Mr., Emplymt. on I.C.R. (Ques.) 11498 (vi).

Rivière à la Graisse, Dredging, &c., Expenditure (M. for ret.*) 853 (i).

—— inquiry for ret., 2896, 3689 (ii).

—— Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 686 (i).

Rivière du Loup Post Office, Improvement to Grounds, &c. (Ques.) 6399 (iv).

—— Postmaster, Resignation and Salary (Ques.) 6399 (iv).

Ross Rifle, Correction of Mr. S. Hughes Speech, Ques. of Priv., 9126 (v).

—— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. S. Hughes) 9332 (v).

BERGERON, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*

St. Anicet Wharf, Apptmt. of Mr. Dupuis, Revenues, &c. (Ques.) 3230 (ii).

——— Expenditure and Collections, &c. (Ques.) 1935 (i).

——— Expenditure by Public Works (Ques.) 3479 (ii).

Ste. Anne de Sorel Lighthouse, Destruction of Trees, &c. (Ques.) 7731 (iv).

St. Fulgence Pier, Paymaster's List, Signatures, &c. (Ques.) 1115 (i).

——— Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 1130 (i).

St. Helen's Island Sale (remarks) in Com. on B. 218, 13417 (vii).

St. Laurent Wharf, Expenditure *re* Construction, &c. (Ques.) 895, 1121 (i).

St. Paschal and Kamouraska Mail Contracts, Tenders, Bondsmen, &c. (Ques.) 3236 (ii).

Sabourin, Maj., Cor. between Lt.-Col. Malette and Dept. (M. for copy*) 3434 (ii).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4580 (iii).

School Statutes, Saskatchewan Province, on M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) to adjn., 6862 (iv).

Sorel Irregularities, Allegations against Mr. Roy (remarks) 8296 (v).

——— Rep. of Mr. Gaudet (remarks) 6988, 7099, 7938 (iv).

Soulanges Canal, Floods at Valleyfield (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10339 (vi).

——— Investigation *re* Charges against Overseer (Ques.) 6407 (iv).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants Bill, on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3756 (ii).

Sudbury County Court Judge, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 12413 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Archives) 671; (census and statistics) 673 (i), 12879 (vii); (exhibitions) 10601 (vi), 12889; (live stock) 12896 (vii); (Year-Book) 678 (i).

Canals—Generally—(additional remuneration) 13174 (vii); (salaries) 10325; (statistical branch) 10318 (vi).

Canals—Lachine (repairs) 5672; (slope walls) 5663 (iii).

Canals—Soulanges (floods, &c.) 10339 (vi).

Canals—Welland (electric lighting) 12195; (Port Colborne) 12212 (vii); (Port Maitland piers) 5674, 5678 (iii); (surveys) 12208; (widening) 12211 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen.'s Office (salaries, &c.) 637; Inland Revenue (salaries) 646 (i); Marine and Fisheries (Ass't Dep. Min.) 12915 (vii); (salaries) 977, 1014 (i); Militia (salaries) 8872 (v); Mines, 646 (i); Post Office (clerical assistance) 8873 (v); (salaries) 8872 (v); Public Works (salaries) 643 (i), 12917 (vii); Sec. of State (salaries, &c.) 611; Trade and Commerce (salaries) 648 (i).

Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9227, 9262 (v).

BERGERON, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Geological Surveys (oil borings) 13163 (vii).

Hydrographic Surveys (Gulf of St. Lawrence) 13169 (vii).

Immigration (U. S. labourers) 13169 (vii).

Justice—Administration of, Supreme Court (contingencies) 12917 (vii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5775 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Australia) 13152 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4200 (ii); (ice-breakers) 1907 (i).

Militia (annual drill) 10287 (v).

Miscellaneous (Chinese riots) 13155; (Cotton strikers) 13156; (Marine investigation) 13169 (vii).

N.W.M. Police (pay of force) 8863; (salaries) 8863 (v).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 1086 (i).

Penitentiaries (maintenance) 5514 (iii); (wrecks) 3187, 3201 (ii); (St. Vincent de Paul) 12918 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vancouver) 13339 (vii); (Vernon) 10876; (Victoria immigration) 10876 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10892; (repairs) 10886 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8528 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 7111; (Bridgewater) 7136; (Halifax customs) 7155; (Halifax quarantine) 7171; (Inverness) 7172; (Shelburne) 7173; (Westville) 7179 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (North Bay) 7811 (iv); (Park Hill) 13332 (vii);

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (deptl. buildings) 13478; (heating) 13340 (vii); (skylights) 7816 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Cookshire) 7286; (Dundee) 7286; (Farnham) 7288; (Grosse Isle) 7289; (Knowlton) 7290; (Lachute) 7293; (Lévis) 7294; (Longueuil) 7305 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. and Alta. (Edmonton) 13336; (Moosejaw) 13337; (Saskatoon) 13337; (Strathcona) 13338 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (Dawson) 13339 (vii).

Public Works Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Port Hastings) 11266; (Port Hood) 11268

Public Works—Marine (ship channel) 5035 (iii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (gratuities) 5731 (iii).

Public Works—Telegraphs (Yukon) 13178 (vii).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines—B.C. (Cape Beale) 5732 (iii).

Railways—G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10383 (vi); I.C.R. (Halifax accommodation) 5549 (iii); (supplies) 10336; Miscellaneous (arbitrations) 10330; (extra clerks) 10345; (statistical branch) 10328; Ry. Commission (legal expenses) 10362 (vi).

Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry. on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor., &c., 917 (i).

Toronto Ordnance Lands Sale B. 218 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 13417 (vii).

BERGERON, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*

Trans-Canada Ry. Co.'s B. 107 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 5386 (iii).

Travelling Expenses of Officials, Passes, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1015 (i).

Valleyfield, Armoury (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7687 (iv).

——— Floods on Lake St. Francis, Damage, &c. (rearks) on M. for Sup., 7808 (iv).

——— (remarks) 7996 (iv).

——— Post Office Clock (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7115 (iv).

——— Regiment Organization, Cor., &c., *re* (M. for copy*) 3434 (ii).

Timber Limits, Disposal of (remarks) on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2519, 2679 (ii).

T. Lindsay Co., Amount of Goods purchased, &c. (Ques.) 8615 (v).

Vancouver Bank incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 4581 (iii).

Ventilation of H. of C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13340 (vii).

Votes and Proceedings, Correction in Names of Clerks, 13066 (vii).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6120 (iii).

BICKERDIKE, Mr. R., *Montreal, St. Lawrence.*

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5127 (iii)

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6915 (iv).

Independent Bank Audit, Establishment of (Ques.) 11232 (vi).

Presbyterian Church Widows' and Orphans' Fund (B. 23) 1°*, 430 (i) ; in Com. 2788 (ii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 12598 (vii).

BLACK, Mr. J. B.. *Hants.*

Canada Temperance Act. Amt. (B. 187) 1°*, 10717 (vi).

Cigarettes, Sale and Prohibition of, on prop. res. (Mr. Blain) 5251 (iii).

Coasting Privileges, Prop. Res., on Order being called, 2795 (ii).

Diseases and Public Health Bureau, Establishment of (prop. res.) 2562 (ii).

French Translation of Govt. Documents (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3184 (ii).

Shad Hatchery, Windsor, N.S. (Ques.) 8894 (v).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Round Hill wharf) 11282 (vi).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10697 (vi).

B

BLACK, Mr. J. B.—*Con.*

Whale Fishing Cos. in B.C., Licenses granted, &c. (remarks) 10277 (v).

BLAIN, Mr. R., *Peel.*

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup. 4717 (iii).

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3855 (ii)

Architects Institute of Canada incorp. B. 88 (Mr. Walsh) in Com., 5382, 5408 (iii).

Aud. General, Salary B. 208 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 12645 (vii).

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10944 (vi).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4502 (iii).

Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5945 (iii).

Bole Drug Co., Supplies furnished to Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5941 (iii).

Brampton Post Office, Repairs, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7480 (iv).

Braund, Samuel, Apptmt. as Inspector on Welland Canal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5674 (iii).

British Pensioners, Notice of Deductions, &c. (Ques.) 7501 (iv).

Bronze Coat-of-arms, Duty *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7150 (iv).

Campaign Literature franked by Depts. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10356 (vi).

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. 187 (Mr. Black) on M. for 2°, 13507 (vii).

Cattle exported to U.S., Fees *re* Thoroughbreds (remarks) 2768 (ii).

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11254 (vi).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10752 (vi).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of (prop. res.) 5087; on M. to resume debate, 5251 (iii).

——— Resolution of W.C.T.U. of Brampton (read) 7278 (iv).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 11347; in Com., 11368, 11655 (vi), 12166, 12183 (vii).

Civil Service Commission Report, Number distributed (remarks) 6060 (iii).

——— (remarks) on Presentation, 5638 (iii).

Co-operative Societies B. 5 (Mr. Monk) on M. for 2°, 4556 (iii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 11314 (vi).

Documents, Original, Production of, to Members on M. for Sup., 1871 (i).

——— Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7761 (iv).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Documents, Instructions to Minister of Marine (remarks) 7810 (iv).
See 'Pub. Accts,' &c.

Dog-Fish Scrap, Shipments from Canso to U.S. (Ques.) 1126 (i).

Dom. Elections Act. Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11834; (amt.) 11835 (vi); 12943 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act. Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11523, 11181 (vi).

Dredging Contracts, O. Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6777 (iv).

Eclipse Manufacturing Co., Payments to (Ques.) 3239 (ii).

——— Amounts paid to (M. for ret.*) 3435 (ii).

——— Supplies, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7468 (iv).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13272 (vii).

Falconer, Kenneth, Arrangement *re* Balance of Pay (Ques.) 10516 (vi).

Fire Extinguishers, &c., on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) 7666 (iv).

——— Cor. on File, Custody of Documents (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7761 (iv).

Fraser, Mr. A. W., Payments to, for Legal Services (Ques.) 2979 (ii).

Fruit (apples) Inspection, Complaints *re* (remarks) 2754 (ii).

Gatineau Point Bridge, Sums contributed by Govt. (Ques.) 355 (i).

Geological Museum, Progress *re* Construction (remarks) on Conc., 13568 (vii).

Govt. Employees and Provincial Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10989 (vi).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6256 (iv).

G.T.P., Accidents to Employees (remarks) 7447 (iv).

——— Accidents on Construction, Reports *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6655 (iv).

——— Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 8748 (v).

Halifax Customs House, Name of Contractor, &c. (Ques.) 7211 (iv).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) on M. for 3°, 4544 (iii).

Hogs slaughtered, Compensation, paid, &c. (remarks) 13085 (vii).

House of Commons Accountants, &c., Increase *re* Salaries under C. S. Bill (remarks) 13528 (vii).

Immigrants, Number entering Canada, Bonuses paid, &c. (Ques.) 5256 (iii).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6475 (iv).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*

I.C.R. Extension to Great Lakes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2454 (ii).

Inverness Harbour, Purchase of McIsaac's Pond (Ques.) 5792 (iii).

Inverness Public Building, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 5997 (iii).

'King Edward,' Dredge, Emplymt. in Lunenburg Harbour (Ques.) 13063 (vii).

Lacas, Mr., Payments to by Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1037 (i).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11247 (vi).

Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Book-keeping, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4008 (ii).

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) 7389 (iv).

——— Leave of Absence for Mr. Watson (remarks) 10918 (vi).

——— Rep. of Judge Cassels (remarks) 10915 (vi).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6892, 7228; (M.) to ref. to Com., 7226 (iv).

Midland Dredging Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5718 (iii).

Milford Haven Wharf, N.S., Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 13060 (vii).

National Battlefields (lands) Amt. B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 13503 (vii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 5003; on Amt. (Mr. Bristol) in Com., 5059 (iii).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4697 (iii); in Com., 10849 (vi).

Opium Prohibition B. 205 (Mr. Lemieux) on Senate Amts., 13523 (vii).

Order, Ques. of, Discussions *re*, in Com. of Sup., 4106 (ii).

'Petrel,' Str., Supplies purchased, &c. (M for ret.) 7937 (iv).

Petroleum Bounty B. 192 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 12644 (vii).

Port Credit Harbour, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 10513 (vi).

Port Dufferin Dredging, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 4828 (iii).

Postal Rates on Letters at Confederation, &c. (Ques.) 8175 (iv).

Postmasters, Rural, Salary Increases, &c. (Ques.) 183 (i).

Provincial Subsidies, Amounts paid under present agreement and previously (Ques.) 315 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation (prop. res.) 3070; Neg. (Y. 49; N. 103) 3145 (ii).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Public Works, Estimated Cost, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7150 (iv).
——— Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4952 (iii).
Quebec Tercentenary, Attendance of Rural Corps, Letter (read) 8694 (v).
Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4981 (iii).
Registrar of Grey County, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Telford) 11303 (vi).
Rolla L. Crain Co., Payments to by Govt. (Ques.) 3239 (ii).
——— (M. for ret.*) 3435 (ii).
Ross, Mr. D., Resignation as Member (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11106 (vi).
St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.'s (B. 98) 1° m., 3315 (ii); in Com., 4580 (iii).
St. Francis River, Melbourne Pier, Rock Removal, &c. (Ques.) 6918 (iv).
——— Piers at Richmond, Total Expenditure (Ques.) 6641, 6918 (iv).
St. Mary's Post Office, Construction (remarks in Com. of Sup., 12735 (vii).
——— Item *re* Expenditure of $658.03 (Ques.) 11937 (vi).
——— Total Cost (Ques.) 11019 (vi).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Political Interference of Warden (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5547 (iii).
Seed Oats purchased in P.E.I., Incomplete Answer (remarks) 12551, 12661 (vii).
Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5445 (ii).
S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3785, 3818 (ii); in Com., 12611 (vii).
Speakers Expenses in House of Commons, Comparison, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1016 (i).
Supplies for Govt., Apptmt. of Purchasing Commission, on Amt. (Mr. Fielding) to prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5826; (amt.) to Amt., 5847, Neg. (Y., 46; N., 90) 5877 (iii).
Superannuation and Retirement Act, Payments under (Ques.) 7989 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture (seed branch) 5504 (iii).
Canals—Carillon (dams) 12768 (vii); (statistical branch) 10323 (vi); Lachine (repairs) 5673; (slope walls) 5668; Welland (Port Maitland piers) 5674 (iii).
Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries, &c.) 624, 634; Public Works (salaries) 640 (i).
Excise (provisional allowances) 819; (travelling expenses) 816 (i).
Geological Survey (oil borings) 13166 (vii).
Indians—Ont. and Que. (land sales) 12739 (vii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5041, 5774 (iii); (Lime Kiln crossing) 13323 (vii).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (subsidies) 12263 (vii).
Marine (hospitals) 5783 (iii); (ice-breakers) 1901 (i); (Hudson Bay patrol) 3997 (ii); (Lake St. Peter piers) 4753; (patrol boats) 4749; (Sorel property) 4752 (iii).
Militia (annual drill) 5746 (iii).
Miscellaneous (Prince Fushimi's visit) 5784 (iii); (seed grain) 2780 (ii).
N.W.M. Police (pensions) 8871 (v).
Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5522; (maintenance) 5510 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Cranbrook) 10864; (Cumberland) 10865; (Vernon) 10870 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10887; (rents, &c.) 10981 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon drill hall) 10954; (Winnipeg military) 10973 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 7112, 7118; (Bridgewater) 7137; (Glace Bay) 7139; (Halifax) 7140; (Halifax customs) 7144; (Halifax Military) 7143 (iv); (Lunenburg) 13326 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—N.W. (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10977 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Brantford) 7457; (Dom., renewals) 7468; (Glencoe) 7486 (iv); (Kingston) 10909 (vi); (Leamington) 7816 (iv); (Markham) 13331 (vii); (North Bay) 7813; (Owen Sound) 7817; (Renfrew) 7825; (St. Mary's) 7827; (Simcoe) 7830 (iv); (Walkerville) 13334 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (archives fittings) 5700 (iii); (rents, &c.) 10985; (repairs, &c.) 10981 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Chicoutimi) 7280; (Cookshire) 7281; (Grosse Isle) 7289 (iv); (Knowlton) 13329 (vii); (Magog) 7306; (Montreal examining warehouse) 7425 (iv); (Montreal pneumatic postal) 5704 (iii); (Montreal Post Office) 7411; (Montreal station C) 7422; (Nicolet) 7429; (Quebec citadel) 7430; (Que. arsenal) 7435; (Quebec drill hall) 7431; (St. John's) 7444 (iv); (Sherbrooke) 13330 (vii); (Sherbrooke drill hall) 7439 (iv); (Three Rivers) 13330 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (commissioner's house) 10884 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Baddeck) 11220; (Digby) 11226 (vi); (dredging) 13341 (vii); (Parker's cove) 11258; (Parrsboro) 11259; (Port Hastings) 11267; (Port Hood) 11269; (Portuguese cove) 11279; (Round Hill) 11285; (Tancook island) 11231 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Belle River) 12090; (Blanche River) 12091; (Brighton) 12133; (Port Credit) 12101; (Tobermory) 13351 (vii).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11079; (Deep Waterways Commission) 11106 (vi).
Public Works—Telegraph Lines (Marconi) 12143; (Yukon) 13179 (vii).
Railways—I.C.R. (advertising) 10191 (v); (rolling stock) 5553 (iii), 12257 (vii).
Trade and Commerce (Chinese Act) 12264 (vii).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Tenders, Advertisements *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7475 (iv).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10699 (vi).
See 'Cigarette.'

Travelling Expenses of Min. to Col. Conference, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3997 (ii).

U. S. Warships on Great Lakes, Inquiry *re* Armaments, &c. (Ques.) 7502 (iv).

Vancouver Bank incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 4582 (iii).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6124 (iii).

Wharfs, Piers, Amount of Revenue collected, &c. (Ques.) 2391 (ii).

——— Expenditure *re* (M. for ret.*) 5800, 5802 (iii).

——— (M. for ret.) 5476 (iii).

——— Total Expenditure since 1895 (Ques.) 5078 (iii).

Wheat, Frozen, Shipping from Man. and N.W. (remarks) on M. to adjn., 825 (i).

Woollen Industry, Legislation *re* Relief (remarks) 12772 (vii).

BOLE, Mr. D. W., *Winnipeg.*

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of, Inquiry *re* (prop. res.) 3853 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 7939 (iv).

Drug Contracts with Govt., Ques. of Priv., 5562 (iii).

Manitoba Voters' Lists, Affidavits *re* Frauds (read) on Debate on Dom. Elections B. 115, 7942 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 3993 (ii).

Winnipeg Bank incorp. (B. 19) 1°*, 430 (i); in Com., 2787 (ii).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir F. W., K.C.M.G. (Minister of Militia and Defence), *Kings N.S.*

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4399, 4498 (iii).

British Pensioners, Notice of Deductions from Imp. Govt. (Ans.) 7502 (iv).

Canadian Patriotic Funds (B. 216) in Com., 13320 (vii).

Cavalry Brigade, Eastern Townships, Camp at Quebec (Ans.) 9273 (v).

Cold Storage Co., Connection with: *See* 'N.B.,' &c.

Dom. Arsenal, Cor. with Ross Rifle Co. *re* (Ans.) 7991 (iv).

Dominion Camp Equipment Co., Incorporation of (Ans.) 3238 (ii).

Drill Shed, Lindsay, Date of Construction (Ans.) 1111 (i).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir F. W.—*Con.*

Eastman Rifle Match, Investigation *re* Accident (Ans.) 1125 (i).

Esquimalt and Halifax Garrison, Equipment, &c. (Ans.) 1293 (i).

——— Transfer to Canada (Ans.) 1288, 1293 (i).

Fortifications, Construction of, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 6646 (iv).

Garrison Artillery, B.C., 5th Regiment, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 5792 (iii).

Garrison Commons, Date of Sale, &c (Ans.) 354 (i).
See 'Ordnance,' &c.

Goderich Military Camp, Target Practices, &c. (Ans.) 9713 (v).

Govt. Business (remarks) 12504 (vii).

Halifax Garrison, Coal Supply, &c. (Ans.) 10015 (v).

——— Replacement of, by Imp. Troops (Ans.) 1288 (i).

Home Guards, N.W.T., Issue of Scrip to (Ans.) 2161 (ii).

Insurance Commission's Rept., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Foster) 9337, 9461 (v).

Kentville Rifle Range, ref. to in Budget debate, 5290 (iii).

Lancaster Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R.M.C., on M. for Sup., 1022 (i).

Lee-Enfield Rifle, Accident at Rockliffe (Ans.) 10014 (v).

——— Number purchased, Dates, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 6645 (iv).

Military Camp in Eastern Townships, proposed Arrangements, &c. (Ans.) 3842 (ii).

Militia Allowances, Arrears of (Ans.) 9274 (v).

Militia—Board of Officers, Pay and Allowance, &c. (Ans.) 2165 (ii).

Militia Camps, Holding of (remarks) 9779 (v).

——— (stmnt.) 9835 (v).

Militia Dept., Attack *re* Boots furnished, Ques. of Priv., 10739 (vi).

——— and Civil Service Commissioner's Report, Statement in Com. of Sup., 12505 (vii).

——— at Quebec, Working Hours for Masons (Ans.) 10791 (vi).

——— Report (presented) 4494 (iii).

——— Threats *re*, &c. (remarks) 13584 (vii).

Militia, Apptmts. as Generals, Number and Qualifications (Ans.) 5086 (iii).

Militia Food Supplies, on Inquiry for Ret., 3042 (ii).

Militia, Memorandum of General Lake (M.) *re* placing on Table, 12770 (vii).

Militia Pay, Arrears, Reasons for, &c. (Ans.) 8443 (v).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir F. W.—*Con.*

Militia Permanent Corps, Apptmt. of Commission *re* Pay (Ans.) 1293 (i).

Militia Promotions, Names and Records, &c. (remarks) 352 (i).

Militia Stores, Inspection of (Ans.) 8181 (iv).

——Rural Battalions, Care of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5738 (iii).

Militia Supplies at Halifax, Tenders, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 6406 (iv).

Minnedosa Armoury (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10890 (vi).

N.B. Cold Storage Co., and Ministerial Connection *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9306 (v).
See 'St. John.'

Niagara Camp, Transportation of Troops, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 2163 (ii).

Niagara Lands, Sale for Military Purposes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13540 (vii).

Ordnance Lands—Toronto—Sale (B. 218) in Com. on Res., 13417 (vii).

Petawawa Camp, Training of Troops, &c. (Ans.) 5792 (iii).

Plains of Abraham, Lease to Ross Rifle Co. (Ans.) 1348 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on Prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3072 (ii).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4894 (iii).

Quebec Tercentenary, Attendance of Rural Corps (remarks) 8695 (v).

—— City Corps, &c. (remarks) 8386 (v).

—— Food supplied (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13176 (vii).

—— Mobilization of Militia, Abandonment of (remarks) 8855 (v).

—— Protests from Regiments *re* Attendance (Ans.) 7992 (iv).

—— Representation of Veterans (remarks) 7998 (iv).

—— Transportation of Troops (remarks) 8384 (v).

Rankin, Col., Resignation of (remarks) 11406 (vi).

Returns, on Inquiry for, 2025 (ii).

Rifles purchased from other Companies than Ross Co. (Ans.) 1123 (i).

Rifle Range at Charlottetown, Purchase Price (Ans.) 6233 (iv).

R.M.C., Investigation into conduct of Cadet Lancaster, on M. for Sup., 1022 (i).

Ross Rifle, Accident at Rockliffe Range, Report *re* (Ans.) 11495 (vi).

—— Bayonets, Adoption of by Govt. (Ans.) 5786 (iii).

—— Bayonets, Date of Contract, O.C., &c. (Ans.) 6235 (iv), 8176, 8442 (v).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir F. W.—*Con.*

Ross Rifle, Consignment to N.W.M. Police, Where manufactured (Ans.) 5259 (iii).

—— Contract *re* Bayonets (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13543 (vii).

—— memorandum *re* agreement (read) 13553 (vii).

—— Contract Price, Inspection, &c. (Ans.) 8174 (iv).

—— Cor. with Imp. Govt., Rep. in British War Office, Disappearance from Library of House, Ques. of Priv., 4961 (iii).

—— Disposition of Manufactured Rifles (Ans.) 3237 (ii).

—— Extension of Cove Fields Lands, &c. (Ans.) 4405 (iii).

—— Extravagance of Militia Dept., on Amt. (Mr. Worthington) to Com. of Sup., 8953 (v).

—— Interchangeable parts with Lee-Enfield Rifles, Cor. with Imp. Govt. (Ans.) 3899 (ii).

—— Negotiations with Vickers Maxim Co., &c. (Ans.) 178 (i).

—— Number delivered as per Contract, Cost per Rifle (Ans.) 8180 (iv).

—— Number ordered, Payments, Total Number delivered, &c. (Ans.) 168 (i).

—— Number reported Unfit for Use (Ans.) 3841 (ii).

—— Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' *re* Accident at Rockliffe Range (Ans.) 10515 (vi).

—— Payments to since Jan. 1, 1908 (Ans.) 7210 (iv).

—— Provisions for Bayonets, &c. (Ans.) 3483 (ii).

—— Sealed Pattern, Discovery of (Ans.) 3237 (ii).

—— Services of Govt. Officials, Names, Rank, &c. (Ans.) 365 (i).

—— Tests in England, Reps., &c., Ques. of Priv., 8167 (iv).

—— Tests, Rep. of Col. Gaudet (Ans.) 9714 (v).

—— Total Number in Use in Canada (Ans.) 5786 (iii).
See 'Dom. Arsenal.'

Royal Canadian Dragoons, St. Johns, Tenders *re* Supplies (Ans.) 5788 (iii).

St. Helen's Island, Sale, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B 218, 13418 (vii)

St. John Fusiliers, 62nd, Annual Drill, Delay in Payments to (Ans.) 847 (i).

St. John Cold Storage, Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 3580 (ii).
See 'N.B.'

Sherbrooke Militia Corps, Establishment of (Ans.) 9273 (v).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir F. W.—*Con.*

S. A. War, Land Scrip for Volunteers, &c. (Ans.) 1111 (i).

——— Medals for 3rd Contingent (Ans.) 1110 (i).

——— Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3769, 3819 (ii).

Sub-target Machines ordered, Dates, Payments, &c. (Ans.) 171 (i).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Militia (salaries) 8871 (v).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4136 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 5732 (iii), 10286 (v), 13540; (customs dues) 12156; (Dom. arsenal) 12154; (gratuities) 13177; (pay and allowances) 12147; (properties) 12148; (provisions, &c.) 12150; (Quebec reviews) 13176; (rifle and artillery grants) 12152; (Ross rifle contract) 13543; (R. M. College) 12152, 13177; (salaries and wages) 12147; (Stoney Creek monument) 13177; (warlike stores) 12148 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10886; Man. (Winnipeg hospital) 10955; (Winnipeg, military) 10970; (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10975 (vi); (Guelph armoury) 7678; (Hamilton drill hall) 7693; (Kingston) 7814; (Kingston, artillery park) 7701; (Kingston, gun shed) 7700 (iv); (Kingston, militia stores) 10908 (vi); (Kingston, R.M.C.) 7703; (London, military) 7706 (iv); (Quebec cliffs) 12148 (vii).

Sutherland Rifle Sights, Contract *re* (Ans.) 5207, 5258 (iii).

——— Number ordered, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 569 (i).

Thirteenth Hussars, Service Medal *re* Fenian Raids (remarks) 13533 (vii).

Toronto Barracks, Approval of Plans, &c. (Ans.) 7204 (iv).

Valleyfield Armoury (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7687 (iv).

Vickers Maxim Co., Purchases from, by Govt. (Ans.) 356 (i).

Western Rifle Association, Pet. *re* Govt. Grant (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5743 (iii).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L., *Carleton, Ont.*

Address, The, 23 (i).

——— on M. to consider (remarks) *re* Questions, 8 (i).

Admiralty Court Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. Aylesworth, in Com. on Res., 4846 (iii).

Advertisements for Tenders of Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4717 (iii).

Algoma Steel Co., Orders from Govt. for Steel, &c. (remarks) 8606 (v).

All-Red Line, Omission of (remarks) on the Address, 23 (i).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12432, (amt.) 12439; neg. (Y. 48; N. 108) 12499 (vii).

Anglo-American Treaty with G.B., Information *re* (remarks) 6985 (iv).

——— Cor. *re* (remarks) 9715 (v).

——— Further Information (remarks) 7447 (iv).

——— Information *re* Presenting, 8516 (v).

——— Tel. *re* (remarks) 6926 (iv).

Appeal Court of B.C., B. 165 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 8466 (v); in Com., 10863 (vi).

Architectural Institute of Canada on M. (Mr. Ethier) to refund Fees, 11234 (vi).

Asiatic Labour in B.C.: Ques. of Privilege, 6526 (iv).

Audit and Inspection of Banks, Legislation *re* (remarks) 12658 (vii).

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10934 (vi).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4389; in Com., 4400 (iii).

See 'Que. Tercentenary,' &c.

Behring Sea Commission, Expenses of Sir Charles Tupper (remarks) 2883 (ii).

——— Correction *re*, 4669 (iii).

Bell, Dr., Additional Remuneration *re* Acting Director of Geological Survey (remarks) on Conc., 13571 (vii).

Blunden, Frederick, Trial and Conviction, on M. (Mr. Ward) for Cor., 3470 (ii).

Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5949 (iii).

Boundary Delimitations (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9743 (v).

Bounties paid by Govt. for 1908-9 (Ques.) 13226 (vii).

Bridge Subsidies to Rys., on Amt. (Mr. Leonard) in Com., 13313 (vii).

B.C. Fisheries Commission, Report *re* (remarks) 5728 (iii).

Buildings, Cost of Construction (remarks) 12661 (vii).

Business of the House, Precedence *re* Questions (remarks) 431 (i).

——— on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to take in Wednesdays, 5135 (iii).

See 'Govt. Business.'

Cabinet Changes (remarks) on the Address, 24 (i).

Campaign Funds, Charges by Min. of Pub. Works (remarks) on the Address, 26 (i).

Campaign Literature franked by Depts. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10353 (vi).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. of Res., 6201 (iii); in Com., 6414 (iv).

Canada Shipping Act Amt B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12855 (vii).

——— B. 209 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 13058 (vii).

Canada and U.S. Treaty Negotiations, Completion of, &c. (remarks) 937 (i).

——— Boundaries Treaty (remarks) 7834 (iv).

See 'Fisheries,' &c.

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. 187, on M. (Mr. Fielding) to place on Order Paper, 13494; on M. for 2°, 13506 (vii).

Canadian Press Association Subsidy B. 202 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 12847 (vii).

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6871 (iv).

Cassels, Mr. Justice, Acceptance *re* Investigation of Marine Dept (remarks) 6059 (iii).

See 'Marine,' &c.

Cattle Embargo in G. B., Cable *re* Removal by G. B. (remarks) 13228 (vii).

'Champlain,' Str., Use of by Political Agents (remarks) 9126, 9280, 9342, 9460 (v).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10546, 10747, 11021 (vi).

Chinese Immigration into B.C., O.Cs., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 554 (i).

See 'Asiatic,' 'Japanese,' &c.

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 10719, 10724; on M. for 2°, 11338; in Com. on Res., 11355; in Com., 11364, 11561, 11640 (vi), 12164; on Senate Amts., 13520 (vii).

Civil Service Bill, Correction in Hansard *re* Increases, 11494 (vi).

——— Inquiry for, 8516 (v).

——— Resolutions *re* (remarks) 11016 (vi).

Civil Service Commission Rep., Inquiry for, 317 (ii), 4963, 5408, 5567 (iii).

——— (remarks) on Presentation, 5623 (iii).

——— Policy of the Govt. *re*, on M. to Adjn. House, 5882 (iii).

——— Delay in Printing, &c., Investigations *re*, on M. to Adjn., 6143 (iii).

Civil Service Commission Report, Investigation, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Powers (Amt.) on M. for Sup., 7506; Neg. (Y. 48; N. 99) 7618 (iv).

See 'Marine and Fisheries,' &c.

Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com of Sup., 9193 (v).

Colchester Election (remarks) on the Address, 39 (i).

Cold Storage Co.: *See* 'N.B.,' &c.

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Colonial Conference, Travelling Expenses of Ministers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1046 (i).

Colonial Securities and Investment of Trust Funds, Cor, &c. *re* Govtl. Action (Ques.) 174 (i).

Committees, Sel. Standing (remarks) on M (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6 (i).

——— Organization &c. (remarks) 507, 569 (i).

——— Sitting concurrently with House, on M. (Mr. Finlayson) 9579 (v).

Companies Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5493 (iii).

Cornwall Canal, Electric Lighting, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12203 (vii).

——— Information *re* Break, 11121, 11406 (vi).

Criminal Code Amendts., on Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 9282 (v).

Criminal Code (Ry. mortgages) Amt. B. 212 (Mr. Aylesworth) on Senate Amts., 13317 (vii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 11314 (vi).

Customs Defalcations at Huntingdon, B.C., Rep. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9442 (v).

——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Kennedy) 9460 (v).

Customs Duties on Militia Uniforms (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9567 (v).

Customs Estimates, Obstruction in Supply (remarks) 10134 (v).

See 'Supply.'

Customs Inspectors, Suggestion of Civil Service Report (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9553 (v).

Customs Statistics, Duplicating with Trade and Commerce (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 9549 (v).

Cyr, Mr., Letter from, Ques. of Order *re* Reading, &c., 8462 (v).

Debates of the House, Time occupied by Members (remarks) 13539 (vii).

Debates, Official Reps., Conc. in without Notice (remarks) 8896 (v).

Debt of Canada, Portions falling due, &c. (Ques.) 315 (i).

——— Portions maturing in 1908 (Ques.) 315 (i).

Detroit Tunnel, Customs Collection *re* Construction Materials, (M. for O. Cs., &c.*) 5477 (iii).

Dokis Indian Reserve, Surrender of Title, Negotiations *re* (Ques.) 3849 (ii).

——— Name of Govt. Agent (Ques.) 5084 (iii).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Dokis Indian Reserve, Surrender of Timber, O.Cs. Reps., &c. (M. for copies*) 5087 (iii).

Documents in Depts., Access to Original Papers, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1140 (i), 1617, (amt.); Production of, 1622; agreed to, 1667 (i).

Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on M. for Sup., 1801 (i).

——— (remarks) on M. to adjn. deb. 1844 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 7859 (iv), 8423 (v); in Com., 11798, 11828; (amt.) 11922 (vi), 12956; on M. for 3°, 13232 (vii), on M. for 3° (amt.) 13251; on Senate Amts., 13579 (vii).

Dom. Elections Bill and Obstruction Tactics (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9225 (v).

Dom. Lands Survey B. 9 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 231; in Com., 754, 949 (i); Sen. Amts., 3755 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11127, 11153 (vi); in Com., 11158, 11165, 11408, 11510, 11948; Amt. (Mr. Lake) to M. for 3°, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) 11977 (vi); on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) to Amt. (Mr. Lake) to M. for 3°, 12395 (vii).

See 'Lands,' &c.

Doukhobors, Homestead Lands, Sale of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9957 (v).

Doukhobors at Yorkton, Tel. from Sec. Board of Trade (read) 7620 (iv).

——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7628 (iv).

Dredging Contracts, O. C., on Inquiry for, 6854 (iv).

——— O.C., *re* Rule *re* Producing (remarks) 6927 (iv).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (remarks) 9773, 10259 (v).

Drill Halls Ret., Inquiry for, 5659 (iii).

Drury, R. L., Apptmt. as Japanese Agent (remarks) 4769 (iii).

——— O.C. *re* Apptmt. Inquiry for, 4963 (iii).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4687 (iii); in Com., 10763 (vi).

Dunsmuir, Hon. Mr., Lt. Gov. of B.C., Cor. with Govt. *re* Legislation (remarks) 1861 (i).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13261; in Com. on Res., 13279; in Com., 13419 (vii).

Employees of Parliament, Religion, &c., on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Ret., 5485 (iii).

Esquimalt Naval Station, Maintenance of by Govt. (Ques.) 1117 (i).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Esquimault Naval Station, Cor., &c., *re* Maintenance (M. for copies) 1128 (i).

Estimates, Suppl., Inquiry *re* Further, 12503 (vii).

Estimates, Preparation of, Insufficient Votes, &c. (remarks) in Conc., 5920 (iii).

Exchequer Court Act Amt.B. 116 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 8503 (v).

Financial Review, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 13459 (vii).

Financial Stringency, &c. (remarks) on the Address, 35 (i).

See 'Wheat,' &c.

Fisheries Act (trials) Amt. B. 31 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 5249 (iii).

Fisheries Boundaries Treaty between U.S. and Can., Information *re* (remarks) 2023 (ii), 6844 (iv).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1712 (i).

Fishing Bounties paid to Cape Breton Fishermen, &c., (M. for ret.*) 1130 (i).

Fishing Licenses: *See* 'Whale,' &c.

Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 1393 (i), 3514 (ii); in Com., 3582, 3642 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty Bill (remarks) *re* Discussion, 3754 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Treaty, Delay *re* Canadian Tariff &c. (remarks) 13534 (vii).

——— Discussion *re* (remarks) 1206 (i).

——— on Preparation of Statement *re* Duty Units (remarks) 943 (i).

——— (remarks) on the Address, 28 (i).

French SS. Subsidy: *See* 'Can. and France,' &c.

French Translation of Govt. Documents &c (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3181 (ii).

Fruit Marks Inspection and Sale B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 10556 (vi).

Gelinas, Mr., Repayments of Travelling Expenses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 668 (i).

Gold and Silver Marking Act Amt. B. 123 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5496 (iii).

——— B. 197 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12555 (vii).

Govt. Business, Introduction of Govt. Bills (remarks) 10258 (v), 11826 (vi).

Govt. Business (remarks) 10403, 10511 (vi), 12163 (vii).

——— Ry. Subsidies (remarks) 12504 (vii).

——— Suppl. Estimates, &c. (remarks) 11016 (vi).

Govt. Legislation &c. (remarks) 7721 (iv), 10303, 11123 (vi).

Govt. Officials and Interference in Elections (remarks) in Com. on B. 115, 11903 (vi).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Govt. Officials and Municipal Elections in N.B., on M. (Mr. Sproule) to Com. of Sup., 2894 (ii).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, on prop Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6280 (iv).

Grain Bill: *See* 'Man. Grain,' &c.

G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2226 (ii); in Com., 12070 (vii).

G.T. Ry. Co.: *See* 'Major's Hill Park.'

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr Crawford) in Com., 9463 (v).

G.T.P. Ry., Cost of Construction (Statement) in Com. of Sup., 12238 (vii).

——— on M. (Mr. Graham) to lay on Table, 12049 (vii).

——— Reply to Min. of Rys., 12682 (vii).

——— Cost inclusive of Terminals, &c., (Ques.) 9265 (v).

——— (remarks) on the Address, 37 (i).

——— Total Cost, &c. (remarks) 5728 (iii).

——— Information *re* (remarks) 10393, 10916, 11407, 11939 (vi).

G.T.P., Eastern Division, Estimated Length, &c. (Ques.) 5563 (iii).

G.T.P., Engineering Staff, Resignation of Mr. Hodgins (Ques.) 366, 516 (i).

——— (M. for cor.*) 558 (i).

——— Charges *re* Classifications, &c. (remarks) 6844, 6925 (iv).

——— on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. to Com., 7213 (iv).

G.T.P., La Tuque Branch, Flooding by Water (remarks) 8607 (v).

——— Mountain Division, Incomplete Ret (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12223 (vii).

——— Ret., Inquiry for, 6288 (iv).

——— Supplies via American Routes (remarks) 9027 (v).

See 'Indian,' &c.

Gunn, Mr. B. B., Decease of (remarks) 431

Halifax Garrison, Disbandment of &c. (remarks) 1208 (i).

——— Discontent *re* Pay, Par. in Press, 5659 (iii).

See 'Esquimalt.'

Halifax Immigration Frauds, Dismissal of Mr. J. Bernstein (remarks) 8695 (v).

——— Charges *re* (remarks) 9334 (v).

See 'Immigration,' &c.

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3710 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. Lennox) to ref. back to Ry. Com., 3229 (ii).

Hindus in B.C., Protests *re* Treatment (remarks) 5490 (iii).

See "Chinese," &c.

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Hindus in B.C., Deportation from B.C., &c. (remarks) 5338 (iii).

House of Commons Act (members) Amt. (B. 66) 1° m., 1346 (i); 2° m., 5226 (iii).

House of Commons, Allotment of Rooms in New Wing (remarks) 5728 (iii).

——— Rules and Hours for Adjournment, on prop. Res. (Mr. Wright) 590 (i).

See 'Rules.'

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6395 (iv).

Immigrants, Fraudulent Circular issued &c. (remarks) 606 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 769 (i).

——— B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 5657 (iii); in Com., 6431 (iv).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 7066 (iv).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolishing of to Agents, on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1328 (i).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 1298 (i).

Immigration Irregularities at Halifax, Investigation *re* (remarks) 5567 (iii), 6465 (iv).

——— Rep. of Mr. Robertson (remarks) 9127 (v).

——— Restitution *re* (remarks) 5659 (iii).

——— Statement *re* (remarks) 4963 (iii).

See 'Halifax,' &c.

Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale of, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13129 (vii).

Indian Reserves, Land Grant to G.T.P. Ry. Co. in B.C., O.Cs. Reps., &c. (M. for copies*) 4773 (iii).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6471 (iv).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 833; on M. to ref. to Banking and Commerce Com., 1743 (i).

I.C.R., Cars sent to U.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10222 (v).

——— Civic Elections at Halifax, Interference of Employees (remarks) 6845 (iv).

——— Employes in Prov. of Quebec, Interference in Provincial Elections (remarks) 9777 (v).

——— Employees and Municipal Elections (remarks) 2885 (ii).

——— Employees Provident Fund Amt. B. 117 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4995 (iii).

——— Truro Sewerage Frontage, (M. for cor.*) 5800 (iii).

See 'Govt. Rys., &c.

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Irrigation Act, Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 955 (i); on M. to withdraw, 2974 (ii).
——— B. 99 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4671 (iii).
Japanese in B.C., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Lemieux) 12659 (vii).
Japanese Immigration (remarks) on the Address, 32 (i).
——— Announcement of Mr. Lemieux's Mission (remarks) 1208 (i).
——— Cor. *re* Limitation, &c., Inquiry for, 94 (i).
——— Debate in Japanese Diet, Rep. *re* (remarks) 4737 (iii).
——— Information *re* (remarks) 947 (i).
——— Parliamentary Control of, 2025, (amt.) 2043 (ii). Neg. (Y. 45; N. 100) 2158 (ii).
——— Statement by Postmaster General (remarks) 1424 (i).
——— on Stmt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1602, 1614 (i).
Japanese and Oriental Immigration, O.Cs. Cor. Papers, &c. (M. for copies) 854 (i).
Japanese Treaty, Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 1928 (i.)
Joly, Sir Henry, Lt. Gov. of B.C., Cor. &c. sent to by Govt. (M. for copies*) 554 (i).
Judges in Man. and Ont., Salaries B. 206 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 12551; in Com., 13050 (vii).
Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12399 (vii).
Keewatin Timber and Pulp Woods, Disposal of, &c. (remarks) 13587 (vii).
Kun, Agnes Ballum, Exercise of Clemency by Justice Dept. and Res. of Town Council of Sydney (read) 9334 (v).
——— Release of (remarks) 9580 (v).
Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R.M.C., on M. for Sup., 1026 (i).
Lands Titles Act Assurance Fund B. 168 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 10526 (vi).
See 'Dom. Lands,' &c.
Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 10952 (vi).
Life Saving Stations, Establishment of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3186 (ii).
Literature distributed through Mails, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9103 (v).
Loans to Govt., Temporary, &c., Outstanding, Rates of Interest, (Ques.) 235 (i).
——— since Oct., 1906, Rates of Interest, &c. (Ques.) 314 (i).
Lobster Fishing at Pictou, Inquiry for Ret., 12772 (vii).
Lovell, Mr. H., Decease of (remarks) 230 (i).
Major's Hill Park, and G.T.R. Hotel (remarks) 1425, 1585 (i).
See 'G.T.R.'

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Consent of Legislature, &c. (remarks) 936 (i).
——— Bill *re* Extension (remarks) 1741 (i), 2882 (ii), 11706 (vi).
Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), 12790 (vii).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12569 (vii).
Man. Voters Lists, Affidavits quoted by member (remarks) 7949 (vii).
Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Ass't. Judge in Exchequer Court (remarks) 11311 (vi).
——— Apptmt. of Counsel (remarks) 6845 (iv).
——— Apptmt. of Counsel for Civil Service Commissioners, on M. for Sup., 7322 (iv).
——— Delays, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn. Hse., 8458 (v).
——— Delays, &c., on M. for Sup., 9725 (v).
——— Deputy Minister, Resignation, Acceptance of (remarks) 7621, 7938, 7995, 8088 (iv).
——— Evidence *re* (remarks) 8516 (v).
——— Evidence presented day by day to Hse. (remarks) 8293 (v).
——— Investigation by Minister (remarks) 6526 (iv).
——— Method of Procedure (remarks) 10742 (vi).
——— Officials, Suspension *re* C. S. Report (remarks) 6004 (iii), 6846 (iv).
——— Postponement of by Judge Cassels (remarks) 8385 (v).
——— Proceedings, Public, &c. (remarks) 7321 (iv).
Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3029 (ii); in Com., 3034 (ii).
Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) on M. (Mr. Blain) to ref. back to Com., 7227; in Com., 7242 (iv).
Metlakatla and Songhees Indian Reserves, Legal Opinion of Justice Dept. (M. for copies*) 5477 (iii).
——— Inquiry for, 2381 (ii).
Militia Camps, Holding of, &c. (remarks) 9779, 9835 (v).
'Montcalm' Str., Collision, Investigation *re* (remarks) 8172 (iv).
Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9478 (v).
See 'Govt. Business,' &c.
Motions, Unopposed, and Business of the House (remarks) 8896 (v).
National Battlefields (lands) B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 13498 (vii).
See 'Que.,' &c.
N.T. Ry.: *See* 'G.T.P.'

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

N.B. Cold Storage Co. and Ministerial Connections *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9420 (v).

N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference of Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3054 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 3670 (ii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co's. B. 82 (Mr. Adamson) on Senate Amts., 10511 (vi).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Amounts paid *re* Immigration (remarks) on M. for Sup., 770 (i).

Northwest Territories Act Amt. B. 210 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13052 (vii).

Occidental Fire Insurance Co's. B. 131 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 7725 (iv).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4697 (iii); in Com., 10856 (vi).

Opium Prohibition B. 205 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 12550; on Senate Amts., 13523 (vii).

Owen Sound Strike, Settlement of (remarks) 8606 (v).

Pacific Coast Fire Insurance Co's. B. 40 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6229 (iv).

Pakenham Mail Bags, Destruction of, &c. (remarks) 1425 (i).

Patent Medicines B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 12625 (vii).

Peace Union, Interparliamentary Union, Meeting at Ottawa (remarks) 13582 (vii).

Postal Arrangements between Canada and U.S., on Statement (Mr. Lemieux) to Com. of Sup., 3168 (ii).

Post Office Act (drop letter) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 7932 (iv).

P.E.I. Public Works Expenditure, on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Ret., 2172 (ii).

P.E.I. Ry., Harmony-Elmira Branch B. 202 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 12628 (vii).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Tunnel Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 4654 (iii).

Prisons and Reformatories Act (Halifax) Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10692 (vi).

Private Bills, Discrepancy in Fees between Senate and House of Commons (remarks) 10122 (v).

Provincial Subsidies, Increased Payments, &c.(Ques.) 173 (i).

Public Acounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3080 (ii).

——— Meetings and Adjournments (remarks) 1442 (i).

——— Sittings concurrently with House (remarks) 9504 (v).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Public Bills and Orders, Precedence of (remarks) 2941, 3405 (ii).

Public Buildings constructed since 1897, Amounts expended, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1130 (i).

Public Works Estimates, Discussions *re* (remarks) 5661, 5730 (iii).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4945 (iii).

Quebec Bridge, Cor., Plans, Specifications, O.Cs., &c. (M. for ret.*) 605 (i).

Quebec Bridge Disaster (remarks) on the Address, 30 (i).

——— Report, Distribution of Printed Copies (remarks) 5914 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Rep., 946, 1739 (i), 3043 (ii).

——— Printing of (remarks) 6924, 7099, 8171 (iv).

Quebec Bridge, Moneys contributed *re* Finances, Estimated Cost of Completion (Ques.) 5566 (iii).

——— Par. in Toronto Globe *re* Change of Site (remarks) 7931 (iv).

Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s B. 217 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13417; in Com., 13491 (vii).

Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co's. B. 128 (Mr. Michaud) in Com., 6226 (iv).

Quebec Tercentenary, Number of Troops, &., (remarks) 10259 (v).

Questions, Precedence of &c. (remarks) 350 (i).

Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bennett) on Par. in 'Globe,' 2383 (ii).

Railway Act (Commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4965 (iii).

——— (compensation) Amt. B. 27 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 5246 (iii).

——— (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3397 (ii).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 583 (i).

——— on ques. of Order, ref. to debate in Senate, 577 (i).

Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°, 4659 (iii); in Com., 8511 (v), 10636; on Amt. (Mr Monk) to M. for 3°, 11606; on M. for 3°,11614; (amt.) 11619; Amt. neg. (Y. 40, N. 74) 11631 (vi).

Ry. Mortgages: *See* 'Criminal Code,' &c.

Railway Subsidies B. 215 (Mr. Graham) in Com., Applications and Constructions, 13478 (vii).

——— Inquiry for, 12771 (vii).

——— Applications for, Memorandum *re* (remarks) in Com., 13304, 13315 (vii).

Returns delayed, &c. (remarks) 13082 (vii).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Returns delayed, on Inquiry for, 2384 (ii), 6847 (iv).

—— Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv. *re* Par. in Toronto Globe, 4660 (ii).

See 'Documents,' &c.

Ross Rifle Co., Defects, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Worthington) on M. for Sup., 9073 (v).

—— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. S. Hughes) 9331 (v).

—— Report from Public Accounts Com., Delay, &c. (remarks) 5728 (iii).

Rules of the House, Proposed Amendments to, on prop. Res. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 2985 (ii).

See 'House of Commons.'

St. Lawrence Power Co. and Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. Gervais) for Cor., &c., 3011 (ii).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Political Interference of Warden (remarks) 5548 (iii).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. MCraney) in Com., 8564, 9069, 9167 (v).

Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Agreement with Govt. *re* Sale of Homestead Lands, Letter (read) 9127 (v).

—— Information *re* (remaks) 9280 (v).

—— Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 10102 (vi).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1382 (i).

—— Extension of Time of Payment, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2912 (ii).

—— Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 10121 (v).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5417; (amt.) 5460 (iii).

S. A.Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3762 (ii), 12595; in Com., 13048; (amt.) 12612; on Senate Amts., 13524 (vii).

Stanstead By-election, Disappearance of Papers (remarks) 8087 (iv).

—— on M. for Sup., 8839 (v).

—— on M. for Com., 8888 (v).

Sub-target Machines, on M. to ref. papers to Pub. Accts. Com. (remarks) 946 (i).

Supplies for Govt., Apptmt. of Purchasing Commission, on prop Res. (Mr. Foster) 5820 (iii).

—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Johnston) 5831 (iii).

Supply B. 220 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 13579 (vii).

Supply—Conc., 5499 (iii).

—— Estimates, Basis of Appropriations (remarks) 5919 (iii).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Supply—Obstructions to Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9909 (v).

—— on M. (Mr. Fowler) to Com. of Sup., 10034 (v).

—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Ross) 10025

See 'Dom. Elections B. 115,' &c.

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 672; (census, &c.) 674 (i); (dairying) 10397 (vi); (Patent Record) 672 (i).

Canals—Generally (salaries) 10325; (staff and repairs) 10304 (vi).

Interior (astronomical survey) 9737 (v); (salaries, &c.) 616 (i); Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 978 (i).

Customs—Inspectors (travelling expenses) 9536 (v); Miscellaneous (cruisers) 9578 (v); Outside Service (salaries) 9226, 9441 (v).

Dom. Lands (forest reserves) 10062 (v); (salaries) 10040 (v).

Immigration (agents) 9878 (v); (deportations) 9882 (v); (literature, &c.) 9948 (v).

Militia (annual drill) 10286 (v); (rifle ranges) 12505 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (wrecks) 3147, 3185 (ii).

Penitentiaries (maintenance) 5510 (iii).

Post Office (inspectors) 9103 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg military)10973; (Winnipeg warehouse) 8568 (v); Miscellaneous (Deep Waterways Commission) 11112; Slides and Booms (surveys, &c.) 11071 (vi).

Railways—G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10378 (vi); (construction) 12238 (vii); (inspection) 10392 (vi).

Railways—I.C.R. (rolling stock) 5550 (iii); (Windsor Branch) 10145 (v).

Railways — Miscellaneous (extra clerks) 10342 (vi); (inspections, &c.) 10341 (vi); (legal expenses) 10363 (vi).

Supreme Court Act Amt. B. 121 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5497 (iii).

Technical Schools, Legislation *re* (remarks) 12660 (vii).

Telegraph and Telephones and Man. Boundaries, Legislation, Inquiry for, 3042 (ii).

Telephones and Telegraphs, Control by Ry. Commission (remarks) on the Address, 37 (i).

See 'Ry. Act Amt.'

Timber Berths, &c., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Turriff) Ques. of Order *re* reading Evidence before Pub. Accounts, 11308 (vi).

Timber Licenses, Inquiry for Ret., 1739 (i).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2527 (ii).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10701 (vi).

Trans-Canada Ry. Co.'s B. 107 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 5386 (iii).

Transcontinental Ry. Commissioners' Rep. and Ry. Commission Reps., Printing of, &c. (remarks) 7 (i).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Trust Funds: *See* 'Colonial Securities.'

Under-Secretaries of State (remarks) on the Address, 25 (i).

U.S. Warships passing through Canadian Canals (remarks) 5338 (iii).

Water Carriage of Goods B. 178,on M. for 2°, 12508 (vii).

Whale Fishing Licenses granted in B.C., on M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10284 (v).

Wharfs, Piers, &c., and other Public Works, Expenditure since Jan. 1st, 1897, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1130 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 4867 (iii).

Wheat Transportation from N.W. and Financial Aid, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2182 (ii).

Yukon Act (Govt.) Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10532 (vi).

Yukon Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9636 (v).

Yukon Moral Reform, Inquiry for Dr. Shearer's letter, 10303, 11122 (vi).

Yukon Placer Mining Act. Amt. B. 150 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8188 (v),10519 (vi).

BOYCE, Mr. A. C., *Algoma West.*

Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Subsidies, Reports, &c. (Ques.) 892 (i).

Alien Labour, Protection to Canadians, Pet. (read) in Com. of Sup., 12156 (vii).

Archives Dept., Index Cards, Quantity purchased, Names of Firms, &c. (Ques.) 6057 (iii).

Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjourn House, 5906 (iii).

——— (remarks) on Presentation, 5644 (iii).

Coal Lands in N.W.T., Lease granted, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5087 (iii).

Copper Cliff Post Office, Charges against Postmaster Kilpatrick (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 658 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. on Election Bill, 11913 (vi).

Deputy Ministers, Payments for Special Services, &c. (Ques.) 1736 (i).

Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1655 (i).

Dredging Contracts, Payments to Great Lakes Dredging Co., &c. (Ques.) 1736 (i).

——— Renewals without Tenders (remarks) 6634 (iv).

Dredging in Ontario Harbours, Tenders, Contracts, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1129 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 7949 (iv); 11739; in Com., 11818, 11905; (amt.) 11931 (vi); in Com., 12926; on M. for 3° (amt.) 13230; neg. (Y. 60; N. 99) 13249 (vii).

BOYCE, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Farm and Garden Produce at Sault Ste. Marie, Customs Duties, &c. (Ques.) 13060 (vii).

Fort William or Mission Reserve, Conditions of Sale to G.T.P. Ry. Co. (Ques.) 5256 (iii).

G.T.R. Hotel, Major's Hill Park, Sale, B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 12077 (vii).

G.T.P., Steel Rail Contracts, Importations, &c. (Ques) 12775 (vii).

——— Steel Rails, Purchases, Prices, Firms, &c. (Ques.) 10738, 10790 (vi).

——— Supply Transportation, Award of Contracts, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2171 (ii).

——— Ties purchased in U.S., &c. (remarks) 1443 (i).

——— Transportation of Supplies, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 1932 (i).

Heath Point Lighthouse, Contract *re* Rebuilding (Ques.) 7210 (iv).

Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale of, 13095; (amt.) 13122; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 101) 13138 (vii).

——— (remarks) *re* Telegram of Mr. Sifton, 13528 (vii).

——— Withdrawal from Sale, &c. (Ques.) 2396 (ii).

I.C.R. Officials, A. T. LeBlanc, &c., Accounts, Vouchers, &c. *re* Travelling Expenses, &c. (M. for copies*) 2982 (ii).

——— Steel Rails purchased from Algoma Steel Co., Contracts *re* (Ques.) 9269 (v).

Manitoulin & North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidies, Reps. *re* &c. (Ques.) 893 (i).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 11992 (vi).

Niagara Falls, Rep. of Dr. Spencer, Cost of, &c. (Ques.) 6054 (iii).

Ontario, North, Division of Prov. (remarks) 8294 (v).

Port Arthur Dredging, Contracts, Securities, &c. (Ques) 697 (i).

Prefontaine, Hon. R., Date of Sailing for England, Acting Minister of Marine, &c. (Ques.) 7732 (iv).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigations, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3125 (ii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 3085 (ii).

Public Buildings and Works, Initiated since 1896, (M. for ret.*) 2170 (ii).

Ques. of Priv., Stmnt. of hon. member for Thunder Bay *re* Misleading House, 7995 (iv).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 3°, 11610 (vi).

Ry. Act Amt., (remarks) 12194 (vii).

BOYCE, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Returns, Inquiry for, 2381 (ii).

St. Mary's River, Kaministiquia, Port Arthur, &c., Dredging Contracts, Expenditure *re*, &c. (M. for ret.*) 853 (i).

'Sault Express,' Amounts paid for Advertising, &c. (Ques.) 696 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 853, 1129 (i).

Sault St. Marie Port, Farm Produce entered, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 898 (i).

Sault Ste. Marie Steel Works, Closing of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 13470 (vii).

See 'G.T.P.' &c.

Seed Grain Distribution, Extension to Unorganized Territories (remarks) 5408 (iii).

——— O.C. *re* Advances (remarks) 6635 (iv).

Spanish River Dredging, Amount of Expenditure (Ques.) 4764 (iii).

Steel Concrete Co., Payments to by Govt. (M. for ret.*) 3850 (ii).

See 'Walker.'

Supplies purchased by Govt., Apptmt. of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5872 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries, &c.) 635 (i); Labour Dept. (salaries) 12156 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4015 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. Steamers) 1072 (i); (life-saving stations) 2972; (wrecks) 3152, 3195 (ii).

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5524 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Mint) 1452, 1474; (Museum) 1498 (i).

Railways—I.C.R. (legal costs) 5557; (Pictou) 5559 (iii).

Timber Berths, East Saskatchewan, Conditions of Sale to Owners, &c. (Ques.) 3839 (ii).

Timber Berths, Nos. 1050, &c., Bonuses, Rentals, &c. (M. for ret.*) 852 (i).

——— Nos. 1048, &c., on Order for Ret. (amt.) 850 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3318 (ii).

Timber Berths, Original Documents, &c. (M. for ret.) 2983 (ii).

See 'Indian Lands.'

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on M. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2466 (ii).

Wallberg, Mr. E. A., Contracts with Steel Concrete Co., Payments *re* (Ques.) 3842

——— Payment by Public Works Dept. (Ques.) 5085 (iii).

See 'Steel.'

Yukon Placer Mining Act, Grants *re*, Claims, Names, &c., for one year (M. for ret.*) 698 (i).

BOYER, Mr. G., *Vaudreuil.*

'Challenge' Dredge, Quantity of Material removed (Ques.) 12651 (vii).

Dorval, Dredging at Yacht Club Wharf (Ques.) 13060 (vii).

Dredging Work at Rigaud River, &c. (M. for cor.*) 6240 (iv).

Maple Syrup and Sugar Adulteration, Penalties *re* Violations, &c. (Ques.) 6639 (iv).

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3461 (ii).

Soulanges Canal, Claims *re* Accidents, &c. (M. for reports*) 6239 (iv).

BRABAZON, Mr. G. H., *Pontiac.*

Georgian Bay Canal, Survey, &c., on M. (Mr. McCool) for copies, 1997 (i).

——— Final Report of Engineer, &c. (Ques.) 240 (i).

Immigrants, Total Number entering Canada for ten Months, Deportations, &c. (Ques.) 240 (i).

BRISTOL, Mr. E., *Toronto Centre.*

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3866

Canadians at Niagara, Indignity by U. S. Customs Officers (remarks) 11121 (vi).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11669 (vi).

Colonial Conference, Travelling Expenses of Minister (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1047 (i).

Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1638 (i).

——— on M. for Sup., 1797 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11126; in Com., 11815, 11843; (amt.) 11820 (vi); in Com., 12920; on M. for 3°, 13234 (vii).

French Treaty, going into Effect (Ques.) 8614 (v).

Goderich Military Camp, Target Practices, &c. (Ques.) 9712 (v).

G.T.P., Montreal Branch, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13303 (vii).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3705, 3720 (ii).

Japanese Immigration, Parliamentary Control, &c., on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2056 (ii).

——— on Stmt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1605, 1663 (i).

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Appointment of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7354 (iv).

BRISTOL, Mr. E.—*Con.*

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9502 (v).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. (B. 82) in Com., 4997, 5052; (amt.) 5056 (iii).

Public Accounts Com., Meetings, &c. (remarks) 1442 (i).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (mint) 1454, 1470 (i).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2647 (ii).

Timber Sales to Saskatchewan Valley Co., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 8807 (v).

——— on M. (Mr. Turriff) 8700 (v).

——— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Turriff) 11309 (vi).

Unleavened Bread, Pet. *re* Customs Duties (Ques.) 8616 (v).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6120 (iii).

Yukon Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9679 (v).

BRODER, Mr. A., *Dundas.*

Brockville Cheese Curing Room, Lease, Rental, &c. (Ques.) 3897 (ii).

Budget, The, 5980 (iii).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10753 (vi).

Civil Service Commission's Report, Investigations, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Powers, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7574 (iv).

Deep Waterways Commission, St. Lawrence, Damming at Long Sault (remarks) 13142 (vii).

Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on M. for Sup., 1825 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11140 (vi).

Gold and Silver Marking B. 197 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12554 (vii).

Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6905 (iv).

Japanese Immigration, Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2098 (ii).

Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2904 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Agriculture (dairying, &c.) 10398; (exhibitions) 10591 (vi); Canals, Welland (electric lighting) 12205 (vii); Public Works, Miscellaneous (telegraph branch) 11098 (vi).

Technical Students, Employment on Govt. Works, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3297 (ii).

BRODER, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Williamsburg Canal, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12205 (vii).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P., (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) *Rouville.*

'Arctic,' Str., Amounts expended for Repairs, Supplies, &c., from June 1904, to June, 1907 (Ans.) 185 (i).

———Trip in Northern Waters, ref. to in Com. of Sup. 4012 (ii).

Bait Freezer at North Sydney, Govt. Assistance *re* Construction (Ans.) 3849 (ii).

Beauchemin, A., Employment at Sorel (Ans.) 5467 (iii).

See 'Sorel,' &c.

Becancour River Dredging, Commencement of, Payments, &c. (Ans.) 7213 (iv).

Behring Sea Commission, Expenses *re* (Ans.) 1733 (i).

——— Expenses of Sir C. H. Tupper (explanation) 4669 (iii).

Bellechasse Lighthouse Keeper, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 4830 (iii).

Belleville Harbour, Issue of Bonds, &c. (Ans.) 6238 (iv).

——— Ret., Delay, &c. (remarks) 4408 (iii).

Berins Fish Hatchery, Failure *re* Spawn Supply (Ans.) 3241 (ii).

Bernier, Capt., Islands flagged *re* Arctic Expedition (Ans.) 5208, 5466 (iii).

Birnie and Noble, Advances to, &c. (remarks) in Com of Sup., 987 (i).

See 'Fishing,' &c.

Briar Island Marine Signalling, Change of System (Ans.) 9266 (v).

B.C. Fisheries Commission, Report *re*, on Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5728 (iii).

B.C. Fishing, Licenses issued to Packers Associations (Ans.) 8173 (iv).

Brodeur, Hon. L. P., Travelling Expenses from June 30th, 1906 (Ans.) 1347 (i).

See 'Marine,' 'Travelling,' &c.

Bronte Harbour Wharfage, Dues collected (Ans.) 13064 (vii).

Burlington Channel Lighthouse, Damages to (Ans.) 5467 (iii).

Campbellton Harbor, Gas Buoys, Tender *re* (Ans.) 8612 (v).

Can. Ensign: *See* 'Red Ensign.'

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6161, 6173, 6198; 1°*, 6215 (iii); 2°*, in Com., 6102 (iv).

See 'Franco,' &c.

Canada Shipping Act, Amt. B. 17 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) on M. for 2°, 3420 (ii).

——— (B. 183) 1°*, 10119 (v); in Com., 12851, 13052 (vii).

Canso Medical Officer, Successor to Dr. Brine (Ans.) 1736 (i).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Captains of Govt. Vessels, Examinations *re* Efficiency (Ans.) 3236 (ii).

Cascumpec Harbour Buoys, Tenders for Placing (Ans.) 681 (i).

Cassels, Mr. Justice, Acceptance *re* Investigation of Marine Dept. (remarks) 6060 (iii).

See 'Marine,' &c.

'Castle' Tug, Removal of Wreck, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 6641 (iv)

Champlain, Str., Emplymt. by Political Agents, (explanation) 9280 (v).

Civil Service Commission Report, Investigation, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Powers, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7578 (iv).

——— Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. House, 5890 (iii).

———Statement *re* Marine Dept., 5620 (iii).

——— Translation (remarks) 6926 (iv).

Clarke, Capt. Arthur, Compensation *re* Death (Ans.) 8180 (iv).

Clement, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt., Salary, &c. (Ans.) 11300 (vi).

Coal Shipments from N.S. and Cape Breton, Res. from Board of Trade, P.E.I. (Ans.) 5471 (iii).

Cold Storage Plant, Canso, Total Cost of Construction (Ans.) 8379 (v).

Colonial Conference, Travelling Expenses of Minister (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 999, 1040 (i).

See 'Travelling.'

'Coquitlam,' Str., Compensation *re* Seizure (Ans.) 2389 (ii).

Cowie, F.W., Salary, Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ans.) 5649 (iii).

Currie, W. D., Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 7731 (iv).

Debates, Official, Rep. of Com., Conc. without Notice (remarks) 8896 (v).

Deep Sea Fisheries on Pacific Coast, Cruiser, &c. (Ans.) 1934 (i).

Deputy Ministers, Payments for Special Services (Ans.) 1736 (i).

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1149 (i).

'D. H. Thomas,' Tug, Dom. Subsidy Grant (Ans.) 8184 (iv).

Dog Fish Reduction Plant, Operation at Canso (Ans.) 5651,5779, 5790 (iii), 8179 (iv).

Dog-Fish Scrap, Shipments from Canso to U.S. (Ans.) 1126 (i).

Esquimalt Naval Station, Maintenance of by Govt. (Ans.) 1117 (i).

——— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Copies of Cor. 1128 (i).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Falconer, K., Payments to for Services (Ans.) 8890 (v).

——— Payment of Balance of Account (Ans.) 10516 (vi).

——— Ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4000 (ii).

Fire Extinguishers purchased by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7640 (iv).

——— (personal explanation) 7663 (iv).

——— Production of Original File (remarks) 9281 (v).

——— Quotations from, Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7765 (iv).

——— on Inquiry for Original Papers, 8912 (v).

Fisheries, B.C., Negotiations with Mr. Bastedo (remarks) 6849 (iv).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1723 (i).

Fisheries Inspectors in Alberta, Names, &c.; (Ans.) 12390 (vii).

Fisheries between Dom. and Provs., Jurisdiction *re* (Ans.) 2395, 3429 (ii).

——— Conference *re* (Ans.) 3236 (ii).

——— Negotiations with Provs., Instructions to Mr. Bastedo (remarks) 4407 (iii).

——— Protection Service, Amounts expended since 1885 (Ans.) 1118 (i).

Fisheries in Lake Winnipeg, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 2390 (ii).

Fish Hatchery, Failure *re* Spawn, &c. (Ans.) 1683 (i).

Fish Hatchery at Selkirk, Failure *re* Spawn Supply (Ans.) 3240 (ii).

Fishing Leases granted between Lake Superior and Rocky Mountains, Name &c. (Ans.) 1684 (i).

Fishing Licenses in B.C., Granted to Japanese (Ans.) 7446 (iv).

Fishing Rights in Matane River, &c. (Ans.) 7446 (iv).

——— Complaints, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5775 (iii).

Fishing Privileges, Lesser Slave Lake, Lease &c. (Ans.) 6398 (iv).

Fish Island, Name of Present Lightkeeper (Ans.) 6058 (iii).

Fog Signal Co., Payments to (Ans.) 11498 (vi).

Forchu Fish Hatchery, Duties of Supervisor, &c. (Ans.) 3427 (ii).

France and Canada SS Subsidy, (prop. res.) 3493 (ii).

See 'Can. and France.'

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Sel. Com., 927 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 1384 (i); in Com., 3609, 3636 (ii); on M. for 3°, 4335 (iii).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, Ratification by French Senate (remarks) 13082 (vii).

Gananoque and Burnt Island Lights, &c., Apptmt. of Keeper (Ans.) 8383 (v).

Gaudette, Mr. Victor, Emplymt by Govt. (Ans.) 515, 1120 (i).

Georgian Bay Fisheries Commission, Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 981 (i).

——— on Rep. of Mr. Birnie (remarks) 5729 (iii).

See 'Birnie, &c.

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6282 (iv).

Govt. Steamers, Number purchased, &c. (Ans.) 10731 (vi).

——— Maintenance and Supplies, in Com. of Sup., 1078 (i).

——— Pay of Officers, &c. (Ans.) 10736 (vi).

——— Trips of Mr. Cowie, &c. (Ans.) 5468 (iii).

See 'Cowie,' &c.

Hackett, Capt., Tug *re* Lime Kiln Crossing, Remuneration, &c., (Ans.) 7729 (iv).

Halliday Bros., Lighthouses, Supplies, &c. (Ans.) 6236 (iv).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) on M. for 3°, 4543 (iii).

Heath Point Lighthouse, Contract *re* Building (Ans.) 7210 (iv).

'Hurona-Mongolian' Collision, Investigation *re* (Ans.) 358 (i).

Hydrographic Surveys, Amounts expended, &c. (Ans.) 1128 (i).

Ice-Breaker for Northumberland Straits, Progress *re* Construction (Ans.) 1734 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2944 (ii).

Ingonish Light-keeper, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 8618 (v).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6477 (iv).

I.C.R. Employes and Provincial Elections (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9778 (v).

Lacas, Mr., Payments to by Marine Dept. (statement) in Com. of Sup., 1035 (i).

'Lady of the Lake,' Str., Crew during Winter &c. (Ans.) 6403 (iv).

——— Purchase Price, Staff, &c. (Ans.) 3434 (ii).

Life-Saving Boats in B.C., Purchase of &c. (Ans.) 684 (i).

Life Saving Stations, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3186 (ii).

Lighthouse Keepers on Pacific Coast, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 1934 (i).

Lighthouses in Nicolet River, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 3837 (ii).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Lighthouses in Quebec, Classification, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 172 (i).

Lighthouse Service on St. Lawrence, Charter of Steamers, &c. (Ans.) 11299 (vi).

Lighting Buoys on Rideau Canal, Contract *re* (Ans.) 9477 (v).

Lobster Fishery Overseers in Lunenburg, &c., Names, &c. (Ans.) 2794 (ii).

Lobster Fisheries, Issue of Licenses, *re* (Ans.) 2388 (ii).

Lobster Fishery Regulations, Pet. from Fishermen's Union N.S. (Ans.) 6644 (iv).

Lobster Fishing Fines, Names and Amounts (Ans.) 10256 (v).

Lobster Fishing Licenses, Refusals in Northumberland County (Ans.) 9473 (v).

——— Licenses in Savage Harbour, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 4404 (iii).

Lobster Fishing Licenses in P.E.I., on M. (Mr. Martin) for Cor., 5475 (iii).

Lobster Fishing at Pictou, on Inquiry for Ret., 12772 (vii).

Lobster Fishing in St. John, N.B., Legal Size, &c. (Ans.) 10257 (v).

Lobsters, Undersized, Caught at Lunenburg, &c., Complaints *re* (Ans.) 2793 (ii).

Lockery & McCombel, Amounts *re* Extra Harbour Dues (Ans.) 11936 (vi).

'Lord Kitchener,' Tug Boat, Payments *re* Services (Ans.) 7198 (iv).

Louisburg, Bait Freezer, Amount expended, &c. (Ans.) 4406 (iii).

——— Harbour Dues for 1906, &c. (Ans.) 7503 (iv).

——— Harbour Master, Remuneration, &c. (Ans.) 3428 (ii).

——— Marine Hospital, Condition of, &c. (Ans.) 4402 (iii).

Lyall & Sons, Storage of Refuse on Harbour Property (Ans.) 11936 (vi).

Marconi Co. and Commercial Press Business (Ans.) 513 (i).

Marconi Station, Glace Bay, Operation of, &c. (Ans.) 2161 (ii).

Marconi System, Regulation *re* Rates, &c. (Ans.) 174 (i).

Marine and Fisheries Dept., Acting Deputy (remarks) 11939 (vi).

——— Dep. Minister, Resignation and Acceptance (remarks) 7938 (iv).

——— Letter *re* (read) 8088 (iv).

Marine and Fisheries, Book-keeping, Ret. *re* Mr. Falconer's Accounts, laid on Table, 4223 (iii).

——— Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 510 (i).

——— Ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3989 (ii).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commissioners, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7325 (iv).

——— Apptmt. of Counsel (remarks) 6845 (i).

——— Apptmt. of Mr. Perron (remarks) 6926 (iv).

——— Defalcations of Mr. Roy (remarks) 10741 (vi).

——— Delays, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn. House, 8452 (v).

——— Deputy Minister, Suspended Officers, Date of Apptmt, &c. (Ans.) 6982 (iv).

——— Investigation by Minister (remarks) 6636 (iv).

——— Investigation, Public &c. (remarks) 7321 (iv).

——— Method of Procedure (remarks) 10742 (vi).

——— Officers under Suspension (remarks) 6846 (iv).

Marine and Fisheries, Minister's Travelling Expenses, Refund, &c. (Ans.) 8889 (v).

Marine and Fisheries Warehouse, Sussex St. (Ans.) 13062 (vii).

Marine and Militia Stationery Supplies, Purchase *re* Book-keeping (Ans.) 6234 (iv).

Markey Fishing Leases, Copy laid on Table, 11404 (vi).

Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3022; in Com., 3034 (ii).

Meaford Harbour, (B. 158) 1° m., 7195 (iv); in Com., 8510 (v).

Merwin, Geo. T., Payments to by Marine Dept. (Ans.) 11701 (vi).

Montcalm, Str., Amount expended, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1886 (i).

——— Purchase Price, Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 8441 (v).

'Montcalm,' Str., Amount expended, &c. (revestigation *re* (remarks) 8087, 8171 (iv).

——— Accident (remarks) 10121 (v).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Contract *re* Cement (Ans.) 7199, 7499 (iv).

——— Expenditure *re* Cleaning, &c. (Ans.) 8888 (v).

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3456 (ii).

Motion, Unopposed, and Business of the House (remarks) 8896 (v).

Naval Instruction, Drilling of Canadian Seamen, &c. (Ans.) 1119 (i).

Naval Stations in Canada, Maintenance of, Arrangements with G. B. *re* (Ans.) 1118 (i).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Noble, Mr. James, Conviction *re* Fishery Regulations (Ans.) 5651 (iii).

Partridge Island Stores, Emplymt. of Ferry, Rate, &c. (Ans.) 1120 (i).

Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, on M. (Mr. Sloan) to Com. of Sup., 3980 (ii).

'Petrel' Str., Amounts paid for Supplies, &c. (Ans.) 7937 (iv).

Playgreen Lake, Conditions *re* Lease, &c. (Ans.) 6403 (iv).

Port Hood Fishery Officer, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 10255 (v).

Prefontaine, Hon. Mr., Date of Sailing for England, &c. (Ans.) 7732 (iv).

Prescott Light Station, Presentation to Dr. W. C. Brown (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 984 (i).

P.E.I. Cable Service, &c. (remarks) 8516 (v).

P.E.I. Fisheries Protection Service, Annual Cost, &c (Ans.) 360 (i).

——— Life-Saving Station, Establishment of (Ans.) 681 (i).

P.E.I. Lighthouse Supplies, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 358 (i).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Contract *re* Construction of Steamer (Ans.) 2546 (ii).

——— Georgetown and Cape George Route, Test *re* (Ans.) 895 (i).

——— Contract *re* Construction (Ans.) 8444 (v).

——— Progress *re* Construction, &c. (Ans.) 365 (i), 5796 (iii).

——— Rep. *re* (Ans.) 4584 (iii).

——— Signing of Contract (Ans.) 10254 (v).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Removal of Steamers from Georgetown Route (remarks) *re* Discussion, 1109 (i).

——— 'Str. Stanley,' Route, &c. (Ans.) 172 (i), 6160 (iii).

——— Total Quantity of Freight, Delays, &c. (Ans.) 844 (i).

——— Withdrawl of Str., &c. (remarks) 1207 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Investigations, &c., on Ques. of Order (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 3084 (ii).

Quahaug and Clam Fishing, Changes *re* (Ans.) 1940 (i).

Ry. Act (telephones) Amt. B. 118, on Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 10663 (vi).

Red Ensign, Flying on Merchant Vessels, Authority for (Ans) 12776 (vii).

Returns, on Inquiry for, 1018, 1740 (i), 2025, 2886, 3318 (ii).

——— Delayed (remarks) 13082 (vii).

Rideau Canal, Buoys, &c., Contract *re* Lighting (Ans.) 8613 (v).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Russian Govt., Compensation to B.C. Schooners (Ans.) 683 (i).

St. Anicet Wharf, Apptmt. of Mr. Dupuis (Ans.) 3230 (ii).

——— Expenditure and Collections (Ans.) 1935 (i).

Ste Anne de Sorel, Lighthouse, Destruction of Trees, &c. (Ans.) 7732 (iv).

St. Lawrence Route, Wrecks, Collisions, &c. (Ans.) 10739 (vi).

St. Louis, Mr., Payments to, by Marine Dept (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 979 (i).

St. Peters Post Office, on Inquiry for Ret., 2787 (ii).

Salmon Fishing Licenses in B.C., Number, Condition, &c. (Ans.) 5652, 5998 (iii).

——— Gardner's Inlet, &c. (Ans.) 5652 (iii).

——— Payments *re* (Ans.) 5651 (iii).

Salmon Net Fishing, Priviliges in Restigouche River (Ans.) 13518 (vii).

Saskatchewan Fishing Licenses, Issue of, &c. (Ans.) 351 (i).

Shad Hatchery at Windsor, N.S. (Ans.) 8894 (v).

Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, on M. (Mr. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7756 (iv).

Shipping Master, Quebec, Apptmt of, &c. (Ans.) 11700 (vi).

Shipping, Statistics *re* Tons registered (Ans.) 2790 (ii).

See 'Canadian Shipping Act,' &c.

Signal Dues at Halifax (B. 152) 1°m., 6457 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 8510 (v).

Sorel Pay Lists, Alleged Padding, Rep. *re* (remarks) 7938 (iv).

——— Allegations against Mr. Roy (remarks) 8295 (v).

——— Final Rep. (remarks) 10794 (vi).

——— Investigation *re* Pay Rolls, &c. (Ans.) 4768 (iii).

——— Papers laid on Table, 5477 (iii).

——— Rep. of Mr. Gaudet (remarks) 7099 (iv).

——— Rep. of Mr. Gaudet laid on Table, 8170 (iv).

——— Rep. *re* Irregularities (remarks) 5408 (iii).

Sorel Shipyards, Mr. Desbarats, Connection *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5934 (iii).

Soulanges County Wharfage Dues, Amount received, &c. (Ans.) 9277 (v).

Spain, Commander, Travelling Expenses, Cor. with Aud. Gen. (Ans.) 4405 (iii).

——— Cor. laid on Table, 4825 (iii).

——— on Inquiry for Papers, 4670 (iii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1010 (i).

——— (statement) in Com. of Sup., 1033 (i).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

'Stanley,' Str., Passenger Accommodation (Ans.) 687 (i).

Steamboat Inspection Act (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12262 (vii).

Steamboat Inspection Report (presented) 3896 (ii).

Stevenson, Mr. A. W., Payments to *re* Auditing, Dept. of Marine (Ans.) 3233 (ii).

Submarine Signal at Negro Point, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 5202 (iii).

Summerside Harbour and Str. Stanley (remarks) 6160 (iii).

Supplies purchased for Govt., Apptmt. of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5829 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (ass't. dep. min.) 12915 (vii); (salaries) 977 (i).

Fisheries (dogfish works) 13325 (vii); (inspectors, &c.) 12261 (vii); (protection steamers) 13326 (vii).

Hydrographic Surveys (Gulf of St. Lawrence) 13169 (vii).

Immigration (agents) 9853 (v).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies, rents, &c.) 5039 (iii); (aids to navigation) 5040, 5773 (iii); (lighthouses) 12262 (vii); (lightkeepers) 13323 (vii); (Lime Kiln crossing) 13323 (vii); (maintenance, &c.) 5039 (iii); (pensions) 13324 (vii); (pilotage pensions, &c.) 5046 (iii); (Point Pelee lightship) 13325 (vii); (repairs) 5039 (iii); (salaries) 4755, 5039 (iii); (signal service) 5045 (iii); (Thunder Bay icebreaker) 5041 (iii); (wireless stations) 5045 (iii).

Marine and Fisheries (dockyard) 5039 (iii); (dredging plant, &c.) 4754 (iii); (hospitals) 5782 (iii); Hudson Bay Patrolling) 3985 (ii); (ice-breakers) 1885 (i); (Lake St. Peter piers) 4752 (iii); 12262 (vii); (Patrol Boats in Hudson Bay) 4747 (iii) (Sorel property) 4751 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Marine investigation) 13169 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 3220 (ii); (Govt. steamers) 1078 (i), 5763 (iii); (ice-breakers) 2942, 2952; (life-saving awards) 2972 (ii); (masters and mates) 2969 (ii); (naval schools) 3153 3222 (ii); (obstructions) 3211 (ii); (tidal service) 3215 (ii); (winter mail service) 3217 (ii); (wrecks) 3147, 3184, 3195, (wrecking plant subsidies) 3221 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Elmwood) 13335 (vii).

Public Works—Marine Dept. (gratuities) 13321 (vii); (St. Lawrence channel) 5035 (iii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11082 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Bonaventure) 12036 (vi); (Peribonka) 12036 (vi); (Piche Point) 12035 (vi).

Technical Students, Emplymt. on Govt. Works, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3294

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor. &c., 915 (i); on Amt. (Mr. Barker) 922 (i).

Toronto Harbour Life Saving Station, Establishment of (Ans) 4586 (iii).

Trap Bag Nets in Pokemouche River (Ans.) 9476 (v).

Trap Net Licenses issued to John A. Webster, &c. (Ans.) 7204 (iv).

Travelling Expenses of Minister, Payments *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4122 (ii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 986 (i), 3985 (ii).

'Victor,' Tug, Repairs to, &c., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Reid) 9775 (v).

'Vigilant,' Cruiser, Investigation *re* Collision (Ans.) 683 (i).

Wallberg, Mr. E. A., Contracts with Marine Dept. (Ans.) 3230, 3843 (ii).

——— Contracts with Steel Concrete Co., Payments *re* (Ans.) 3843 (ii).

Washington Fisheries Commissioners, Expenses *re* (Ans.) 1732 (i).

Washington Treaty and Behring Sea Commission, Duration of, &c. (Ans.) 2165 (ii).

Watson, Mr., Apptmt. as Counsel *re* West Elgin Fraud (remarks) 6848 (iv).

See 'Marine,' &c.

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6121 (iii).

Westport, N.S., Installation of Marine Signals (Ans.) 9274 (v).

Whale Fishing Cos. in B.C., Granting of Licenses, &c., on M. (Mr. A. A McLean) 10269 (v).

——— Moneys due, Penalties, &c. (Ans.) 5996 (iii).

Wharfs, Piers, &c., Amount of Revenue collected (Ans.) 2391 (ii).

——— Expenditure, on Inquiry for Ret., 4867 (iii).

Willson, T. L., Payments *re* Ottawa Carbide Co. (Ans.) 11498 (vi).

Wireless Tel. Stations on Pacific Coast, Erection of (Ans.) 683 (i).

BROWN, Mr. J. P., *Chateauguay.*

Pontiac Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 155) 1°*, 6525 (iv).

Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 195) 1°*, 11589 (vi).

BUREAU, Hon. J. (Solicitor General) *Three Rivers and St. Maurice.*

Convict Labour, Control of, Sales of Articles, &c. (Ans.) 238 (i).

Hansard, Extra Copies, Distribution of (remarks) 9131 (v).

BUREAU, Hon. J.—*Con.*

Judges, Supreme Court, Quebec Apptmnt. on Commissions (Ans.) 358 (i).

Justice, Deptl. Report (presented) 185 (i).

'Le Soleil,' *re* Voting of French Members, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7994 (iv).

Revised Statutes, French Version, Date of Completion (Ans.) 357 (i).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Political Interference of Warden (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5539 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Justice (salaries) 10396 (v); Justice (Exchequer Court) 5506; (salaries) 5505 (iii); Marine and Fisheries (Arctic cruise) 4012 (ii); Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5522 (iii); (maintenance) 5509 (iii).

BURROWS, Mr. T. A., *Dauphin.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8357 (v).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11172, 11445, 11526; (amt.) 11943 (vi).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10822 (vi).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6358 (iv).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12812 (vii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12568 (v).

Seed Grain for Settlers in Man., &c., in Com. of Sup., 2772 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Miscellaneous (seed grain) 2772 (ii); Public Works— Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8531 (v).

Timber Limits, Leasing, &c., on Amt. (Mr Lake) 2378 (ii).

——— Ques. of Priv. *re* Par. in Winnipeg 'Telegram,' 9023 (v).

——— Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., on M. (Mr. Turriff) 8734 (v).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 8751 (v).

CALDWELL, Mr. T. B., *Lanark, N.*

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5446 (iii).

CALVERT, Mr. W. S., *Middlesex, W.*

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82, on Amt. (Mr. Bristol) in Com., 5062 (iii).

South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 16) 3° m., 1929 (i).

CALVERT, Mr. W. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10886 (vi).

West Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 24) 1°*, 430 (i).

CARNEY, Mr. M., *Halifax.*

Dom. Lands (surveys) B. 9 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 764 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10595 (vi); Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4160 (ii).

CARON, Mr. J. B. T., *Ottawa.*

'Arctic,' Str., Cruise in Northern Waters, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4026 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 11344 (vi).

Georgian Bay Canal, Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. McCool) for Copies, 2005 (i).

Northern Empire Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 86) 1°*, 2160 (ii).

Royal Mint of Canada, Cor. with Imp. Govt. *re* (M. for copy*) 5210 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4026 (ii).

CARVELL, Mr. F. B., *Carleton, (N.B.)*

Anse St. Jean Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vii).

Chicoutimi Public Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8401 (v); in Com., 13021 (vii).

Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6798 (iv).

Fraser Lumber Co.'s (B. 8) 1°*, 231 (i).

Govt. Employees and Provincial Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10990 (vi).

G.T.P., Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep., 12293 (vii).

Hillsborough Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7188 (iv).

Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12405 (vii).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 11992 (vi).

N.B. Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 53) 1°*, 1108 (ii).

Obstructions to Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9929 (v).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5441 (iii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12619 (vii).

CARVELL, Mr. F. B.— *Con.*

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10899 (vi); N. S. (Shelburne) 7177 (iv); Ont. (Kingston) 10913 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (St. John surveys) 13348 (vii); (St. John tidal waters) 12005 (vi); N.S. (Port Hood) 11276 (vi); Ont. (Midland and Tiffin) 12112 (vii).

CASH, Mr. E. L., *Mackenzie.*

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. (amt.) 11964 (vi).

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5014 (iii).

——— Manner of Living, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5752 (iii).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6334 (iv).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 3314 (ii).

Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co. of Canada (B. 26) 1°*, 430 (i).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12580 (vii).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1353 (i).

SUPPLY—

Immigration (general expenses) 5752 (iii).

CHISHOLM, Mr. T., *Huron, E.*

Address, The, 263 (i).

Bubonic Plague, Prevention of into Canada (Ques.) 686 (i).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6214 (iii).

Diseases and Public Health Bureau, on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2573 (ii).

Documents, Original, Production of, to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1651 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11945, 11953 (vi).

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5007 (iii).

Fishing Licenses issued in Saskatchewan Lakes, Number, &c. (M. for ret.*) 559, 697 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. 2896 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Res., 1238 (i).

Fruit Marks Act Inspection Sale B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 10564 (vi).

Hudson Bay Co., Original Land Registers of Lord Selkirk's Estate, &c. (Ques.) 4403 (iii).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6834 (iv).

CHISHOLM, Mr. T.—*Con.*

McGee, Hon. Thomas D'Arcy, Monument *re* (remarks) 6288 (iv).

Mint Building, Ventilation of, &c. (Ques.) 3036 (ii).

National Battlefields (lands) Amt. B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 13501; in Com., 13502 (vii).

Obstructions to Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9945 (v).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) on Senate Amts., 13316 (vii).

Patent Medicines Inspection B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 6216 (iii); in Com., 12623 (vii).

'Petrel,' Str., Supplies, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 7937 (iv).

Postmasters' Assessments, Amount collected, &c. (Ques.) 6458 (iv).

Quebec Bridge, Rep. of Sel. Com., on M. (Mr. McLean) to conc., 13353 (vii).

Salmon Fishing Licenses, Number granted in B.C., Conditions, &c. (Ques.) 5998 (iii).

Saskatchewan Fishing Licenses, Issue of, &c. (Ques.) 351 (i).

S.A. SS. Subsidy, Amount to Elder-Dempster Co. (Ques.) 2792 (ii).

S.A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12607 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries, &c.) 622 (i); Interior—Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5759 (iii); Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4184 (ii).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2687 (ii).

CHISHOLM, Mr. W., *Antigonish.*

Antigonish Armoury, Leasing, &c., Letters, Tels., &c. (M. for copies*) 1131 (i).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1702 (i).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Georgetown and Cape George Route, Test *re* (Ques.) 895 (i).

——— Tunnel Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 4630 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Generally (repairs, &c.) 11695 (vi).

CHRISTIE, Mr. P., *Ontario, S.*

Cattle Embargo in G.B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12884 (vii).

Cattle, Exports and Imports from Canada to G.B. (Ques.) 6460 (iv).

Cattle Registered, Importations from U.S., from 1904-7 (Ques.) 6238 (iv).

Postal Services, Delays, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 7266 (iv).

CHRISTIE, Mr. P.—*Con.*

Railway Commission (ass't. chief) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3930 (ii).

Sheep Quarantine by U.S. (remarks) 13537 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (live stock) 12895 (vii); (seeds) 12893 (vii).

CLARKE, Mr. A. H., *Essex, S.*

Address, The, 254 (i).

Battlefields of Canada, B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4385 (iii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5120 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11825, 11859; (amt.) 11881 (vi).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s (B. 25) 1°*, 430 (i); in Com., 3194, 3226, 3621, 3692, 3737 (ii), 4224 (iii); 3° m., 4357, 4536 (iii).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6474 (iv).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 11992 (vi).

Patent Medicines, B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 12627 (vii).

Public Accounts Com., Meetings and Adjournments (remarks) 1440 (i).

——— 3rd Rep. (M. to conc.) 2159 (ii).

——— Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3131 (ii).

Tobacco, Protection *re* Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor., &c., 913 (i).

Walker, Andrew, Relief (B. 124) 1°*, 5336 (iii).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6126 (iii).

Windsor, Chatham and London Ry. Co.'s (B. 108) 1°*, 3834 (ii).

Windsor Pump and Foundry Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 72) 1°*, 1424 (i).

Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8494 (v).

CLEMENTS, Mr. H. S., *Kent, W.*

Address, The, 194 (i).

Binder Twine Seizures, Payments to A. Smith (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 653 (i).

Blankets purchased by Militia and Indian Depts., Amount, Price, &c. (Ques.) 4584 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 6465 (iv).

See 'Militia.'

Bounties paid by Govt. since 1896 (M. for ret.*) 1130 (i).

——— (Ques.) 895 (i).

CLEMENTS, Mr. H. S.—*Con.*

Brome County Employees, Number, &c. (M. for ret.*) 6241 (iv).

Budget, The, 6527 (iv).

Canned Foods, &c., Inspection Regulations, Names of Counties, &c. (Ques.) 514 (i).

——— Cor. *re* Regulations, &c. (M. for copies*) 557 (i).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy, B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6174 (iii).

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11254 (vi).

Charlan, Mr., Salary as Tobacco Expert (Ques.) 11495 (vi).

Chilvers, Messrs., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 8894 (v), 9266 (v).

Chilvers, Francis W., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 10515 (vi).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12164 (vii).

Colchester Point, Essex Pier, Amount expended (Ques.) 12652 (vii).

Concrete Wharfs, Dissatisfaction in Ont. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11278 (vi).

Detroit River Tunnel, Duties on Construction Material, &c. (Ques.) 1116 (i).

——— Material imported, &c. (Ques.) 4583 (iii).

——— Material entered free of Customs Duties (Ques.) 10254 (v).

——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 10417 (vi).

Dillon, Michael, Emplymt. by Customs Dept. at Windsor (Ques.) 7201 (iv).

Documents, Original, Ques. of Priv., 6010 (iii).

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5031 (iii).

Dredging Contracts, Renewals without Tenders (remarks) 6634 (iv).

Essex County Junior Judge, Apptmt. of &c. (Ques.) 1939 (i).

Falconer, Payments to *re* Auditing Accounts of Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4178 (ii).

Floods at Chatham, Damage &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 4742 (iii).

Foster, Frederick, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 12652 (vii).

Glencoe Post Office Building, Contract *re* (Ques.) 3846 (ii).

Hackett Dock, Purchase of, at Amherstburg (Ques.) 7730 (iv).

Hog Cholera in Essex, Number of Animals slaughtered (Ques.) 9280 (v).

Hogs slaughtered, Compensations paid, &c. (remarks) 13092 (vii).

Immigrants deported from Chatham, Names and Cause, &c. (Ques.) 5796 (iii).

CLEMENTS, Mr. H. S.—*Con.*

Immigrants at Chatham, Complaints *re* Deportation of (Ques.) 6922 (iv).

Immigrants distributed in West Kent, Certificates, &c. (M. for copies*) 1513 (i).

Immigration Agents appointed in Ontario, Names, Number, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1129 (i).

Immigration Agents, Special Prizes, &c. (Ques.) 3484 (ii).

Immigration Forms, Number returned by Farmers, &c. (Ques.) 3847 (ii).

Immigration Officers in Kent County, Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 514 (i).

——— on M. for Sup., 3172 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3041 (ii), 4223 (iii).

Indian Department, Extravagant Management (remarks) on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11066 (vi).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr Templeman) in Com., 6470 (iv).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11248 (vi).

Lime Kiln Crossing, Charter of Capt. Hackett's Tug, Remuneration *re* (Ques.) 7729 (iv).

Mail Tenders at Rimouski, Complaints *re* 'Lady Evelyn' (Ques.) 5799 (iii).

Marcoun, Mr. Frank, Commission *re* Settlement of Claims, &c. (Ques.) 1122 (i).

Meats and Canned Food Inspectors, Number appointed, Names, &c. (Ques.) 172 (i).

Meat Inspection Regulations, Meetings at Chatham (remarks) in debate on Address, 196 (i).

Meat Inspection Act Violations, Inquiry for Ret., 3042 (ii).

Militia, Purchase of Blankets, Return *re* (remarks) 5914 (iii).
See 'Blankets.'

North Atlantic Trading Co., Bonuses by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 793 (i).

Pacaud, Benjamin, Apptmt. to Customs, Windsor (Ques.) 5200 (iii).

Patent Medicines Inspection B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) in Com. on Res., 6216 (iii).

Pepin, J. A., Emplymt. at Windsor Customs (Ques.) 7201 (iv).

Perdue, Dr M. B., Apptmt. as Inspector, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 173 (i).

Piggeries at Experimental Farm (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12895 (vii).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4931 (iii).

Railway Commission (Ass't. Chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3928 (ii).

Rankin, Col., Resignation of (remarks) 11405 (vi).

Returns, Inquiry for, 1739 (i).

CLEMENTS, Mr. H. S.—*Con.*

Returns, Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv., 4665 (iii).

Ruscomb River Works, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1122 (i).

Sandwich Post Office Site, Price, &c. (Ques.) 7201 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (live stock industry) 12894 (vii); (Meat and Canned Foods Act) 12893 (vii); (seeds) 12892 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Trade and Commerce (salaries) 652 (i).

Fisheries (protection steamers) 13326 (vii).

Indians—Ont. and Que. (administration) 12732 (vii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Lime Kiln crossing) 13323 (vii); (Thunder Bay icebreaker) 5042 (iii).

Marine, &c.—Public Works (ship channel) 5038 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (naval schools) 3154 (ii); (obstructions) 3212 (ii); (wrecks) 3188 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8524 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Dom. renewals, &c.) 7479 (iv); (Glencoe) 7487 (iv); (Guelph armoury) 7678 (iv); (Kingston R. M. C.) 7704 (iv); (Leamington) 7705 (iv); (Markham) 7712 (iv); (North Bay) 7712 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal Station C.) 7420 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 8599 (v); (Maple Creek) 8600 (v); (Prince Albert penitentiary) 8601 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Port Hood) 11273 (vi); (Port Royal) 11278 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Belle River) 12090 (vii); (McGregor's Creek) 12103 (vii).

Public Works—Marine Dept. (gratuities) 13322 (vii).

Public Works—Slides and Booms (surveys, &c.) 11073 (vi).

Tecumseh Park Breakwater, Dangerous Condition (remarks) 12657 (vii).

Thames River Wharf, Damages to (remarks) 7506 (iv).

Tilbury, Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vii).

Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor. &c., 908 (i).

Wallace, Michael J, Emplymt in Customs at Windsor (Ques.) 7500 (iv).

Waugh, James, Refund to Govt. *re* Immigration Agent (Ques.) 4765 (iii).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6138 (iii).

Wilson Cordage Co., Cor. Accounts, &c. (M. for copies*) 1129 (i).

Windsor, Detroit and Belle Isle Ferry Co., Cor. &c. (M. for copies*) 1131 (i).

——— Expiration of Franchise (Ques.) 1940 (i).

COCKSHUTT, Mr. W. F., *Brantford.*

Address, The, 123, (amt.) 147 (i); Amt. Neg. (Y. 95: N. 56) 274 (i).

All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12448 (vii).

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10940 (vi).

Battlefields of Canada, B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4391; in Com., 4400 (iii).

Bell Memorial Association, Grant, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 11206 (vi).

Brantford Srike, Cor. with Justice Dept. (Ques.) 10016 (v).

Budget, The, 5314 (iii).

Buffalo Herds for Parks (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5756 (iii).

Butter Imports, Quantity, Countries of Origin, &c. (Ques.) 1116 (i).

Canada and France SS Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6176 (iii).

Canadian Associated Press B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 12407 (vii).

Cataract Power Co., Welland Canal, Amount diverted at DeCew Falls, &c. (Ques.) 897 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12183 (vii).

Customs and Trade Returns, Duplicate Printing, &c., on M. for Sup. (remarks) 9736 (v).

Customs Dept. and Civil Service Rep. *re* on M. for Sup., 10428 (vi).

Customs Seizure for 1905-7, Reasons, Fines, &c (M. for ret.*) 4588 (iii).

——— Customs Dept., Criticism, on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10428 (vi).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10825 (vi).

Dominion Power Co.'s Bill, Inquiry for, 10919 (vi).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4239 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Res., 1237 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3556 (ii); in Com., 3617 (ii), 3640 (ii).

Fraser, Donald, Customs Collector, Investigation *re* Defalcations (Ques.) 5200 (iii).

Gold and Silver Marking Act Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12555 (vii).

G. T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2240 (ii).

G.T.P., Accidents on Construction (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6661 (iv).

——— Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12725 (vii).

COCKSHUTT, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 4227 (ii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6451 (iv).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolishing of, to Agents, &c. (prop. res.) 1295 (i).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6998 (iv).

Indian Schools, Dr. Bryce's Report (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 625 (i).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6490 (iv).

Japanese Immigration, Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2074 (ii).

Newspaper Rates, List of Publications (M. for copy*) 1295 (i).

Post Office Act (postage) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 10704 (vi).

Quebec Tercentenary, Mobilization of Militia, Abandonment of (remarks) 8857 (v).

Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°, 4659 (iii) .

Saskatoon, Saskatchean, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4238 (ii)

SUPPLY—

Agriculture (seed branch) 5501 (iii).

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries, &c.) 625 (i).

Indians—(destitute, relief) 5762 (iii).

Interior—Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5756 (iii).

Militia (annual drill) 5741 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10891 (vi); Ont. (Brantford) 7455 (iv).

Technical Education, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 2873 (ii).

CONMEE, Mr. J., *Thunder Bay and Rainy River.*

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12855 (vii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5097 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 10721 (vi); in Com., 11386 (vi); 12167 (vii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 7982 (iv), 7998 (iv), 11727 (vi); in Com., 11802 (vi), 11833 (vi), 12958 (vii); on M. for 3°, 13235 (vii).

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5030 (iii).

Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6803 (iv).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3635 (ii).

CONMEE, Mr. J.—*Con.*

G.T.P., Accidents on Construction (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6659 (iv).

——— Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12678 (vii).

——— Ties purchased in U.S. (remarks) 1445 (i).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3702 (ii), 3719 (ii).

Hudson Bay Ry. (remarks) on Amt. (Mr. Foster) *re* Financial Review, 13467 (vii).

Japanese Immigration, Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2109 (ii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12561 (vii).

Midland Dredging Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5716 (iii).

Niagara, St. Catherines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) on Amt. (Mr. Bristol) in Com., 5064 (iii).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4914 (iii).

Railway Act (Commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4971 (iii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12611 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Lachine (slope walls) 5664 (iii); Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4054, 4132 (ii).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, &c., on Amt (Mr. Lake) 2345 (ii).

COPP, Mr. A. J. S., *Digby*

Dominion Atlantic Ry. Co.'s (B. 50) 1°*, 1108 (i); in Com., 4231 (ii); on Senate Amts., 5785 (iii).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. Ross) in Com., 5412, 5519 (iii).

Townsend, Arthur James, Relief (B. 196) 1°*, 11589 (vi).

CRAWFORD, Mr. J., *Portage la Prairie.*

Address, The, 316 (i).

Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com., 11986 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8076, 8089 (iv); in Com., 13007 (vii).

G.T.P. Branch Lines Ry Co.'s (B. 151) 1°*, 6287 (iv).

——— on Order for Com., 7141 (iv); in Com., 7667, 8125 (iv), 8552, 8609, 8741, 9377, 9461 (v).

Grazing Land leased to Brown, Bedingfield & Co., Number of Acres (Ques.) 13062 (vii).

'Hansard,' Extra Copies, Distribution of (remarks) 9132 (v).

CRAWFORD, Mr. J.—*Con.*

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6382 (iv)

Land Grants to Rys. in Man. and N. W. Ters., Areas reserved on July 1, 1896 (Ques) 13512 (vii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12571 (vii).

Railway Act (demurrage) Amt B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3381 (ii).

Returns, Questions, &c., ordered by House, Time to complete, &c. (Ques.) 4242 (ii).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1364 (i).

SUPPLY—

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5523 (iii)

Public Works--Buildings--Man. (Dauphin) 8521 (iii); (Neepawa) 8537 (v).

Timber Berths, Awarded between June 1904 and July 15th, 1896, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3851 (ii).

——— Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2676 (ii).

CROCKET, Mr. O. S., *York (N.B.)*

Blackhall, Mrs., Claims *re* Caraquet Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11685 (vi).

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6878 (iv).

Civil Service Act. Amt B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11558 (vi).

Documents, Original, Production of, to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1655 (i).

——— on M. for Sup., 1861 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13028 (vii)

Elections in N.B., Federal Govt. Patronage, on M. for Sup., 3043 (ii)

Freight Rates, Discrimination *re* City of St John, Cor. &c. (M. for copies*) 2397 (ii).

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr Crawford) in Com., 9464 (v).

G.T.P., Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12710 (vii).

——— Grand Falls and Moncton Section, Contract *re* (Ques.) 9266 (v).

Immigration in N.B., Co-operation with N.B. Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 621 (i).

I.C.R., Claim Agent, E. H. Allen, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 3480 (ii).

——— Deterioration in Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10147 (v).

——— Freight Rate Discrimination against Fredericton, N.B., Cor., &c. (M. for copy) 2558 (ii).

——— Moncton Shops, Contractor, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 1509 (i).

CROCKET, Mr. O. S.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Pictou Engine House, Contract *re* Construction, &c. (Ques.) 1683 (i).

Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12403 (vii).

Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13287 (vii).

MacIlreith, Mr., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7174 (iv).

Mail Service in N.B. and N.S., Number of Post Offices, Postal Revenue, &c. (M. for ret.*) 852 (i).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12796 (vii).

Moncton Shops, Payments to E. A. Wallberg (Ques.) 8892 (v).

N.B. Coal and Ry. Co.'s Claim against Ry. Dept. (Ques.) 9714 (v).

Post Office Services Ret., Inquiry for, 6288 (iv).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4916 (iii).

Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s B. 128 (Mr. Michaud) in Com., 6227 (iv).

Ry. Act (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10639 (vi).

Representation of the Mar. Provinces in H. of C., on M. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 9830 (v).

St. Mary's Indian Reserve (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 634 (i).

Seed Grain for N.W. Settlers, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2911 (ii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 12597 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 12889 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries, &c.) 621 (i); Mines (salaries) 647 (i); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 652 (i).

Immigration (deportations) 9886 (v).

Indians—N.B. (agents salaries) 13170 (vii); (salaries) 12736 (vii); (schools) 13170 (vii).

Militia (gratuities) 13178 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2942 (ii).

Post Office (inspectors) 13154 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Emerson) 8534 (v); (Neepawa) 8537 (v); (Winnipeg, warehouse) 8573 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Fredericton) 13328 (vii); (Moncton) 13328 (vii); (Quarantine, water service) 7187; (St. John) 7186 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 7119; (Bridgewater) 7136 (iv) (Halifax customs) 7156 (iv); (Inverness) 7172 (iv); (Shelburne) 7173 (iv); (Westville) 7179; (Yarmouth) 7182 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Guelph armoury) 7679 (iv); (Kingston artillery park) 7701 (iv); (Kingston, hospital)

CROCKET, Mr. O. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

7702 (iv); (Kingston, R.M.C.) 7704 (iv); (North Bay) 7718 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Dom. Arsenal) 7438 (iv); (Dundee) 7287 (iv); (Farnham) 7287 (iv); (Knowlton) 7291 (iv); (St. John's) 7444 (iv); (St. John's military) 7442 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. and Alta (Battleford) 8578 (v); (Edmonton) 8579 (v); (Estevan) 8581 (v); (Humboldt) 8584 (v); (Moosejaw) 13337 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Buctouche) 11684 (iv); (Campbellton wharf) 11685 (vi); (Campbellton 13344 (vii); (Caraquet wharf) 11685 (vi); (Dover wharf) 11692 (vi); (Madawaska) 11696 (vi); 13344 (vii); (Miscou) 13344 (vii); (Moncton) 11696 (vi); (New Mills) 13345 (vii); (Richibucto) 11698 (v); (St. John river) 11698 (vi); (St. John, surveys) 13346 (vii); (St. John, tidal waters) 12008 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis) 11216 (vi); (Baddeck) 11220 (vi); (Cow Bay) 11225 (vi); (Portuguese cove) 11279 (vi).

Railways—G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10384 (vi); (inspection) 10392 (vi).

Railways—I.C.R. (Chatham diversion) 12758 (vii); (claims dept.) 10176 (v); (double tracking) 12250 (vii); (Fredericton improvements) 12758 (vii); Halifax accommodation) 12227 (vii); (Indiantown branch) 12258 (vii); (locomotives) 10156 (v); (machinery) 12257 (vii); (Moncton car shops) 12251 (vii), 12256 (vii); (Pictou accommodation) 12230 (vi); (Sackville) 12235 (vii); (salaries) 10147 (v); (supplies) 10191 (v).

Railways—P.E.I. (Haney, M. J., claim) 12762 (vii).

Railways—Ry. Commission (maintenance, &c.) 10389 (vi).

Venoit, Mr. P. G., Complaints *re* Interference in Politics (Ques.) 6406, 7730 (iv).

Woodstock, N.B., Mr. C. L. Smith's Salary, &c. (Ques.) 2794 (ii).

——— Interference in Elections, on M. for Sup., 2886 (ii).

Yukon Act (Govt.) Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10534 (vi).

DANIEL, Mr. J. W., *St. John (City).*

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3862 (ii).

All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12469 (vii).

'Arctic,' Str., Cruise in Northern Waters, ref. to, in Com. of Sup., 4026 (ii).

Aud. General, Salary B. 208 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 12645 (vii).

Boards of Trade Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11990 (vi).

Canada and France SS Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6173 (iii).

DANIEL, Mr. J. W. —*Con.*

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12852 (vii).

——— B. 209 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 12647 (vii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12183 (vii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com., 11983 (vi).

Dom. Liabilities due N.B. from 1869 to 1884, &c. (Ques.) 2217 (ii).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4686 (iii).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1722 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Res., 1236 (i); on M. for 1°, 3494 (ii); in Com., 3593 (ii), 3637

Franco-Canadian Treaty, and Favoured Nation Clause (Ques.) 514 (i).

G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res, 2222 (ii); in Com., 12081 (vii).

Halifax Garrison, Coal Supply, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 10015 (v).

Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Instruction *re* Municipal Offices, &c. (Ques.) 3430 (ii).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10493 (vi).

Imports from France, Value for five years, &c. (Ques.) 1124 (i).

I.C.R., Claims *re* Damages, Settled and Unsettled, &c. (Ques.) 5793 (iii), 7196 (iv).

——— Employees, Names and Number taken in Jan. and Feb. in N.B. (Ques). 5793 (iii).

——— Hard Pine Tenders, Number, &c. (Ques.) 3233 (ii).

——— Moncton Workshops, Tenders *re* Leasing, &c. (Ques.) 5800 (iii).

——— Number employed in N.B. for Jan. Feb., &c. (M. for ret.*) 6241.

International Ry., N.B., Directors, Amount of Stock, &c. (Ques.) 4246 (iii).

Lobster Fishing in St. John, N.B., Legal Size, &c (Ques.) 10257 (v).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), 12795 (vii), 12829 (vii).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9494 (v).

Negro Point Submarine Signal, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 5202 (iii).

New Brunswick Cold Storage Co., Lease of Land to, Cost and Terms, &c. (Ques.) 563 (i).

——— Ministerial Connections *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9313 (v).

See 'Trueman.'

DANIEL, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*

N.B. Credit, Amount &c. (Ques.) 1937 (i).

N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference of Dom. Govt. Patronage (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3050 (ii).

Obstruction to Supply, on M. (Mr. Fowler) to Com. of Sup., 10032 (v).

Partridge Island Stores, Emplymt. of Ferry, Rate, &c. (Ques.) 1120 (i).

Patent Medicines B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 12624 (vii).

Prisons and Reformatories Act (Halifax) Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. 10692 (vi).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4958 (iii).

Ry. Act (telephones) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10648 (vi).

Representation of the Mar. Provinces in House of Com., on M. for Sup., 9780 (v).

——— Ques. of Priv., 9891 (v).

Rifle Range, Charlottetown, Purchase Price, &c. (Ques.) 6233 (iv).

Ryan, Mr. G. M., Ry. Mail Supt., Apptmt. of Successor (Ques.) 7504 (iv).

St. John Fusiliers, 62nd, Payments *re* Annual Drill, Delays, &c. (Ques.) 846 (i).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8563 (v).

Senate Reform, on prop. Res. (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 1561 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com on Res,, 3787 (ii); in Com., 12596 (vii).

Sussex Military Camp (remarks) 9836 (v).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10569 (vi); (Year Book) 678 (i).

Canals—Lachine (Richard, Jos., compensation) 13175 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Public Works (salaries, &c.) 639 (i).

Customs—Inspectors (travelling expenses) 9541; Miscellaneous (printing, &c.) 9577 (v); Outside Service (salaries) 9229 (v).

Fisheries (dogfish reduction works) 13325; (protection steamers) 13326 (vii).

Geological Survey (maps, &c.) 12260; (specimens) 12261 (vii).

Immigration (agents, &c.) 9972 (v).

Indians—N.B. (schools) 13172 (vii).

Labour Dept.—(Gazette) 12261 (vii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5040 (iii); (lifeboats) 13323; (lighthouses) 12262; (Point Pelee lightship) 13325 (vii); (salaries) 5039 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (St. John and Cumberland) 12263.

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4026 (ii); (ice-breakers) 1908 (i).

Marine—Public Works (ship channel) 5036 (iii).

Militia (annual drill) 5736 (iii); Dom. arsenal) 12155; (gratuities) 13177; (provisions, &c.) 12150; (R. M. College) 12152; (warlike stores) 12149 (vii).

Miscellaneous (Chinese riots) 13155; (Civil Service Commissioners) 13168; (Olympic Games) 13167 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 3221 (ii); (Govt. steamers) 1082 (i); (ice-breakers) 2961; (life-saving awards) 2973; (masters and mates) 2969; (Naval Schools) 3153, 3223; (tidal service) 3215; (wrecks) 3194, 3196 (ii).

Post Office (inspectors, N.B.) 13153 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Fairville) 13328; (St. John) 13329 (vii); (St. John, quarantine station) 5703 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Bridgewater) 7136 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston militia stores) 10908 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (H. of C. (additions) 1487; (mint) 1451, 1483; (museum) 1497 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Grosse Isle) 7290 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (St. John harbour) 12012 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis) 11218; (Caribou Island) 11225; (Cow Bay) 11226; (Round Hill) 11282 (vi).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (architects' branch) 11096; (clerical assistance) 11100; Deep Waterways Commission) 11102; (telegraph branch) 11097 (vi).

Railways—I.C.R. (advertising) 10186 (v); (double tracking) 12236, 12250; (Halifax accommodation) 12229 (vii); (legal services) 10190 (v); St. John accommodation) 12257 (vii); (salaries) 10154 (v).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10696 (vi).

Trueman, Mr., and N. B. Cold Storage Co., &c., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pugsley) 9344 (v).

See 'N.B. Cold Storage.'

Uniforms, Official, and Customs Duties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9570 (v).

Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8484 (v).

DELISLE, Mr. M. S., *Portneuf.*

Captains of Govt. Vessels, Examinations *re* Efficiency, &c. (Ques.) 3236 (ii).

Lacoste, Sir Alexander, Amount of Pension, &c. (Ques.) 1934 (i).

Money Lenders, Operating in Public Buildings, &c. (Ques.) 1738 (i).

DEMERS, Mr. J., *St. John's and Iberville.*

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3576 (ii).

Sand, Cement or Clay Utensils, Quantity imported from G. B. for 1904-5-6-7 (Ques.) 1506 (i).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (St. John's military) 7442 (iv).

DESJARDINS, Mr. S., *Terrebonne.*

Jesus River Dredging, Payments to Mr. Morgan (Ques) 6980 (iv).

Peat Industry, Employment of Mr. Erik Nystrom, &c. (Ques.) 1122 (i).

DEVLIN, Mr. E. B., *Wright.*

All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12487 (vii).

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1177 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8143 (iv).

Georgian Bay Canal, Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. McCool) for Copies, 2012 (i).

Japanese Immigration, Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2111 (ii).

Prohibition Vote in Quebec (remarks) in Com of Sup., 662 (i).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4922 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4056 (ii); Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 1098 (i).

DUBEAU, Mr. J. A., *Joliette.*

Canadian Northern Quebec Ry. Co.'s (B. 77) 1°*, 1584 (i).

Cigar Stamps, Use of Black Ones (Ques.) 12390 (vii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3573 (ii).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6490 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Year Book) 679 (i).

Tobacco Industry, Amts. to Inland Revenue Act, &c. (Ques.) 178 (i).

——— (M. for copies) 899 (i).

DUGAS, Mr. F. O., *Montcalm.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8282 (iv); in Com., 11863 (vi).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt., B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6493 (iv).

Tobacco, Foreign, Refund, Total Amount, &c. (Ques.) 4402 (iii).

DYMENT, Mr. A. E., *Algoma East.*

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s (B. 137) 1°*, 5913 (iii).

Pacific and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s (B. 138) 1°*, 5913 (iii); in Com., 8610, 9070 (v).

Wheat Transportation from N. W., &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2195 (ii).

ELSON, Mr. P., *Middlesex, E.*

Address, The, 304 (i).

Binder Twine, Purchasers Names and P. O. Addresses (Ques.) 9715 (v).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy, B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6209 (iii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5098 (iii).

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5011 (iii).

Lord's Day Act, Violations at Ottawa *re* Horse Racing on Sunday (remarks) 3753 (ii).

Opium, Amount received *re* Duties, Pet. from B.C. *re* Prohibition, &c. (Ques.) 8614 (v).

Ry. Semaphores, Standard Ladder and Posts, &c. (Ques.) 239 (i).

Salmon Fishing Licenses, B.C., Payments *re* (Ques.) 5651 (iii).

Semaphores at Interlocking Plant, London, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 9714 (v).

Sheep Quarantine by U. S., &c. (Ques.) 13064 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10575 (vi).

EMMERSON, Hon. H. R., *Westmoreland.*

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7671, 8553 (iv).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12866 (vii).

——— B. 209 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 12647 (vii).

C.P.R., Papineauville Branch Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13304 (vii).

Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9178 (v).

Dom. Lands (surveys) B. 9 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 755 (i).

Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6750 (iv).

Easter Adjournment, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6464 (iv).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13273 (vii).

Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13297 (vii).

Govt. Officials and Municipal Elections, on M. (Mr. Sproule) to Com. of Sup., 2893 (ii).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6267 (iv).

Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Political Interference (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6653 (iv).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 833 (i).

EMMERSON, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*
I.C.R., Extension to Great Lakes, (prop res.) 2435 (ii).
——— Passes issued to P. S. Archibald, (Ques.) 2387 (ii).
N. B. Provincial Elections, Interference of Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3058 (ii).
P.E.I. Ry., Branch Lines, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 215, 13482 (vii).
P.E.I. Ry., Harmony-Elmira Branch, B. 202 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 12629 (ii).
P.E.I., Hillsborough Bridge Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2743 (ii).
Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s B. 128 (Mr. Michaud) in Com., 6226 (iv).
Stewart, Mr. James, Inspecting Auditor, I. C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10154 (v).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10595 (vi).
Militia (gratuities) 13178 (vii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Tracadie) 13349 (vii).
Railways—I. C. R. (inspecting auditor) 10154 (v); (double tracking) 12237 (vii); (St. Cyrille diversion) 12757 (vii).
Tobacco, Violation of Act, Ques. of Order, in Com. of Sup., 9242 (v).
William, Thos., Emplymt. on I.C.R., &c. (Ques.) 2388 (ii).

ETHIER, Mr. J. A. C., *Two Mountains.*
Architectural Institute of Can., Refund of Fees (M.) 11234 (vi), 11404 (vi).
Debates, French Edition, Delay in Distribution, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Beland) 3488 (ii).
Geological Survey, Technical Officers (remarks) on Conc., 13575 (vii).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3459 (ii).
Ry. Act (land surveys) Amt. (B. 30) 1° m., 560 (i).
Railway Subsidies B. 215 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 13482 (vii).
Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor. &c., 911 (i).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S. (Minister of Finance) *Shelburne and Queen's (N.S.)*
Accounts and Claims against Govt., Total Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 352, 363 (i).
Address, The, 94; on Amt. (Mr. Barker) 531 (i).
Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4719 (iii).
All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12465 (vii).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
American Bank Note Co., Agreement *re* Printing Stamps, &c. (Ans.) 2593 (ii).
Anglo-French Exhibition, Purchase of Goods, &c. (Ans.) 8443 (v).
——— Total Expenditure (Ans.) 8444 (v).
Anglo-French Treaty, Ratification by British Govt. (remarks) 11706 (vi).
See 'Franco,' &c.
Apples seized at Port of Montreal, Value, &c. (Ans.) 1508 (i).
Architects Institute of Canada incorp. B. 88 (Mr. Walsh) in Com., 5381 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. Ethier) to refund Fees, 11234 (vi).
Aud. Gen.'s Deptl. Rep. (Vol. i)—(presented) 7 (i).
——— (Vol. ii)—(presented) 766 (i).
——— (Vol. iii)—(presented) 6 (i).
Aud. General, Salary (B. 208) Prop. Res., 12502; in Com. on Res., 12645, 1°*, 2°*, in Com., 12645 (vii).
Audit and Inspection of Banks, Legislation *re* (remarks) 12658 (vii).
——— Independent Bank Audit, Establishment of (Ans.) 11232 (vi).
Bank Act Amt. (B. 160) 1° m., 7307 (iv); 2° m., 10919; in Com., 10933 (vi).
Bank Act Amt., on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 4298 (ii).
Banks, Aid to: *See* 'Dom. Notes Bill,' 'Wheat,' &c.
Banque de St. Jean, Investigation *re* Failure (remarks) 9336 (v).
Belleville Harbour, Total Revenue, &c. (remarks) 2593 (ii).
Belleville—Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 8556, 8609 (v).
Binder Twine Seizures, Payments to A. Smith (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 653 (i).
Blue Books, Distribution of (remarks) 432 (i).
Boards of Trade Act Amt. (B. 133) 1°*, 5337 (iii); 2° m. and in Com., 11987 (vi); in Com., 12393 (vii).
Bonusing System, on Notice of M. (Mr. Monk) 6289 (iv).
Boone Co., Payments to (remarks) 5083 (iii).
Bounties paid by Govt. for 1908-9 (Ans.) 13226 (vii).
Bridge Subsidies to Ry. Cos., on Amt. (Mr. Leonard) in Com., 13312 (vii).
British Columbia Bank incorp. B. 49 (Mr. Sloan) on M. for 2°, 1469 (i).
B.C., Revenue contributed to Dom. from 1872-3 to 1905, on M. (Mr. D. Ross) for Ret. 3436 (ii).
British Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 21 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3621 (ii).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Bronze Coat-of-arms, Duty *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7150 (iv).

Budget, The, (M.) for Com. on Ways and Means (annual statement) 5137 (iii).

——— (remarks) 519, 560 (i), 4316, 4670 (iii).
See 'Financial Review.'

Business of the House, Precedence *re* Questions (remarks) 430 (i).

Campaign Literature franked by Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10352 (vi).

Canada and France SS Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6174, 6194 (iii); in Com., 6412 (iv).

Canada and Germany Treaty (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10601 (vi).

——— Trade Relations (remarks) 13082 (vii).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. (B. 209) prop. Res., 12392 (vii); in Com. on Res., 12646; 1°, 12649; in Com., 13053 (vii).

Canada Temperance Act Amt. (B. 187) on M. to place on Order Paper, 13493; 2° m, 13506 (vii).

Canadian Associated Press (B. 201) prop. Res., 12052 (vii); in Com. on Res., 12408 (vii); in Com., 12644 (vii); 2° m., 12837; in Com., 12848 (vii).

——— Memorial from Pres'dt. J. Ross Robertson (read), 12837 (vii).

Canadian Associated Press, Govt. Subvention, &c. (Ans.) 5080 (iii).

Canadian Building, Rental, Space, &c. (Ans.) 5208 (iii).

Canadian Loans, Rate of Interest (remarks) 12194 (vii).
See 'Loans,' &c.

Canadian Weather Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 37 (Mr. M. S. Schell) in Com., 5174 (iii).

Canso Medical Officer, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 6647 (iv).

Cattle Embargo in G. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12881 (vii).

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11256 (vi).

Cigarette, Anti-Legislation *re* (remarks) 7279 (iv).

Civil Servants, Increases *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12913 (vii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) prop. Res., 11300 (vi); in Com. on Res., 11359 (vi); in Com., 11402, 11641 (vi), 12185 (vii).

Civil Service Bill, on Inquiry for, 8516 (v).

——— Resolution *re* (remarks) 11017 (vi).

Civil Service Commission's Rep., on Inquiry for, 90, 938, 1740 (i), 3043, 3317 (ii), 4316, 4832, 4963, 5408, 5491, 5567 (iii).

——— on Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 4495 (iii).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Civil Service Commission's Rep., presented, 5620 (iii).

——— Number distributed, &c. (remarks) 5723, 6060 (iii), 6222 (iv).

——— Translation, &c. (remarks) 6222, 6926 (iv), 13477 (vii).
See 'Marine,' &c.

Civil Service Commission's Report, Policy of Govt. (remarks) on M. to Adjn. House, 5883 (iii).

Civil Service System, Re-organization of, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9158 (v).

Coal Duties, Refunds *re* Coke, &c. (Ans.) 6924 (iv).

Cold Storage Cos., Grants to (Ans.) 1938 (i).

Colonial Conference, 1907, Total Expenditure by Govt. (Ans.) 512 (i).

——— Travelling Expenses of Ministers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1001 (i).
See 'Intercolonial,' &c.

Colonial Securities and Investment of Trust Funds, &c., Cor. *re* Govtl. Action (Ans.) 174 (i).

Companies Act Amt. (B. 104) 2°* and in Com., 5492 (iii).

Contractors' Securities, Amounts retained (Ans.) 1112 (i).

Co-operation B. 5 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 4565 (iii).

Copper Cliff Postmaster, Charges *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 659 (i).

Crown Life Insurance Co.'s B. 180 (Mr. Tisdale) in Com., 9962 (v).

Customs Estimates, Obstruction in Sup. (remarks) 10143 (v).

Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com., 11984 (vi).

Customs, Outside Service (salaries) 9221 (v).

Debates, Official, Adoption of 2nd Rep. (remarks) 12505 (vii).

——— 4th Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Gervais) to Conc., 8835 (v).

——— Conc. without Notice (remarks) 8898 (v).

Debt of Canada, Portions falling Due (Ans.) 315 (i).

——— Portions maturing 1908 (Ans.) 315 (i).
See 'Loans,' &c.

Detroit River Tunnel, &c., on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10182 (vi).

Documents, Original, Production of, to Members, on M. for Sup., 1805 (i).

Dominion Guarantee Co.'s B. 127 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 6231 (iv).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11202 (vi).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Dom. Lands Act Amt., on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) to Amt. (Mr. Lake) on M. for 3°, 11977 (vi).

Dom. Liabilities due to N.B. from 1869 to 1884, &c. (Ans.) 2217 (ii).

Dom. Loans and Overdrafts, Disposition of, &c. (Ans.) 313 (i).

Dominion Notes Issue (grain advances) (B. 159), 1° m., 7307 (iv); 2°*, in Com., 10795 (vi).
See 'Seed Grain,' &c.

Dom. Notes Outstanding, Oct. 1907, Total Amount (Ans.) 692 (i).
See 'Loans.'

Dom. Power and Development Co.'s (B. 173) on Conc. by Senate, 12549 (vii).

Dominion Revenue from 1873 to 1907 (Ans.) 1734 (i).

Draper, Mr., and Mr. Pepper, Candidates for Municipal Office (Ans.) 687 (i).

——— (Remarks) in Com. of Sup., 612 (i).

Dry Docks Subsidy (B. 119) M. for Com. on Res., 4314 (iii); in Com. on Res., 4675 (iii); 1°*, 4689 (iii); in Com., 6911 (iv), 10761; on Senate Amts., 11633 (vi).

Easter Adjournment (M.) *re* 6843 (iv).

Employees of Parliament, Religions, &c., on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Ret., 5480 (iii).

Estimates of 1908-9 (presented) 554 (i).

——— Suppl. (1908) presented, 2381 (ii), 5134 (iii).

——— Suppl. (1909) presented, 12503 (vii).

Estimates, Preparation of, Insufficient Votes, &c. (remarks) in Com., 5920 (iii).

Favoured Nation Treatment, Conventions *re* Commercial Relations, &c. (Ans.) 840 (i).

Financial Review, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 13442 (vii).
See 'Budget.'

Financial Stringency: *See* 'Wheat,' &c.

Fisheries Regulations, Violation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5780 (iii).

Foresters Subsidiary High Court B. 62 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 5175 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty (B. 57), Res. prop., 941; (M.) for Com. on prop. Res., 1213 (i); on M. for 1°, 1421 (i); 2° m., 2220, 3502; in Com., 3582, 3636; 3°m., 4317, agreed to (Y. 103; N. 5) 4376 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Sel. Com., 930 (i).

Franco-Canadian Treaty, Canadian Goods and Minimum Tariff, on M. (Mr. Ames) for Ret., 851 (i).

——— Delay in Approval, &c. (Ans.) 12655 (vii).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Franco-Canadian Treaty, Delays *re* Canadian Tariff (remarks) 13535 (vii).

——— Discussion *re* (remarks) 1206 (i), 3754 (ii).

——— Distribution to Members (remarks) 606 (i).

——— Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 12651 (vii).

——— Favoured Nation Clause and Foreign Countries (Ans.) 845 (i).

——— German Surtax, Effect, &c. (Ans.) 844 (i).

——— Going into Effect (Ans.) 8614 (v).

——— Imports from U.S., Exclusion, &c. (Ans.) 846 (i).

——— Information *re* (remarks) 570 (i).

——— Information in Detail (remarks) 1585 (i).

——— Maximum and Minimum Rate, &c. (Ans.) 178 (i).

——— Mess from His Ex. (presented) 6 (i).

——— and Most Favoured Nation Clause (Ans.) 514, 564 (i).

——— Preferential Tariff, Names of Countries, &c. (Ans.) 844 (i).

——— Preparation of Stmnt. (remarks) 8 (i).

——— Printing and Distribution, &c. (remarks) 94 (i).

——— Ratification by French Senate (remarks) 13083 (vii).

——— Shipments from Canada, &c. (Ans.) 4763 (iii).

——— Stmnt. *re* Papers to be distributed 848 (i).

——— U.S. Exports, &c. (Ans.) 896 (i).
See 'Mess. from His Ex.'

Fruit Inspection, in Closed Packages, &c. (Ans.) 2982 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3623 (ii).

Govt. Business (remarks) 13207 (vii).

——— Legislation *re* (remarks) 11123 (vi).

——— Suppl. Estimates, &c. (remarks) 11016 (vi).

Govt. Securities *re* Dom. Notes, &c. (Ans.) 6235 (iv).

Grain Shipments from the West, Financial Aid, &c. (remarks) 608 (i).
See 'Dom. Notes Bill.'

Grand Bend Wharf, Contract (Ans.) 5653 (iii).

G.T.P. Ry., Bond Issue, Sale of, &c. (Ans.) 8441 (v).

——— Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12694 (vii).

——— Guarantee Bonds (B. 171) 1° m., 8825 (v); 2°*, and in Com., 10771 (vi).

——— Medical Attendance, O.C. regulating

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Deductions (Ans.) 1937 (i).
—— Medical Fees, Deductions *re* (Ans.) 9473 (v).
—— Montreal Branch, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13301 (vii).
—— Route, Change of, Financial Reasons, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen,' Ques. of Priv., 8089 (iv).
—— Securities *re* Construction Contracts (Ans.) 357 (i).
—— Ties purchased in U.S. (remarks) 1445 (i).
Gunn, B. B., Late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 431 (i).
Halifax Garrison, Discontent *re* Pay, &c. (remarks) 5660 (iii).
Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Instruction *re* accepting Municipal Offices (Ans.) 3430 (ii).
—— Political Interference (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6648 (iv).
Hay and Straw Embargo, by G. B. (Ans.) 4765 (iii).
Hillsborough Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7189 (iv).
Immigrants stranded in Toronto (remarks) 429 (i).
Insurance Act Amt. (B. 42) 1° m., 827 (i); 2° m., 1741, (M.) to ref. to Banking and Commerce Com., 1743 (i).
Insurance Bill, Discussion *re*, 1107 (i).
—— Information *re* (remarks) 7099 (iv).
—— Introduction of (Ans.) 9272 (v).
—— (Remarks) 8386 (v).
Insurance Commission, Total Expenditure, Payments, &c. (Ans.) 232 (i).
—— Evidence, Sale of, for private Profit (Ans.) 6059 (iii).
Insurance Companies' Deposits, Total Amount, Securities, &c. (Ans.) 241 (i).
Insurance, Supt., Salary (B. 200) in Com. on Res., 12407 (vii).
Intercolonial Conference, Expenses of Canadian Ministers (Ans.) 13511 (vii).
—— Total Expenditure (Ans.) 13225 (vii).
See 'Colonial,' &c.
I.C.R., Circular *re* Payment of Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10128 (v).
—— Employees Provident Fund Amt. B. 117 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4995 (iii).
Iron and Steel Bounties, Amounts paid from 1903 to 1907 (Ans.) 4245 (iii).
Judges Salaries, Application *re* Payments (remarks) 11018 (vi).
Keewatin Timber and Pulp Lands, Disposal of (remarks) 13587 (vii).
Labour unemployed, Protection to (Ans.) 10735 (vi).
Lead Bounties (B. 191) prop. Res., 9773 (v); in Com. on Res., 10952; 1°*, of B., 10953 (vi); 2° m., 11235; in Com., 11243 (vi); 3° m., 12054 (vii).
Lead Bounty Bill, Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 11408, 11705 (vi).
Lithographing and Printing, Expenditure by Govt. Outside of Canada (Ans.) 1506 (i).
Live Stock, N.B., Information *re* Figures, &c. (Ans.) 1507 (i).
Loans, Temporary, since Oct. 1906, Rates of Interest, &c. (Ans.) 314 (i).
Loans, Temporary, Total Amounts, &c. (Ans.) 314 (i).
Loan of August, 1907, Names of Banks where discounted (Ans.) 564 (i).
Loan negotiated in London, Conditions *re* (Ans.) 12654 (vii).
Loans and Overdrafts, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Foster) 13584 (vii).
Loan of 1874, Commission for Renewal (Ans.) 11501 (vi).
Loan, Temporary or Advances, Rates of Interest (Ans.) 12654 (vii).
See 'Dom. Loans,' &c.
Lumber Combine Investigation, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 2977 (ii).
Lumber Duties from U.S., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to Com. of Sup., 9509 (v).
McGee, Hon. Thos. D'Arcy, Monument to (remarks) 6288 (iv).
MacIlreith, Mr., Legal Agent for Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11220 (vi).
Mail Subsidies to Steamships, Total Amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 689 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries, Extension (remarks) 6222 (iv).
—— on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12794 (vii).
Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7330 (iv).
—— Deptl. Investigation by Minister (remarks) 6526 (iv).
—— Distribution of Evidence (remarks) 10789 (vi).
—— Evidence, Printing, &c. (Ans.) remarks) 8517 (v), 11301 (vi).
—— on Inquiry for Evidence (Mr. Foster) 11203 (vi).
—— Leave of Absence for Mr. Watson (remarks) 10918 (vi).
—— Rep. of Judge Cassels (remarks) 10915 (vi).
See 'Civil Service,' &c.
Meat and Food Inspection Act, Number and Names of Establishments (Ans.) 1505 (i).
Military Camps, &c. (remarks) 9838 (v).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Mint Building, Ventilation of (Ans.) 3036 (ii).

Mint, Date of Operation, Value of Coinage, &c. (Ans.) 11297 (vi).

—— Gold Coins, &c. (Ans.) 2593 (ii).

Mint, on Inquiry for Papers, 938 (i).

—— Papers laid on Table, 941 (i).

Mint, Royal, Sums expended, Apptmts., &c. (Ans.) 232 (i).

Money-Lenders operating in Public Departments (Ans.) 1738 (i).

Montreal Turnpike Trusts, Indebtedness, Payments, Audit, &c. (Ans.) 1932 (i).

—— Payment of Interest, &c. (Ans.) 2979 (ii).

Mutual Reserve Life Insurance Co., Amount of Deposit in Govt. Hands (Ans.) 3485 (ii).

N.B. Credit, Amount of (Ans.) 1937 (i).

Obstruction to Supply, on M. (Mr. Fowler) to Com. of Sup., 10020 (v).

—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) 10025 (v).

Obstruction Tactics (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9221 (v).

Old Age Annuities (B. 120) in Com. on Res., 4690; 1°*, 4702 (iii); 2°*, in Com., 10848 (vi); 3° m., 12053 (vii); on Senate Amts., 13316 (vii).

Old Age Pensions Bill (M.) to withdraw, 3654 (ii).

Old Age Pension Scheme, on M. (Mr. Pringle) for Sel. Com., 2433 (ii).

Ordnance Property, Toronto, Sale Bill (prop. res.) 13226 (vii).

Ottawa Improvement Commission, Amount expended to Jan. 1st, 1908, &c. (Ans.) 11500 (vi).

Pacific Coast Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 40 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6182, 6228 (iv).

Parliamentary Documents, Distribution of (remarks) 610 (i).

Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, on M. (Mr. Sloane) to Com. of Sup., 3978 (ii).

Petroleum Bounty (B. 199) in Com. on Res., 12406 (vii); in Com., 12644 (vii).

Pianos rented, &c. for Speaker's Rooms (Ans.) 563 (i).

Post Office Savings Bank Deposits, Increase of Interest (Ans.) 691 (i).

P.E.I. Ry., Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2744 (ii).

—— Communication with C. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13353 (vii).

P.E.I. and G.B., SS. Subventions (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12754 (vii).

P.E.I., Harmony-Elmira Branch B. 202 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 12636 (vii).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

P.E.I., Subsidy, Deduction *re* Hillsborough Bridge (Ans.) 5079 (iii).

Provincial Subsidies, Amounts paid under present agreement, &c. (Ans.) 315 (i).

—— Amounts paid before and after Adjustment (Ans.) 8616 (v).

—— Dates of Payments, Sums owing, &c. (Ans.) 564 (i).

—— Date of last Payments, &c. (Ans.) 237 (i).

—— Increased Payments, &c. (Ans.) 173 (i).

Public Accounts (presented) 6 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3110 (ii).

—— Meetings, &c. (remarks) 9504 (v).

—— on M. to Conc. in 3rd Rep., 2160 (ii).

Public Bills and Orders, Govt. Business (remarks) 13493 (vii).

—— Precedence of, &c. (remarks) 3404 (ii).

Public Works Estimates, Discussion *re* (remarks) 5730 (iii).

Public Works, Estimated Cost, Extravagance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7146 (iv).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4937 (iii).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. Co., Deficit, &c. (Ans.) 6459 (iv).

Quebec Bridge, Dom. Govt. Guarantee, Amount, &c. (Ans.) 2394 (ii).

—— Investigation *re*, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Sel. Com., 2553 (ii).

Quebec Bridge Finances, Estimated Cost of Completion, &c. (Ans.) 5566 (iii).

—— Corrected answer, 6059 (iii).

Quebec Bridge Report, on Inquiry for, 6223 (iv).

Quebec Bridge and G.T.P., Agreement *re* Rentals, &c. (remarks) 13227 (vii).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 583 (i).

—— B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 11605 (vi).

Railway Commissioners Board Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8511 (v).

Religious Fanatics in Man. (remark) 12161 (vii).

Representation of the Mar. Provs. in H. of C., on M. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 9839 (v).

—— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Daniel) 9892 (v).

Returns, on Inquiry for, 6010 (iii).

Rifles purchased by Govt. since 1896, Number, Price, &c. (Ans.) 5654 (iii).

Royal Mint, Amount of Gold and Silver Coins (Ans.) 8613 (v).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Royal Mint, Ques. of Order *re* Govt. Apptmts., 1461 (i).

St. John Cold Storage Co., Names of Stockholders, &c. (Ans.) 1938 (i).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Political Interference of Warden (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5547 (iii).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8563, 8610, 9068, 9167 (v).

Seed Grain Bill, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2780 (ii).

Seed Grain for Settlers in Man., &c., in Com. of Sup., 2770 (ii).

See 'Grain,' &c.

Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, Extension of time for Payment, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2916 (ii).

Senate Sittings, Number of Days, Cost, &c., for 1895, 1906-7 (Ans.) 1114 (i).

Shipping Rings, Combinations, &c. (remarks) 5919 (iii).

—— Royal Commission *re* (remarks) 5916 (iii).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5520 (iii).

S. A. Volunteers, Land Grants (remarks) on M. for Sup., 11205 (vi).

South Huron By-Election, Amount paid Returning Officer (Ans.) 9270 (v).

Standard Plate Glass Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 41 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 6183 (iii).

Stanstead Election Papers, Disappearance of, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 8849 (v).

Supplies purchased by Govt., Apptmt. of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5822; (amt.) 5826, Agreed to (Y. 93; N. 43) 5879 (iiii).

Supply—(M.) for Com., 554 (i).

Supply (B. 96) *re* Seed Grain, 1° m., 2°*, and in Com., 2782 (ii).

—— (B. 136) 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 5957 (iii).

—— (B. 186) 1°*, 2°*, and 3°*, 10510 (vi).

—— (B. 220) 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 13579 (vii).

Supply, Changes in Procedure (remarks) 1884 (i).

—— Charges of Obstruction by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9895 (v).

See 'Obstructions,' &c.

—— Conc. (M.) 5499, 5915, 5919 (iii).

—— Discussion *re* Estimates (remarks) 5661 (iii).

—— Estimates, Basis of Appropriations (remarks) 5920 (iii).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10588 (vi).

Charges of Management (Dom. Notes) 5562 (iii); (Receiver General) 12160 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen.'s Office (salaries) 635 (i); Finance (Artz, J. G.) Conc., 13578 (vii); (Ross, H. T.) 12914 (vii); (salaries) 637 (i); Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office (salaries) 610 (i); Interior (salaries, &c.) 617 (i), 9708 (v); Militia (salaries, &c.) 611 (i); Printing and Stationery (salaries) 612 (i); Privy Council (Bennetts, F. K.) 12902 (vii); Railways (Butler, M. J.) 12756 (vii); Sec. of State (C. S. examiners) 12917 (vii); Sec. of State (salaries, &c.) 611 (i); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 648 (i).

Customs—Inspectors (salaries) 9577 (v); Outside Service (salaries) 9253 (v).

Finance (Treasury Board) 5562 (iii).

House of Commons (Clerk of Crown in Chancery) 10508 (vi); (printing, &c.) 10507; (provincial voters' lists) 10508 (vi); (sessional clerks) on Conc., 13578 (vii).

Inspection of Staples (inspectors) 12264 (vii).

Insurance (Supt.'s office) 12160 (vii).

Justice (Exhequer Court) 5507 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS Subventions (Canada and Australia) 13152 (vii); (China and Canada, &c.) 13152 (vii); (G. B. and Canada) 12728 (vii); (P.E.I. and G.B.) 12264 (vii); (St. John and Cumberland) 12263; (subsidies) 12262 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4017 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 5662 (iii); (customs dues) 5662 (iii); (supplies, &c.) 5662 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Brantford monument, Telephone) Conc., 13567 (vii); (charwomen) 10509 (vi); (Civil Service Commission) 13168 (vii); (cotton strikers) 13162 (vii); (Jamaica Earthquake) 5784 (iii); (Japanese riots, B.C.) 5783 (iii); (Olympic Games) 13167 (vii); (Prince Fushimi's visit) 5783 (iii); (seed wheat) 2770 (ii); (Yukon, Bank of Commerce) 13167 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (wrecks) 3152 (ii).

Penitentiaries (maintenance) 5514 (iii).

Post Office (stamps, &c.) 9111 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Emerson) 8535 (v); (Winnipeg warehouse) 8571 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (mint) 1453, 1472 (i); (rents, &c.) 11004 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Glace Bay) 7139; (Halifax) 7140; (Shelburne) 7173; (Westville) 7179 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Dom. Arsenal) 7437; (Knowlton) 7292 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Baddeck) 11220 (vi); (Lakevale channel) Conc., 13568 (vii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11083 (vi).

Railways Generally (extra clerks) 10344 (vi); I.C.R. (collection of revenues) 5694 (iii); (Moncton—Truro, additional line) 12760 (vii); (salaries) 10128 (v); Ry. Commission (Quebec Bridge) 12770 (vii).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Senate (salaries) 10489 (vi).
Trade and Commerce (Chinese Act) 12264 (vii).
Temporary Govt. Loans, Rate of Interest, &c. (Ans.) 234, 235 (i).
Town Site, Section 32, Erection of Public Buildings (Ans.) 1348 (i).
Trade and Commerce, Deptl. Rep., (presented) 7 (i).
Travelling Expenses of Ministers from March, 1907 (Ans.) 562 (i).
See 'Colonial,' &c.
Uniforms and Customs Refunds (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9570 (v).
Wallberg, E. A., Payments by Public Works Dept. (Ans.) 5086 (iii).
Water Carriage of Goods (B. 178) on M. for 2°, 13508 (vii).
——— (remarks) 13416 (vii).
Ways and Means (M.) for Com., 554 (i), 13579 (vii).
Ways and Means—The Budget, 5137 (iii).
Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6118 (iii).
Wednesday Evenings and Morning Sittings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9486 (v).
Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. 125 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6185 (iii).
West India Trade, Reciprocity Negotiations (remarks) 1860 (i).
Wharfs, Piers and Harbours, Total Expenditure since 1895 (Ans.) 5078 (iii).
Wheat Transportation from West, Financial Aid, &c. (Ans.) 173 (i).
——— Bank Negotiations (Ans.) 171 (i).
——— Financial Aid, &c. (Ans.) 1938 (i).
——— Financial Aid by Govt., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Copies of Papers, &c., 899 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. Foster) for Copies of Cor. &c., 2176 (ii).
——— Special Arrangements *re* Shipments of Feed Wheat with Ry. Cos. (Ans.) 893 (i).
Whisky, Illegal Distribution at Thetford Mines, Customs Frauds, &c. (remarks) 9894 (v).
Yukon Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9684 (v).
——— Dom. Revenue and Expenditures from March 31st to June 30th, 1907 (Ans.) 1346
——— Expenditures, Total Expenditure (remarks) *re* Question, 1128 (i).
——— Judges Salaries (remarks) 11123 (vi).
——— Money Transmission, Rates, *re* &c. (Ans.) 2979 (ii).
——— Revenue and Expenditure, Total Amount, &c. (Ans.) 1114 (i).

FINLAYSON, Mr. D., *Richmond, N.S.*
Behring Sea Commission, Expenses *re* (Ques.) 1733 (i).
Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12872 (vii).
Dodds, Mr. W., Information *re* (Ques.) 5655 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11865 (vi).
Public Accounts Com., Sittings concurrently with Hse. (M.) 9579 (v).
Washington Fisheries Commission at Washington, Expenses *re* (Ques.) 1732 (i).

FISHER, Hon. S. A. (Minister of Agriculture) *Brome.*
Accountants for Marine Dept., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4111 (ii).
Address, The, 213 (i).
Agriculture, Deptl. Rep. (prsented) 7 (i).
Anglo-French Exhibition, Canadian Representative (Ans.) 8611 (v).
——— Goods purchased from T. Lindsay Co. (Ans.) 8615 (v).
Architects Institute of Canada incorp. B. 88 (Mr. Walsh) in Com., 5385 (iii).
Archives Dept., Index Cards purchased, Names of Firms, &c. (Ans.) 6057 (iii).
Blankets purchased, Ret., on Inquiry for, 6465 (iv).
Boneless Meat, Frozen, Imported into G.B., Par. in English Newspapers, &c. (Ans.) 3231 (ii).
Brockville, Cheese Curing Room, Lease, Rental, &c. (Ans.) 3897 (ii).
——— Cold Storage Plant, Disposal of (Ans.) 3234 (ii).
Bubonic Plague, Prevention of into Canada (Ans.) 686 (i).
Canada and France SS Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6202 (iii).
Canned Goods Inspection Act Amt. (B. 147) 1° m., 6221; in Com., 6870 (iv).
Canned Goods Inspection Act, Enforcement of (Ans.) 3846 (ii).
Canned Goods Inspection Regulations, Names of Counties, &c. (Ans.) 514 (i).
Cattle Embargo by G. B., Removal of, Action of Govt. since 1896 (Ans.) 2168 (ii).
——— Par. in Montreal Gazette, 13081 (vii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12880 (vii).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 6223 (iv).
Cattle exported to U.S., Fees *re* Thoroughbreds (remarks) 2767 (ii).
Census (complete) of the N.W. Provinces Report (presented) 3422 (ii).
Census Map, Publication of (Ans.) 4406 (iii).
Central Experimental Farm, Sale of Cattle, &c. (Ans.) 2389 (ii).

FISHER, Hon. S. A.—*Con.*

Charlan, Mr., Salary as Tobacco Expert (Ans.) 11495 (vi).

Chartered Banks of Canada, Report (presented) 8086 (iv).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5109 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 189) in Com. on Res., 11350; 1° m., 10717; 2° m., 11315; in Com., 11362, 11536, 11634 (vi), 12163; on Senate Amts., 13520 (vii).

Civil Service Bill, Physical Fitness (remarks) 11018 (vi).

Civil Service Commission's Report, Investigation, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Powers, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7563 (iv).
See 'Marine.'

Civil Service Act Amt. Bill, (remarks) 11124 (vi).

Civil Service Examiners' Report (presented) 8086 (iv).

Cold Storage Establishment in East Elgin, Assistance to (Ans.) 352 (i).

Cold Storage Plants, Construction in Alberta (Ans.) 1685 (i).

Cold Storage, Number constructed, Applications, &c. (Ans.) 236 (i).

Cold Storage Ret., Letter of Mr. McKeown, on Inquiry for, 4223, 4407 (iii).
See 'N.B.'

Cold Storage Shipments, Number for year ending March 1908 (Ans.) 6404 (v).

Co-operation B. 5 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 4565 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on Amt. (Mr. Sproule) to M. for 3°, 13256 (vii).

Exhibitions, Amount of Subsidies paid to (Ans.) 4406 (iii).

Exhibitions outside of Canada, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 4584 (iii).

Experimental Farms, Establishment of, Names of Provs. (Ans.) 7990 (iv).

——— Pet. from Quebec Board of Trade (Ans.) 8182 (iv).

——— Establishment of (Ans.) 2593 (ii).

——— Number under control of Dom. Govt. (Ans.) 3897 (ii).

Experimental Farms, Rep. (presented) 1018 (i).

——— Total Receipts from Sales, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 4585 (iii).

Fruit and Dairy Divisions, Separation of, &c. (Ans.) 2166 (ii).

Fruit Inspection (apples) Complaints *re* (remarks) 2756 (ii).

Fruit and Vegetable Inspectors, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 516 (i).

FISHER, Hon. S. A.—*Con.*

Fruit Marks Act Inspection Amt. (B. 148) 1° m., 6221 (iv); in Com., 10553 (vi).

Fruit Marks Act, Prosecutions *re* Apples, &c. (Ans.) 4831 (iii).

Gold and Silver Marking Act Amt. (B. 123) 1°*, 5337; in Com., 5495 (iii).

——— (B. 197) 1°*, 11990 (vi); 2°*, in Com., 12554 (vii).

Govt. Steamers, Built in Canada (stmnt.) 11124 (vi).

Grain Commissioners Report, on Inquiry for, 4224 (iii).

Hay Shipments to S. Africa, Claims against Dept. of Agriculture (Ans.) 5791 (iii).

High Commissioner's Office, Increase of Salaries (Ans.) 10737 (vi).

Hog Cholera in Essex, Number of Animals slaughtered (Ans.) 9280 (v).

——— Compensations paid, &c. (remarks) 13089 (vii).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10498 (vi).

House of Commons Accountant, &c., Increase of Salary under C. S. Bill (remarks) 13528 (vii).

Inspection and Sale Act Amt. (B. 148) in Com., 6900 (iv).

Inspectors of Food Products, Number of Apptmts. (Ans.) 353 (i).

Jamestown Exhibition, Canadian Exhibits, &c. (Ans.) 5079 (iii).

Japanese Immigration, &c., Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2123 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Copies of O.Cs., &c., 880 (i).

Marine and Fisheries Investigations, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7351 (iv).
See 'C. S. Commission.'

Meats and Canned Foods Inspection Act Amt. (B. 149) 1° m., 6221; in Com., 6890, 7244; 3° m., 7215 (iv).

Meats and Canned Foods Inspectors, Number appointed, &c. (Ans.) 172 (i).

Meat Inspection Regulations, &c., Meetings at Chatham (remarks) in Debate on Address, 213 (i).

Moberley, Mr. H. J., Payments to, by Govt. (Ans.) 3818 (ii).

N.B. Cold Storage Co. and Ministerial Connections *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9321 (v).

N.B. Cold Storage Plants, Bonuses by Govt. (Ans.) 9272 (v).

Order, Ques. of, *re* Montreal Liquor Licenses, Remarks of Hon. Mr. Scott, 4065 (ii).

FISHER, Hon. S. A.—*Con.*

Perdue, Dr. M. B., Duties and Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 173 (i).

Presbyterian College, Halifax, B. 154 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 7668 (iv).

Prohibition Vote in Quebec (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 661 (i).

Returns, on Inquiry for 1018, 1740 (i), 2385 (ii).

Rhindress, Dr. Horace, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 6000 (iii).

Seed Grain Purchases, Apptmt. of Agent in P.E.I. (remarks) 3690 (ii).

Sheep Quarantine by U.S., &c. (Ans.) 13064 (vii).

——— (remarks) 13537 (vii).

Smith, Mr. W. M., Dom. Fruit Inspector, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 2393 (ii), 5085 (iii).

Supplies purchased by Govt., Appmt. of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5860 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture (Archives) 671; (census, &c.) 673 (i), 12879 (vii); (dairying) 10397; (exhibitions)10569 (vi), 12889; (fumigating stations) 12879 (vii); (Imperial Institute) 10623 (vi); (live stock) 12895 (vii); (Meats and Canned Foods Act) 12893 (vii); (Patent Record) 672 (i); (Seed Control Act) 5500 (iii); (seeds) 12891 (vii); (Year Book) 677 (i).

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (Dep. Minister) 12878 (vii); (salaries) 645; Trade and Commerce (salaries) 648 (i).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4044 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (experimental farms) 13340 (vii); Que. (Cookshire) 7283; (Grosse Isle) 7290; (Knowlton) 7291 (iv).

Quarantine (public health) 5504 (iii).

Railways—G.T.P. (inspection) 10390 (vi).

Timber Marking Act Amt. (B. 193) 1° m., 11120 (vi); in Com., 12408 (vii).

Trans-Canada Ry. Co.'s B. 107 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 5386 (iii).

Tuberculin Tests, Results of, &c. (Ans.) 9271 (v).

Wheat Frozen, Shipments from Man., &c., on M. (Mr. Blain) to adjn., 826 (i).

Woollen Industry, Number of Employees, Value of Output, &c. (Ans.) 7504 (iv).

FORGET, Mr. R., *Charlevoix.*

I.C.R. 'Ocean Limited,' Date of Beginning and ending of running (Ques.) 6054 (iii).

——— Trains and Official Cars, &c. (Ques.) 5474 (iii).

Post Office Savings Banks, Increase of Interest, &c. (Ques.) 691 (i).

St. Irenee des Bains, Apptmt. of Mr. Geo. Girard as Postmaster (Ques.) 5795 (iii).

FORGET, Mr. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont (Stanley Island pier) 5721 (iii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E., *Toronto, North.*

Accountants for Marine Dept., Payment to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4110 (ii).

Address, The, 66 (i).

Advertisements in Newspapers, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 509 (i).

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4721 (iii).

Advertising in Mar. Prov. Newspapers, Amounts paid, &c. (M. for ret.*) 936 (

Agricultural Implements, Amounts of Rebates, &c. (Ques.) 1112 (i).

Allan, Mr., Interference in Dom. Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 614 (i).

All-Red Route (remarks) in debate on Address, 87 (i).

——— on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12419, 12488 (vii).

——— Purposes of Mr. White's Duties in England (remarks) 608 (i).

——— Mr. Sifton's Address *re* Canada's Attitude (remarks) 947 (i).

——— Statement *re*, Negotiations (remarks) 366 (i).

American Bank Note Co., Agreement *re* Printing Stamps, &c. (Ques.) 2593 (ii).

American Cereal Co., Customs Refunds, &c. (Ques.) 3484 (ii).

Analytical Index to Debates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10504 (vi).

Anglo-Canadian and Continental Bank incorp. B. 141 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 7724 (iv).

Anglo-French Treaty, Ratification of by British Govt. (remarks) 11705 (vi).
See 'Franco, &c.

Anglo-Japanese Treaty, Cor., &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copies, 600 (i).

'Arctic' Str., Amounts expended for Repairs, Supplies, &c., from June, 1904, to June, 1907 (Ques.) 184 (i).

——— Cruise in Northern Waters, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4012 (ii).

Assay Office, Vancouver, Results, &c. (remarks) on Conc., 13573 (vii).

Bait Freezer and Cold Storage Plant in St. John, N.B., Cor., Agreements, &c., with Govt (M. for copies*) 558 (i).

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 7307 (iv); on M. for 2°, 10924; in Com., 10933 (vi).

Bank Act Amendments, on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 4309 (iii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Banque de St. Jean, Investigation *re* Failure (remarks) 9335 (v).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4380; in Com., 4393, 4408, 4497; on M. for 3°, 4530 (iii).

Bell, Dr., Additional Remuneration *re* Acting Director of Geological Survey (remarks) on Conc., 13569 (vii).

Belleville Hospital Site, Inquiry for Ret., 7506 (iv).

Bernier, Capt., Islands, Customs Ports Flagged by him (Ques.) 5208, 5466 (iii).

Blue Books, Distribution to Members, Changes *re* (remarks) 194 (i).

Boards of Trade Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11988 (vi).

Bonanza Post Office Theft, Investigation *re* (Ques.) 1291 (i).

Boundary Delimitations (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9743 (v).

Brass Importations, &c. (remarks) 6233 (iv).

Briar Island, N.S., Marine Signalling, Change of System (Ques.) 9266 (v).

Brodeur, Hon. L. P., Advances *re* Travelling Expenses for Priv. Sec., &c. (M. for ret.*) 1690 (i).

——— Travelling Expenses since July, 1904 (M. for ret.*) 1689 (i).

——— (Ques.) 1347 (i).

Buchanan Town Site (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10086 (v).

Budget, The (reply) 5163; (M.) to adjn. debate, 5199; (rsmd.) 5260 (iii).

——— (remarks) 519, 559 (i); 4316, 4670 (iii).

Budget Speech sent out by Deptl. Clerks (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10349 (vi).
See 'Financial,' &c.

Buffalo Herd, Location in Elk Park, &c. (Ques.) 5208 (iii).

——— Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10103 (v).

——— Purchased for Parks, Authority for Expenditure (Ques.) 896 (i).

Business of Hse. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 10688 (vi).

Cabinet Appointments (remarks) in debate on Address, 80 (i).

Canadian Building, Rental, Space, &c. (Ques.) 5207 (iii).

Canadian Loans, Rate of Interest (remarks) 12194 (vii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Canadian Press Association Subsidy B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 12841, 12850 (vii).

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11253 (vi).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10546, 10753 (vi).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 11351; on M. for 1°, 10718, 10727; in Com., 11369, 11549, 11634 (vi), 12164 (vii).

——— (remarks) 11124 (vi).

Civil Service Commission, Instructions to Judge Cassels, Inquiry for, 7505 (iv).

——— Investigation, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Powers, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7543 (iv).

Civil Service Commission, Rep., Inquiry for, 938, 1740 (i), 2787, 3043 (ii), 4315, 4495 (iii).

——— Number printed, &c. (remarks) 6222 (iv).

——— Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. Hse., 5884 (iii).

——— (remarks) on Presentation, 5631 (iii).

Civil Service System, prop. Res. (M.) to drop, 6242 (iv).

——— (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 9132 (v).

Clarke, Capt. Arthur, Compensation *re* Death, &c. (Ques.) 8179 (iv).

Clement, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt., Salary, &c. (Ques.) 11300 (vi).

Cold Storage Plant, Canso, Total Cost of Construction (Ques.) 8379 (v).

Cold Storage Ret., Missing Letter (remarks) 4407 (iii).

Cold Storage Co., Ques. of Priv. *re* Minister's Stmnt. *re* Insurance Commission, 9337 (v).
See 'N. B. Cold Storage,' &c.

Colonial Conference (remarks) in debate on Address, 82 (i).

——— Travelling Expenses of Ministers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1033 (i).

——— Travelling Expenses of Minister of Marine (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 998 (i).
See 'Imperial.'

Committee Meetings, Rep. in 'Globe,' on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bennett) 2383 (ii).

Congdon, Mr. F. T., Stmnt. *re* Administration of Estates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10111 (v).

——— (remarks) 13420, 13518 (vii).

——— Instructions *re* Estates Trusts (Ques.) 12413 (vii).

Congdon vs. Mrs. Wiley, Investigation, Rep. *re* (Ques.) 565 (i).

Contractors' Securities, Amounts retained (Ques.) 1112 (i).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com., 11981 (vi).

Customs Defalcations, Punishment of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9455 (v).

Customs Estimates, Obstruction in Sup. (remarks) 10133 (v).

Customs, Receipts and Expenditures, 1907-8 (Ques.) 12655 (vii).

Customs and Trade Returns, Duplicate Printing, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9732 (v).

Cyr, Mr., Letter from, Ques. of Order, *re* Stmnts., 8460 (v).

Debates, Official, Rep. of Com., Conc. without Notice (remarks) 8898 (v).

——— on M. (Mr. Monk) to ref. back to Com., 10248 (v).

Deep Waterways Commission, Inquiry *re* Proceedings (remarks) on M. for Sup., 11205 (vi).

Detroit River Tunnel, Customs Tariff *re* Materials, on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10472 (vi).

——— (remarks) 13526 (vii).

Documents in Depts., Access to Original Papers, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1135 (i).

——— Notice of Motion, on Order being called, 2794 (ii).

——— Production of, to Members, on M. for Sup., 1766 (i).

———Production of to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1628 (i).

——— (remarks) on M. to adjn. debate, 1851 (i).

Dog Fish Reduction Plant, Canso, Total Cost of Construction, &c. (Ques.) 8179 (iv).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8321 (v); in Com., 11828, 11895 (vi), 12945; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 13257 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11126 (vi).

——— in Com., 11163, 11165, 11203, 11408,11503, 11453, 11940; on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to M. for 3°, Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 11978 (vi); on Senate Amts., 13522 (vii).

Dom. Loan and Overdrafts, Disposition of, &c. (Ques.) 313 (i).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10796 (vi).

Doukhobors, Condition of, Par. in Montreal 'Gazette' (remarks) 2218 (ii).

Draper, P. M., Candidate for Municipal Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 614 (i).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4679 (iii).

Dunsmuir, Lt. Gov. of B. C. and Natal Act, &c. (remarks) 1738 (i).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4239, 4577 (iii).

Estimates, Insufficient Votes, *re* Public Works, &c. (remarks) in Com., 5923 (iii).

Falconer, K., Payments by Ry. Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10211 (v).

Falconer, K., Payment to for Services (Ques.) 8890 (v).

——— Emplymt. by Ry. Dept. (Ques.) 5078 (iii).

'Fielding' Dredge, Number of Days Working (Ques.) 7199 (iv).

Financial Review, (amt.) on M. for Sup., 13420 (vii).

See 'Budget.'

Fire Extinguishers purchased by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7646 (iv).

——— Cor. quoted by Minister, Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7784 (iv).

——— Inquiry for Original Papers, 8901 (v).

——— on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) 7664 (iv).

——— Production of Original Papers (remarks) 9281 (v).

Fish Exportations from Man., Value, &c. (remarks) 4241 (iii).

Fisheries Negotiations with Provs., Instruction to Mr. Bastedo (remarks) 4407 (iii).

Fort William Terminals Co.'s B. 101 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6224 (iv).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for Com. on Res., 1253 (i); on M. for 2°, 2220; in Com., 3582 (ii); on M. for 3°, 4341 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, Discussion *re* prop. Res. (remarks) 942 (i).

——— preparation of stmnt *re* duty units, 943 (i).

——— Delays in Ratification (remarks) 13536 (vii).

——— Distribution of, to Members (remarks) 606 (i).

——— Information *re* (remarks) 570 (i).

——— Information in Detail asked for, 1585 (i).

——— and Most Favoured Nation Clause, &c. (Ques.) 564 (i).

——— on M. (Mr. Monk) for Sel. Com., 931 (i).

——— Printing and Distribution (remarks) 93 (i).

——— Ratification by French Senate (remarks) 13083 (vii).

——— (remarks) in debate on Address, 86 (i).

——— Stmnt. *re* Tariffs (remarks) 8 (i).

——— U. S. Exports, Articles, &c. (Ques.) 896 (i).

Geological Survey Technical Officers (remarks) on Conc., 13574 (vii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 4230 (iii).

Georgian Bay Fisheries Commission, Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 991

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Girouard, Mr., Resignation from Yukon Council (remarks) 11634, 11938 (vi).
See 'Yukon.'

Gold Commissioner's Office, Yukon, Number of Clerks, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10108 (v).

Govt. Employees, Interference in Elections, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 614 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. on B. 115, 11908 (vi).

Govt. Ownership, &c. (remarks) in debate on Address, 75 (i).

Govt. Steamers, Amounts paid for Provisions, &c., for three years, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1512 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1099 (i).

Grain Transportation from the West, Financial Aid, Explanation in the Senate (remarks) 607 (i).

G..B., Australia and Canada, &c., Fast Line Steamers, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 558 (i).

G. T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2227 (ii); in Com., 12061 (vii).

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 8134 (iv).

——— Guarantee Bonds B. 171 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 8837 (v); in Com., 10772 (vi).

G.T.P. Ry., Bond Issue, Sale, &c. (Ques.) 8440 (v).

——— Commissions issued to Inspectors (remarks) 9716 (v).

——— Contracts, Date, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 6458, 6636 (iv).

——— Contracts *re* Eastern and Western Sections (Ques.) 6234 (iv).

——— Cost of Construction, on M. (Mr. Graham) to lay on Table, 12049 (vii).

——— Liquor Prohibition Sale: Inquiry for Ret. 2024 (ii).

——— Miles under Construction, &c. (Ques.) 165 (i).

——— Police Patrol (remarks) 7997 (iv).

——— Prohibition Zone, Cor. Pets., &c. (M. for copies*) 558 (i).

——— Purchase of Rails for Eastern Division, &c. (Ques.) 9263 (v).

——— Securities *re* Construction Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 356 (i).

——— Transcontinental Commission, Total Salaries, Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 13226 (vii).

Halifax Platform of Conservative Leader (remarks) in debate on Address, 66 (i).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 4224 (iii).

Hay Shipments to S. Africa, Claims *re* Damages (remarks) 5791 (iii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Hillsborough Bridge Claims, on Inquiry for Ret., 3691 (ii).

Hillsborough Bridge Ret., Inquiry for, 2882 (ii).

Hindus in B.C., Protests against by Immigrants, Par. in Ottawa Citizen, 5488 (iii).

——— Tel. *re* Contract Labour (remarks) 4407 (iii).

Homestead Patents, Settlement Conditions (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10095 (v).

Honey Imports, from 1898-1908, Amount, Value, &c. (Ques.) 8177 (iv).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5729 (iii), 10495 (vi).

——— Rules for Hours of Adjournment, on prop. Res. (Mr. Wright) 591 (i).

——— and Senate, Cost outside of Indemnities (Ques.) 4760 (iii).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction of, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6303 (iv).

Hyman, Hon. C. S., Date of Resignation, Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 166 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 5657 (iii).

Imperial Conference, 1907, Expenditure by Govt. (Ques.) 511 (i).

——— Travelling Expenses of Minister, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1513 (i).
See 'Colonial.'

Imports and Exports, ending Sept. 30th and Oct. 30th, 1907 (Ques.) 350 (i).

——— Values from June, to Dec. 1907 (Ques.) 1112 (i).

Imports for Home Consumption, Values for 1907-8 (Ques.) 13063 (vii).

Indian Schools, Rep. of Dr. Bryce (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 623 (i).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6467 (iv).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 833; on M. for 2°, 1742 (i).

Insurance Bill, Discussion *re*, 1107 (i).

——— Discussion *re* (personal explanation) Par. in Montreal 'Star,' 1860 (i).

——— Information *re* (remarks) 7099 (iv), 8386 (v).

Insurance Commission, Rep. *re* Political Literature, Ques. of Priv., 10792 (vi).

——— Rep., Ques. of Priv., 9461 (v).

——— Total Expenditure of Commission, Payments, &c. (Ques.) 232 (i).

I.C.R., Audit System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10211 (v).

——— Cars sent to U.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10222 (v).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
I.C.R., Circular Letter *re* Payments of Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10127 (v).
—— Claims for Damages, by A. W. Belyea, &c. (Ques.) 9472 (v).
—— Employees, and N.B. Elections (remarks) 3317 (ii).
—— Extension Policy (remarks) in debate on Address, 73 (i).
—— Train Service, Explanations *re* Delays, &c., on M. (Mr. Reid) for Ret., 6242 (iv).
—— Transportation, &c. on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4424 (iii).
Irrigation Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 970 (i).
—— B. 99 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4671 (iii).
Japanese Immigration into B.C. (remarks) in debate on Address, 77 (i).
—— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for O.Cs., &c., 881 (i).
—— Ques. of Order *re* Attacks on Prov. Govt., 1763 (i).
—— Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2101 (ii).
Lacas, E., Payments to, by Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 980, 1035 (i).
Ladysmith Wharf, B.C., Cost of (Ques.) 8176 (iv).
Lafferty, Thos., Payment *re* Removal of Snags in St. John River (Ques.) 8379 (v).
Land Titles Act Amt. B. 168 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 10526; in Com., 10528 (vi).
Lead Bounties B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 10952 (vi).
Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 11235; in Com., 11243; on M. for 3° (remarks) 11250 (vi), 12054 (vii).
—— Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 11407 (vi).
Lead Production, by Lead Producers, Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 11705 (vi).
Lighthouse Service on St. Lawrence, Steamers chartered, &c. (Ques.) 11299 (vi).
Loan of 1874, Commission for Renewal (Ques.) 11501 (vi).
Loan of Aug., 1907, Names of Banks where discounted (Ques.) 564 (i).
Loans negotiated in London, Conditions, &c. (Ques.) 12654 (vii).
Loans and Overdrafts, &c. (personal explanation) 13582 (vii).
Loans, Temporary or Advances, Rates of Interest outstanding, &c. (Ques.) 12654 (vii).
Loans and Overdrafts: *See* 'Dom. Loans.'
'Lord Kitchener' Tug Boat, Payments *re* Services (Ques.) 7198 (iv).
MacIlreith, Mr., Legal Agent for Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11220 (vi).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
MacIlreith, Mr., Payments to for Legal Services (Ques.) 695 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12789 (vii).
Marconi Co., and Commercial Press Business, (Ques.) 512 (i).
Marine and Fisheries, Change of Book-keeping System, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 510 (i).
—— O.Cs., Cor., &c., *re* System (M. for copies*) 852 (i).
—— ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3989 (ii).
Marine and Fisheries, Acting Deputy (remarks) 11939 (vi).
—— Deputy Minister, Date of Apptmts. of Suspended Officers, &c. (Ques.) 6982 (iv).
—— Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7335 (iv).
—— Amounts paid Counsel (Ques.) 8837 (v).
—— Delay in Investigation, &c., C. S. Report, &c., M. to adjourn (remarks) 8445 (v).
—— Evidence *re* (remarks) 11203 (vi).
—— Evidence, Distribution of (remarks) 10789 (vi).
—— Evidence and Reports, Printing, &c. (remarks) 11301 (vi).
—— Issue of Judge Cassels' Commission (remarks) 6466 (iv).
—— Method of Procedure (remarks) 10741 (vi).
—— Minister's Travelling Expenses, Refunds, &c. (Ques.) 8889 (v).
—— Public Investigation, &c. (remarks) 7321 (iv).
—— Rep. of Judge Cassels (remarks) 10915 (vi).
Marine and Fisheries Returns, Inquiry for, 2883 (ii).
Marine Signalling at Briar Island, Change of System (Ques.) 9266 (v).
Militia Depts., Threats by Min. of Militia (remarks) 13583 (vii).
Militia Schools, Garrisons, &c., Amounts paid for Provisions, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1512 (i).
Militia Stores, Inspection of, &c. (Ques.) 8181 (iv).
Mines Branch, Acting Director, Additional Salary (remarks) on Conc., 13569 (vii).
Ministers' Travelling Expenses from March, 1907 (Ques.) 562 (i).
Mint, Date of Operation, Values of Coinage, &c. (Ques.) 11296 (vi).
—— Sums expended, Apptmnts., &c. (Ques.) 232 (i).
—— Total Expenditure (M. for ret.*) 557 (i).
—— Inquiry for Papers, 938 (i).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

'Montcalm,' Str., Amount expended, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1886 (i).

'Montcalm,' Str., Investigation *re* Accident (remarks) 8171 (iv), 9715 (v).

——— Rep. *re* Accident (remarks) 10121 (v).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9483 (v).

Motions, Unopposed (remarks) 8839 (v).

National Battlefields (lands) B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 13500; in Com., 13502 (vii).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 11991 (vi).

N.B. Cold Storage Bait Co., Ministerial Interests, &c., on M. for Sup., 9283; on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 9425 (v).
See 'St. John,' &c.

N.B. Elections, Interference of Govt. Officials (remarks) 3579 (ii).

——— Telegram (read) *re* Interference, 3229 (ii).

——— M. to adjn. House, 3657, 3678 (ii).

——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3060 (ii).
See 'Govt. Officials.'

Newspaper Advertising, Amounts paid (Ques.) 509 (i).

Niagara Lands, Sale for Military Purposes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13540 (vii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) in Com. on Amt. (Mr. Bristol) 5060 (iii).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Amounts paid and Claims, &c. (Ques.) 167 (i).

Obstruction Tactics, Discussion of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9220 (v).

——— on M. (Mr. Fowler) to Com. of Sup., 10033 (v).

——— Order, Question of (Mr. D. Ross) 10024 (v).

Official Cars, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10332 (vi).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4691 (iii); in Com., 10850 (vi).

Old Age Pension Scheme, on M. (Mr. Pringle) for Sel. Com., 2425 (ii).

Opium Prohibition B. 205 (Mr. Lemieux) on Senate Amts., 13523 (vii).

Ottawa Improvement Commission, Amount expended to Jan. 1st, 1908, &c. (Ques.) 11499 (vi).

Pardoning Power *re* Criminals, Releases since 1896 (M. for ret.) 2822; (amt.) to Ret., 2846 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 9579 (v), 12919 (vii).

Patronage *re* Civil Service, &c. (M.) to drop, 6243 (iv).
See 'Civil,' &c.

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Port Medway and Medway Station Mail Service, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 11300 (v).

Post Office Act (postage) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 10704 (vi).

Preston, W. T. R., Employment by Govt. (Ques.) 360 (i).

P.E.I. Ry., Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2743 (ii).

Printing in 'Sun,' &c., Inquiry for Ret., 5661 (iii).

Prisoners, Released, &c.: *See* 'Pardoning Power.'

Protection Tariff, &c. (remarks) in debate on Address, 74 (i).

Provincial Subsidies, Dates of last Payments, &c. (Ques.) 237 (i).

——— Sums owing, &c. (Ques.) 564 (i).

——— (remarks) in debate on Address, 79 (i)

Public Accounts Com., Meetings of (remarks) 945 (i).

——— Freedom of Investigations, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3106 (ii).

——— Production of Original Documents (remarks) 4496 (iii).
See 'Documents,' &c.

Public Lands of Dom. (remarks) *re* in debate on Address, 70 (i).

Public Works, Applications *re*, Useless Expenditures (remarks) in Com., 5923 (iii).

——— Deptl. Salaries in Hamilton, Delays (remarks) 10016, 10119 (v).

——— Expenditure in Mar. Provs., since 1896 (M. for ret.*) 555 (i).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry., &c., Cost of Mail Service (M. for ret.*) 1130 (i).

Quebec Bridge Commissioners' Report, Inquiry for, 4494 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 13403 (vii).

Quebec Bridge and G.T.P., Agreement *re* Rental, &c. (remarks) 13227 (vii).

Quebec Bridge, Salaries to Officials (Ques.) 13517 (vii).

Quebec Tercentenary, Army and Navy Veterans Association (remarks) 7448, 7998 (iv), 8695 (v).

Ry. Act (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 10633; in Com., 10638; on M. for 3°, 11613 (vi).

Railway Estimates, Obstruction of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10129 (v).

Ry. Mail Clerk at Edmonton, Expenses *re* Trial (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9108 (v).

Ry. Subsidies, on prop. Res. (Mr. Graham) 13069 (vii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Returns, Inquiry for, 1018, 1740 (i), 2385, 2882, 3318 (ii), 4223, 4832, 6010 (iii), 13081 (vii).

Returns ordered and lost in H. of C., placed in Record Dept. (remarks) 2882 (ii).

—— Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv. 4663 (iii).

Rideau Hall Improvements, Expenditure (Ques.) 5467 (iii).

Roberts, Mr. J. M., Promotion in Interior Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9693 (v).

Ross Rifles, Number ordered, Payments, Total Number delivered, Advances, &c. (Ques.) 168 (i), 8180 (iv).

—— Contract for Bayonets (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13542 (vii).

St. John Cold Storage Ret., Inquiry for, 2309, 3690 (ii).

—— Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 3580 (ii). *See* 'N.B. Cold Storage.'

St. Louis, H., Employment by Govt., Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 1347 (i), 2977 (ii).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4232, 4579 (iii).

School Lands Exhange B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 8086 (iv); on M. for 2°, 8472 (v).

Seed Grain buying and distribution, Information *re* (remarks) 13420 (vii).

—— Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 10122 (v).

Senate, Number of Sittings, Cost, &c., for 1895 and 1906-7 (Ques.) 1114 (i).

Senate Reform, on prop. Res. (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 1574 (i).

—— (remarks) in debate on Address, 70 (i).

Shepley, Mr. G. F., Payments to (Ques.) 1112 (i).

—— Payments to (M. for ret.*) 1295 (i).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5410 (iii).

'Sir Wilfrid Laurier' Dredge, Completion, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 5207 (iii).

Smith, Mr. Obed, Status in London (remarks) 5491 (iii).

Spain, Commander, Expenses *re*, Inquiry for Papers, 4670 (iii).

—— Aud. Gen.'s Rep. *re* (Ques.) 4405 (iii).

—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1010, 1033 (i).

Stanstead Election Papers, Disappearance of, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 8847 (v).

Sub-target Machines, Number ordered, Dates of Order, Payments, &c. (Ques.) 171 (i).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Sub-target Machines, Papers referred to Com. for last Session (remarks) 945 (i).

—— Return, Ref. to Public Accounts Com. (remarks) 312 (i).

Supplies for Govt. Contracts, Tenders, Appmt. of Purchasing Commission (prop. res.) 5802; Neg. (Y. 44; N. 99) 5880 (iii).

—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) 5838 (iii).

Supply, Changes in Procedure (remarks) 1884 (i).

Supply (seed grain) B. 96 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 2783 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Galops (upper entrance) 5671 (iii).

Canals—Generally (extra remuneration) 5697 (iii); (salaries) 10325; (statistical offices) 10317; (surveys) 10340 (vi).

Canals—Lachine (slope walls) 5663; (staff salaries) 5696 (iii).

Canals—Welland (electric lighting) 12195; (piers and bridges) 12207; (Port Colborne) 12212 (vii); (Port Maitland piers) 5675 (iii); (surveys) 12207; (widening) 12211 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen.'s Office (salaries) 636 (i); Finance (Artz, J. G.) 13578 (vii); (salaries) 637; Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office (salaries) 610; Indian Affairs (salaries, &c.) 623 (i); Interior (astronomical survey) 9737 (v); (salaries, &c.) 619 (i); 9693 (v); Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 976, 1033; Militia (salaries) 611 (i), 8871 (v); Printing and Stationery (salaries, &c.) 614; Privy Council (salaries, &c.) 610; Public Works (salaries) 639; Sec. of State (salaries, &c.) 611 (i).

Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9229, 9444; (ports, &c.) 9220 (v).

Dom. Lands (forest reserves) 10054; (homesteads) 10086 (v).

Geological Survey (explorations, officers, &c.) on Conc., 13574 (vii).

House of Commons (Clerk of Crown in Chancery) 10508; (contingencies) 10502; (printing, &c.) 10507; (Library of Parlt.) 10504; (salaries) 10501 (vi); (salary increases) 13562 (vii); (Sergeant-at-Arms) 10503 (vi); (sessional clerks) on Conc., 13577 (vii).

Immigration (general expenses) 5754 (iii).

Interior—Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5755 (iii).

Marine and Fisheries (dredging plant) 4754 (iii); (Hudson Bay patrols) 3985 (ii), 4747 (iii); (ice-breakers) 1885, 1904 (i); (Lake St. Peter piers) 4752; (Sorel property) 4751 (iii).

Militia (annual drill) 5662, 5732 (iii), 10289 (v), 13540 (vii); (customs dues) 5662 (iii); (Ross rifle) 13542 (vii); (supplies, &c.) 5662 (iii).

Miscellaneous (charwomen) 10509 (vi); (seed grain) 2773 (ii).

N.W.M. Police (compensations) 8870; (pay of force) 8863; (pensions) 8870; (salaries) 8863 (v).

N.W.T. (Govt salaries) 10116; (school grants) 10117 (v).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 1086 (i); (ice-breakers) 2969; (life-saving awards) 2972; (masters and mates) 2971 (ii).
Post Office (extra assistance) 9112; (inspectors) 9108; (uniforms, &c.) 9110 (v).
Public Works (Ass't. Dep. Min.) 5698 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings, Alberta (Edmonton) 5705 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Fernie) 5706 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon drill hall) 8519; (Dauphin) 8520 (v); (Winnipeg hospital) 10955; (Winnipeg military) 10969 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (archives fittings) 5700; (improvements) 5707; (rents, &c.) 5707 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Quebec (Montreal pneumatic postal station) 5703 (iii); (Montreal station C) 7419; (Pointe St. Charles) 7419 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis) 11210; (Baddeck) 11219; (Port Hastings) 11266; (Port Hilford) 11267; (Port Hood) 11273; (Porter's Lake) 11263 (vi).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (Architects' branch) 11096; (cement testing) 11088; (clerical assistance) 11099, 11100; (Deep Waterways Commission) 11101 (vi); (gratuities) 5730; (graving docks) 5731 (iii); (telegraph branch) 11097 (vi).
Public Works—Telegraphs (Ashcroft-Dawson) 5731; (B.C., Cape Beale Lines) 5731; (cable service) 5731 (iii).
Railways—I.C.R. (collection of revenues) 5695 (iii); (salaries) 10126; (train service) 10159 (v).
Railways — Miscellaneous (arbitrations) 10329; (unprovided items) 10328 (vi).
Senate (salaries, &c.) 10489 (vi).
Yukon (Govt. salaries) 10107 (v).
Sutherland Rifle Sights, Contracts *re* (Ques.) 5206 (iii).
Temple, Mr. W. A., Emplymt. by Govt. in Yukon (Ques.) 1126 (i).
Thirteenth Hussars, Service Medal, *re* Fenian Raids (remarks) 13533 (vii).
Timber Leases *re* Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., on M. (Mr. Turriff) 8703 (v).
Timber Licenses, Applications to Mr. Mackenzie's Govt. (M. for ret.*) 3242 (ii).
——— (Ques.) 3038 (ii).
Timber Limits, Disposal of, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2693 (ii).
——— Original Papers, on M. (Mr. Lake) for Copies, 2855 (ii).
Timber Limit Grants to Messrs McLeod, Lundy, &c. (Ques.) 236 (i).
——— Statement quoted by Mr. Turriff, Inquiry for, 2386 (ii).
Timber Sales, Opening of Tenders, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Turriff), Ques. of Order, 11304 (vi).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10700 (vi).
Toronto Island Tunnel, Construction by Govt. (remarks) 5565 (iii).
Toronto Postmaster, Apptmt. of (remarks) 2594 (ii).
Torrens Land Title Fund, Information (remarks) 10916 (vi).
Transcontinental Ry. Commission, Expenses in Salaries, Rentals, &c. (Ques.) 13517 (vii).
Travelling Expenses of Ministers at Colonial Conference (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1040 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. in Com. of Sup., 3985 (ii).
——— Payments *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4117 (ii).
Travelling Expenses of Ministers from March, 1907 (Ques.) 562 (i).
Travelling Expenses of Minister of Marine (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 994 (i).
Trent Canal, Newmarket Canal, Reps., Surveys, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10315 (vi).
Turtle Mountain Timber Reserve, on M. of Sup., 7651 (iv).
Victoria Beach Piers, Amounts expended, &c. (Ques.) 237 (i).
Washington Treaty Negotiations and Behring Sea Commission, Duration of, &c. (Ques.) 2165 (ii).
Water Carriage of Goods B. 178, on M. for 2°, 13508 (vii).
Wednesday Evening Sittings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 11233 (vi).
Western Block Extension, Total Cost, Area, &c. (Ques.) 512 (i).
Whale Fishing Cos. in B. C., Licenses granted, on M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10283 (v).
Wheat Transportation, Financial Aid by Govt. (M.) for Copies of Memorials, Cor., &c., 899 (i), 2173 (ii).
Wheat Transportation from West, Negotiations with Banks, &c. (Ques.) 171 (i).
See 'Bank,' 'Financial Stringency'
Whitehorse Townsite, Portions sold and retained, &c. (Ques.) 11496 (vi).
——— (remarks) in Com. on B. 181, 11166 (vi).
Wiley, Mrs. Louise, Claims against Mr. Congdon, Cor., &c. (M. for ret.*) 1131 (i).
See 'Congdon,' &c.
Woollen Industry, Reply to Manufacturers Ass'n. by Prime Minister (remarks) 13420 (vii).
Woollen Industry, Pet. *re* (remarks) 13518 (vii).
Young, Mr. W. C., Inquiry *re* Charges as Mining Inspector, &c. (Ques.) 1127 (i).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Yukon Act (Govt.) Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10529 (vi).

Yukon Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. for Sup., 9580 (v).

——— Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 1131 (i).

——— Incomplete Return (remarks) 5785 (iii).

Yukon-Congdon, F. T., Investigation *re* Estates and Trusts (Ques.) 12050 (vii).
See 'Wiley.'

——— Election Conspiracy, Cor., &c., *re* Trial (M. for copies*) 1131 (i).

——— (Ques.) 1114 (i).

——— Expenditures, Total Amount (remarks) *re* Question, 1128 (i).

——— Revenue and Expenditures from March 31st to June 30th, 1907 (Ques.) 1346 (i).

Yukon Financial Administration, Rep. of Mr. Beddoe (M. for copy*) 1132 (i).

——— Inquiry for, 6464 (iv).

Yukon, Govt. Officials, Re-arrangement, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10108 (v).

——— Lithgow, J. V., Girouard, J. E., and F. T. Congdon, Emplymt. by Govt., Date of Apptmt., &c (Ques.) 5999 (iii).

Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10519 (vi).

Yukon Sunday Observance Law, Instruction to N.W.M.P. *re* (Ques.) 565 (i).

——— Telegraph System, Receipts and Expenditures (Ques.) 512 (i).

——— White Horse Ter., Original Grants of Lands, Names (M. for ret.*) 2796 (ii).

——— Whiskey Permit Agents, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 1127 (i).

——— Wiley vs. Congdon, O.C.s., &c., *re* Charges (M. for copies) (amt.) 1691 (i).

FOWLER, Mr. G. W., *Kings and Albert, N.B.*

Anse St. Jean Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vii).

Architects on Public Works, Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7122 (iv).

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 10923 (vi).

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7669 (iv).

Budget Debate, Ques. of Order, 6616 (iv).

Buildings, Architectural Designs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10984 (vi).

Campaign Literature (French) sent by Justice Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10354 (vi).

Campbellton Harbour, Gas Buoys, Tender *re* (Ques.) 8612 (v).

Campbellton Wharf, Tender *re* Piling Supply (Ques.) 8612 (v).

FOWLER, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*

Chapman, Mr. F. O., Emplymt. in Immigration Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9964 (v).

Chicoutimi Public Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13206 (vii).

Cigarette Restraint Bill (Mr. Aylesworth) on Senate Amts., 13015 (vii).

Civil Servants, Increases, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12913 (vii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11362, 11553 (vi); on Senate Amts., 13520 (vii).

Civil Service Commission Report (remarks) on Presentation, 5640 (iii).

Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9187 (v).

Clifton Breakwater, N.B., Amount of Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 695 (i).

Debates of the House, Time occupied by Members (remarks) 13540 (vii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11842 (vi), 13033 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11162, 11165, 11475, 11508, 11964 (vi).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10823 (vi).

Doukhobors Bonuses *re* Immigration (remarks) in Com. of Sup, 9952 (v).

Fisheries Regulations, Violation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5782 (iii).

Foresters, I. O., Charges in 'Le Canala,' Ques. of Priv., 6005 (iii).

Fraser, Mr. Donald, Dismissal from Customs, &c. (Ques.) 5473 (iii).

G.T.P., Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12677 (vii).

G.T.R. Hotel, Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 12072 (vii).

Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Political Interference (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6647 (iv).

Hillsborough Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7188 (iv).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6391 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6435 (iv).

Indian Lands, B.C., and Provincial Rights (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 629 (i).

Insurance Commission, Evidence, Sale of for Private Profit (Ques.) 6059 (iii).

I.C.R., Answer to Questions (remarks) 13415 (vii).

——— Earnings and Expenses (Ques.) 13510 (vii).

——— Employees, Circular *re* Non-Payment, Par. in St. John Press, on M. for Sup., 10016 (v).

FOWLER, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Extension to Great Lakes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2465 (ii).

—— Gross Earnings for 1908 (Ques.) 13225 (vii).

—— Newcastle Station, Inspector of Work, &c. (Ques.) 13511 (vii).

—— Receipts and Expenses (Ques.) 10514 (vi).

—— Stewart, Mr. James A., Emplymt. of (Ques.) 9712 (v).

Lobster Fishing Licenses, Refusals in Northumberland Co. (Ques.) 9472 (v).

Loggieville Dredging, Payments *re* (Ques.) 9472 (v).

Lyall, Mr. Peter, Contractor for G.T.P. Terminals at Winnipeg (Ques.) 7991 (iv).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12793, 12816 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries Dept., Misconduct of Official, Remarks checked, 6633 (iv).

Marine and Fisheries Warehouse, Sussex St., &c. (Ques.) 13062 (vii).

National Battlefields Commission (land) Amt. B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 13500; in Com., 13505 (vii).

N.B. Cold Storage Co. and Ministerial Connection *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9328; (M.) to adjn. debate, 9330; rsmd., 9344 (v).

N.B. Elections, Mr. Pugsley's Political Connection with (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7130 (iv).

—— Interference of Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3054 (ii).

N.B. Post Offices, Closing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9110 (v).

N.B. Ry. Mail Service Vacancy, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9107 (v).

Official Cars, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10331 (vi).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10854 (vi).

Parliament Grounds, Circular Letter from C. S. Association (read) in Com. of Sup., 11012 (vi).

Presbyterian College Board, Halifax B. 154 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 7668 (iv).

P.E.I. Ry. Branch Lines (remarks) in Com. on B. 215, 13485 (vii).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigations, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3130 (ii).

Public Works, Estimated Cost, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7153 (iv).

—— Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4924 (iii).

Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s B. 217 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 13491 (vii).

FOWLER, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*

Quilty, H. A., Examination *re* Train Despatcher (Ques.) 13225 (vii).

Railway Subsidies B. 215 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 13485 (vii).

Rattenbury & Co., Govt. Agents *re* purchasing Oats in P.E.I., Assignment, &c. (Ques.) 12392 (vii).

Richibucto Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12000 (vii).

Ross Rifle Defects, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Worthington) to Com. of Sup., 9053, 9070 (v).

St. John River, Removing Snags, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 3477 (ii).

Salmon Fishing by Nets, Privileges in Restigouche River (Ques.) 13518 (vii).

Seed Oats purchased in P.E.I., Prices, &c. (Ques.) 12391 (vii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 12598; in Com., 13047 (vii).

Stewart, Mr. James, Inspecting Auditor on I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10151 (v).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10607 (vi); (live stock) 12899; (seeds) 12891 (vii).

Canals—Generally (surveys, &c.) 10340 (vi); Lachine (Richard, Jos., compensation) 13174; Trent (damages) 12768 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (Dep. Minister) 12878; Finance (Ross, H. T.) 12914; Marine and Fisheries (asst. dep. min.) 12915; Railways (Butler, Mr. M. J.) 12755; Sec. of State (C. S. examiners) 12917 (vii); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 650 (i).

Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9240, 9260, 9444 (v).

Dom. Lands (forest rangers) 10041, 10051; (salaries) 10038; (surveys) 9987 (v).

Geological Survey (oil boring) 13165 (vii).

House of Commons (salary increases) 13567 (vii).

Hydrographic Surveys (Gulf of St. Lawrence) 13170 (vii).

Immigration (agents, U.S.) 9965; (literature, &c.) 9950; (relief to settlers) 9985 (v).

Indians—B.C. (land sales) 12752; (salaries) 12736, 13170; (schools) 13170 (vii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (pensions) 13324 (vii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (G.B. and Canada) 12728 (vii).

Militia (annual drill) 5741 (iii), 10287 (v); (gratuities) 13177; (R.M. College) 13177; (Stoney Creek monument) 13177 (vii).

Miscellaneous (Bank of Commerce, Yukon) 13168; (Chinese riots) 13156; (Civil Service Commissioners) 13168; (Olympic games) 13167 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2954 (ii).

Penitentiaries—B.C. (land purchase) 12918 (vii).

FOWLER, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Post Office (inspectors) 9107 (v), 13153 (vii)
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Cranbrook) 13338; (Ladysmith) 13338 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (cattle quarantine stations) 11008; (rents, &c.) 10982 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon drill hall) 10974 (vi); (Portage la Prairie) 13336; (Winnipeg) 13336 (vii); (Winnipeg hospital) 10960; (Winnipeg military) 10970 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Fairville) 13328; (Hillsborough) 13328 (vii); (Quarantine, steam sterilizer) 7187; (quarantine, water service) 7186; (St. John, military) 7186; (Tracadie, lazaretto) 7187 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 7112; (Bridgewater) 7135; (Halifax) 7140; (Halifax, customs) 7151; (Yarmouth) 7181, 7182 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 7490; (Guelph, armoury) 7684; (Hamilton, drill hall) 7692; (Hamilton, post office) 7698; (Kincardine) 7698; (Kingston) 7814; (Kingston, artillery park) 7701; (Kingston, gun shed) 7700; (Kingston, hospital) 7702; (Kingston, R.M.C.) 7702; (London, magazine) 7706; (London, military) 7706 (iv); (Niagara) 13332 (vii); (North Bay) 7811; (Owen Sound) 7817; (Port Arthur) 7825; (Renfrew) 7825; (St. Mary's) 7826; (Welland) 7830 (iv).
Public Works—Building—Ottawa (elevator attendants) 11011; (grounds) 11012; (heating, &c.) 11010 (vi); (museum) 1504 (i); (rents, &c.) 10983; (Rideau Hall) 11005 (vi); (skylights) 7816 (iv); (telephones) 11012 (vi); (Victoria Museum) 13477 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Chicoutimi) 7279; (Cookshire) 7281; (Dom. renewals) 7286; (Farnham) 7287; (Grosse Isle) 7289; (Lachute) 7294; (Lake Megantic) 7294; (Levis) 7298; (Longueuil) 7305; (Montreal, post office) 7417; (Montreal, station C) 7420; (Montreal, warehouse) 7424; (Nicolet) 7428; (Plessisville) 7430; (Pointe St. Charles) 7419; (Quebec, citadel) 7430; (Quebec, Dom. arsenal) 7435; (Quebec, drill hall) 7431; (Quebec, hospital) 7433; (Quebec, immigrant) 7432; (Quebec, warehouse) 7432; (St. Hyacinthe) 7440; (St. John's) 7441; (St. John's, military) 7442; (St. Rochs) 7438 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Sask. and Alta. (Moose Jaw) 13337; (Prince Albert) 13337 (vii); (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10975 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (maintenance) 11005 (vi).
Public Works—Dredging—B.C. (North Thompson River) 13351 (vii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (creosoted timber) 12028 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Beaver Harbour) 13344; (Dorchester) 13344; (Harvey) 13344; (Leonardsville) 13344; (Lorneville) 13344; (Miscou) 13344 (vii); (St. Andrews) 12011; (St. John) 12013; (St. John, tidal waters) 12000 (vi); (St. John, wharfs) 13345; (Tracadie) 13349 (vii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Pugwash wharf) 11279; (Round Hill wharf) 11282; (Yarmouth) 11291
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Goderich breakwater) 13350; (Juniper Island) 13350; (McGillicuddy & Smeeth claims) 13350 (vii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Souris) 13341; (Summerside) 13343 (vii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse a la Barbe) 12028; (Anse a l'Ilot) 12029; (Barachois de Malbaie) 12029; (Batiscan) 12036; (Berthier) 12029; (Bic) 12030; (Bonaventure) 12036; (Chateauguay) 12030; (Chicoutimi) 12030; (Clarke City) 12031; (East Templeton) 12031; (Lake Aylmer) 12032; (Lavaltrie) 12033; (Les Eboulements) 12033; (Montmagny) 12034; (Nicolet) 12034; (Notre Dame de Portage) 12034; (Peribonka) 12035; (Petite Decharge) 12034; (Piche Point) 12035; (Richelieu) 12037; (Rimouski) 12035; (Rivière du Lievre) 12037; (St. Laurent) 12042; (St. Maurice) 12041 (vi); (Three Rivers, deep water wharf) 13349 (vii); (Yamaska, dredging) 12043 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Sask. and Alta. (Lesser Slave) 13351 (vii).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (architects' branch) 11096; (clerical assistance) 11099; (Deep Waterways Commission) 11102; (telegraph branch) 11097 (vi).
Public Works—Telegraphs (Chicoutimi) 13179; (operating) 13178 (vii).
Railways—I.C.R. (Fredericton) 12758 (vii); (locomotives) 10150 (v); (Moncton-Truro additional line) 12760; (Petit Rocher spur) 12759; (St. Cyrille diversion) 12756 (vii); (stationery) 10181 (v).
Railways — Miscellaneous (arbitrations) 10329 (vi).
Railways—P.E.I. (Haney, M. J., claims) 12762 (vii).
Railways—Ry. Commission (Que. Bridge) 12769 (vii).

Turtle Mountain Timber Reserve (remarks) on M. for Sup, 7653 (iv).

Water Carriage of Goods B. 178, on M. for 2°, 13508 (vii).

Yukon Act (Govt.) Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10533 (vi).

GALLIHER, Mr. W. A., *Kootenay.*

Alberta and British Columbia Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 192) 1°*, 11120 (vi).

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7670 (iv).

Blunden, Frederick, Trial and Conviction, on M. (Mr. Ward) for Cor., 3474 (ii).

Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5950 (iii).

GALLIHER, Mr. W. A.—*Con.*

British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 13) 1°*, 350 (i).

Calgary and Fernie Ry. Co.'s (B. 33) 1°*, 606 (i).

Cannon, Catharine Ann Relief (B. 175) M. to remit Fees, 13510 (vii).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10546, 10760 (vi).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5128 (iii).

Documents in Dept., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1170 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. No. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8619 (v); in Com., 11894 (vi); on Amt. (Mr. Sproule) to M. for 3°, 13256 (vii).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4578 (iii).

——— B. 213 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13280 (vii).

Fort William Terminals Ry. Co.'s B. 101 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6225 (iv).

Gammell, Edith Maud Rosario Relief (B. 139) 1°*, 5913; 2° m., 6190 (iii); in Com., 7141 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6437 (iv).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6492 (iv).

Irrigation Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 959 (i).

Japanese Immigration, Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2044 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for O.Cs., &c., 878 (i).

Land Titles Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6519 (iv).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 11237; in Com., 11243 (vi); on M. for 3°, 12059 (vii).

Metal Shingle Patent Relief (B. 207) 2° m., 12649; (M.) to ref. to Com. on Private Bills, 12649 (vii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 4997 (iii).

Northwestern Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 54) 1°*, 1108; 2° m., 1468 (i).

Obstruction Tactics (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9224 (v).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4929 (iii).

Quebec Bridge Rep., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Conc., 13405 (vii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 13404 (vii).

GALLIHER, Mr. W. A.—*Con.*

Railway Act (commission) Amt B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4967 (iii).

Ry. Act (telephones) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10653 (vi).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4580 (iii).

Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, Extension of Time for Payments, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2920 (ii).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5413, 5519 (iii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3808 (ii).

Suburban Mail Delivery, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3284 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Dom. Lands (coal lands) 10070 (v); Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Mint) 1484 (i).

Travelling Expenses of Ministers to Colonial Conference, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3993 (ii).

Vancouver Bank incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 4580 (iii).

Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8489 (v)

GANONG, Mr. G. W., *Charlotte.*

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3870 (ii).

Charlotte County Wharf, Pet. *re* Erection (Ques.) 5202 (iii).

Cirkel, Franz, Remuneration *re* Geological Report *re* Graphite Properties, &c. (Ques.) 7935 (iv).

Glucose, Quantity imported from G. B. (Ques.) 6980 (iv).

Grand Manan Telegraph System, Application *re* Leasing (Ques.) 6463 (iv).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6493 (iv).

I.C.R. Station, Asphalt Platforms, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 5466 (iii).

Leonardville Wharf, Rep. *re* Estimated Cost (Ques.) 6463 (iv).

N.B. Coal and Ry. Co., Balance of Subsidy, Claims *re* (Ques.) 9270 (v).

N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference by Dom. Govt., on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 3667 (ii).

Pianos rented, &c., for Speakers' Rooms (Ques.) 563 (i).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4935 (iii).

Rails purchased from Govt. by N. B. Coal and Ry. Co., &c., Amounts paid and still due (Ques.) 9269 (v).

GANONG, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*

Richibucto Wharf, Length, Purchase Price, &c. (Ques.) 12412 (vii).

Seal Cove Dredging, Rep. *re* Estimated Cost (Ques.) 6463 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5040; (Thunder Bay ice-breaker) 5043 (iii).

Marine, &c., Public Works (ship channel) 5036 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vernon) 10883; (Victoria immigration) 10883 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10897 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8533 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 7497; (Kingston, R.M.C.) 7705; (Leamington) 7705; (Markham) 7710; (North Bay) 7718 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (heating, &c.) 11009; (rents, &c.) 11002 (vi).

Railways—I.C.R. (supplies) 10189; (train service) 10160 (v).

Welchpool, N.B., Wharf, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 7935 (iv).

White Head Wharf, Report *re* Cost (Ques.) 6463 (iv).

GAUVREAU, Mr. C. A., *Temiscouata.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12923 (vii).

I.C.R. Employees Provident Fund Act, Names on List (Ques.) 4582 (iii).

Lighthouses in Quebec, Classification, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 172 (i).

——— Rep. of Inspectors, &c. (M. for copy*) 697 (i).

Literary Aid Fund, Proposed Govtl. Action (Ques.) 1286 (i).

Mutual Reserve Life Insurance Co., Amount of Deposit with Govt., &c. (Ques.) 3485 (ii).

Rivière du Loup Station, Improvement to (Ques.) 5468 (iii).

Shipping Master, Quebec, Apptmt. of, Capt. Koenig's Duties (Ques.) 11699 (vi).

SUPPLY—

Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 4757 (iii).

Trois Pistoles Station, I.C.R., Construction of (Ques.) 12652 (vii).

GEOFFRION, Mr. V., *Chambly and Vercheres.*

G.T.P., Hodgins, Major, Charges *re* (M.) to conc. in Rep. of Special Com., 12265, Agreed to, 12389 (vii).

——— 1st rep. (presented) 8515 (v).

SUPPLY—

Public Works — Buildings — Que. (Longueuil) 7305 (iv).

GERMAN, Mr. W. M., *Welland.*

Admiralty Court Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 4852 (iii).

Belleville and North Hastings Ry., &c., Ques. of Order, 2809 (ii).

Dom. Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. (B. 84) 1°*, 1859 (i).

Niagara Grand Island Bridge Co.'s (B. 48) 1°*, 891 (i).

Port Colborne Harbour Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12211 (vii).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3093 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Welland (Port Colborne) 12212; (surveys) 12207 (vii).

GERVAIS, Mr. H., *Montreal (St. James).*

Admiralty Court Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. Aylesworth) on prop. Res., 2881 (ii); in Com. on Res., 4854 (iii).

Anglo-Canadian Insurance Co.'s Change of Name (B. 126) 1°*, 5256 (iii).

Architects, Institute of Canada incorp. B. 88 (Mr. Walsh) in Com., 5379, 5408, 5785, 5953 (iii).

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10950 (vi).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) on M. for 2°, 3419 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11538 (vi).

Criminal Code (libel) Amt. (B. 92) 1° m., 2543 (ii).

——— (trade restraint) Amt. (B. 96) 1° m., 2976 (ii).

Debates, Official (M.) *re* Correction in Res. on Committees, 824 (i).

——— 1st Rep. (presented) 2590 (ii).

——— 2nd and 3rd Reports of Committee (presented) 6979 (iv).

——— 2nd Rep. (M.) to conc., 7834 (iv); (amt.) 13224 (vii).

——— 4th Rep. of Com. (M.) to conc., 8835 (v).

——— 4th Rep., on M. (Mr. Monk) to ref. back to Com., 10228 (v).

Debates, Official Reporters, and Civil Service Bill (remarks) in Com. on B. 189, 11539 (vi).

Dom. Guarantee Co., Limited (B. 127) 1°*, 5255 (iii).

G.T.P., Montreal Branch, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13302 (vii).

Montreal Circuit Court Judges, Increase in Salary (remarks) in Com. on Bill 206, 12552 (vii).

Montreal Excise Officers, Increases to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 817 (i).

Montreal Liquor Licenses, Attack of Hon. Mr. Scott, Ques. of Priv., 4064 (ii)

GERVAIS, Mr. H.—*Con.*

St. Lawrence Power Co. and Long Sault Dam, Cor., Plans, &c. (M. for copies) 2996 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Excise (provisional allowances) 817 (i).

Supreme Court Act (appeals) Amt. (B. 91) 1° m., 2542 (ii).

Travellers Life Assurance Co.'s Incorp. (B. 35) 1°*, 606 (i).

GIRARD, Mr. J., *Chicoutimi and Saguenay.*

Chicoutimi Public Works Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13188 (vii).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4886 (iii).

Trans-Canada Ry. Co.'s (B. 107) 1°*, 3834 (ii); in Com., 5386 (iii).

GORDON, Mr. D. A., *Kent, E.*

Battlefields of Canada, B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4389 iii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of Sale, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5253 (iii).

Floods at Chatham, Damages *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 4743 (iii).

Giraud, Eugene Francois, Patent Relief (B. 52) 1°*, 1108 (i).

Immigration Agents in Ont., on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 3176 (ii).

Immigration Distribution Agents, James S. Waugh, Cor., &c. (M. for copy*) 1690 (i).

Obstruction *re* Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9898 (v).

Railway Act (Commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4970 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 7486 (iv).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P., (Minister of Railways and Canals) *Brockville.*

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4721 (iii).

Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidies, &c. (Ans.) 892 (i).

Algoma Steel Co., Orders for Steel, &c. (remarks) 8606 (v).

Bear River Station Dwelling, P.E.I. Tender, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 2161 (ii).

Beauharnois Canal, Investigation by M. Dupuis, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 3038 (ii).

——— Lease to Robert Co., &c. (Ans.) 8443 (v).

——— Lease on Inquiry for, 1740 (i).

——— (remarks) 13475 (vii).

Belleville and North Hastings Ry. Co. and G.T. Ry., on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Cor., 2811 (ii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7670 (iv), 8552, 9066 (v).

'Bessie Butler' Str., Dimensions, &c., Use of by R. C. Clergy (Ans.) 12411 (vii).

Bobcaygeon Dam, Flooding of Highways, on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2993 (ii).

——— Transfer of Power Plant, &c. (Ans.) 1114 (i).

Boone, C. S., Co., Amounts paid for Dredging (Ans.) 4244 (iii).

Bridge Subsidies to Ry. Cos., on Amt. (Mr. Leonard) 13310 (vii).

Brockville-Ottawa Ry. Service, on M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn. (remarks) 192 (i).

——— Connections with C.P.R. (remarks) 432 (i).

Brockville-Ottawa and Prescott Ry. Connections, &c. (remarks) 434 (i).

Buell, W. S., Employment *re* Telephone Commission (Ans.) 10011 (v).

Campaign Literature sent by Ry. Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10343 (vi).

Campbellford, Lake Ontario & Western Ry. Co., Exercise of Powers, &c. (Ans.) 236 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com. 4231 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s (B. 214) prop. Res., 13282; in Com., 13420 (vii).

Canadian Northern Ry., Rep. of Engineer *re* Erwood Branch (remarks) in Com., 13309 (vii).

——— Rep. of Engineer *re* Erwood and Pas Mission (remarks) 13475 (vii).

C.P.R., Saskatchewan Bridge Construction, in Com. on Res., 13305 (vii).

Canals, Statistical Branch, List of Officers (read) 10317 (vi).

Cataract Power Co., Amount of Water diverted at De Cew Falls (Ans.) 897 (i).

Central Ry. of Canada, Charter, Deposit, &c. (Ans.) 4767 (iii).

Charlottetown, Pipe Line to Tank, Contract *re* (Ans.) 5656 (iii).

Charlottetown Ry. Station, Contract Price *re* Construction (Ans.) 517 (i).

Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. House, 5894 (iii).

Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9207 (v).

Cold Storage Co. of N.B., Lease of Land to, &c. (Ans.) 563 (i).

Cold Storage Cars for I.C.R. *re* Dairy Produce, Number, &c. (Ans.) 1688 (i).

Cooper & White, Payments to Govt. for Land at Welland (Ans.) 3841 (ii).

Cornwall Canal, Accident to Bank (statement, 11120 (vi).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

Cornwall Canal, (remarks) 12660 (vii).
—— Rep. *re* Repairs, 12161 (vii).
—— Statement *re* Breakage, 11406 (vi).
Cornwall Canal, Arrangements with M'f'g. Cos., *re* Water Power (remarks) 13084 (vii).
—— Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12198 (vii).
Cowly and Highwood, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13299 (vii).
Deep Waterways Commission, Damming of St. Lawrence at Long Sault (remarks) 13152 (vii).
Dom. Power Co.'s Bill, on Inquiry for, 10919 (vi).
Dredging Contracts, Basis of Payments, &c. (Ans.) 9711 (v).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 213) prop. Res., 13258; in Com. on Res., 13278; 1° of B., 13282; in Com., 13419 (vii).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4239 (iii).
Employees of Parliament, Religion, &c., on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Ret., 5483 (iii).
Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13297 (vii).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13299 (vii).
Express Charges in Mar. Prov., Complaints *re* (Ans.) 518 (i).
Falconer, Kenneth, Emplymt. in Ry. Dept. (Ans.) 5078 (iii).
—— Payments by Ry. Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10211 (v).
Fort William Terminals B. 101 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6181 (iii).
Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3635, 3794 (ii).
Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6272 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry., Accidents on Construction (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6656 (iv).
—— Accidents *re* Construction, Prevention of (remarks) 6850 (iv).
—— Accidents to Workmen, Investigation, &c. (remarks) 10624 (vi).
—— Apptmt. of District Engineer at Kenora (Ans.) 895 (i).
—— Branch Lines, B. 51 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 7141, 8137 (iv), 8552, 8609, 8742, 9381 (v).
—— Classifications of Districts 'B' and 'F,' Investigation *re* (Ans.) 12051 (vii).
—— Construction, Accidents to Employees (remarks) 7447 (iv).
—— Contracts, Dates, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ans.) 6458, 6637 (iv).
—— Contracts *re* Eastern and Western Sections, &c. (Ans.) 6234 (iv).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

G.T.P. Ry., Contract for Supplies to District No. 3 (Ans.) 1120 (i).
—— Cost of Construction (M.) to lay on Table, 12049 (vii).
—— Cost of Construction, on Stmnt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 12247 (vii).
—— Cost of Construction (reply) on M. for Sup., 12662 (vii).
—— Cost of Construction (remarks) 10916, 11407, 11939 (vi).
—— Discrimination against Canadian Contractors (Ans.) 7936 (iv).
—— Eastern Division, Estimated Length, &c. (Ans.) 5563 (iii).
—— Eastern and Western Limits, Establishment of (Ans.) 9265 (v).
—— Engineering Staff, Changes *re* (Ans.) 509, 681 (i).
—— Estimated Cost, Inclusive of Terminals, &c. (Ans.) 9265 (v).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10395 (vi).
—— Grand Falls and Moncton Section, Contract *re* (Ans.) 9266 (v).
—— La Tuque Branch, Damages by Floods, &c. (explanation) 8894 (v).
—— La Tuque Branch, Damages by Flooding (remarks) 8607 (v).
—— Liquor, Prohibition of Sale, on Inquiry for Ret., 2024 (ii).
—— Medical Officer Parent, Payments to (Ans.) 8618 (v).
—— Miles under Construction, &c. (Ans.) 166 (i).
—— Moncton and Winnipeg Section, Number of Miles located (Ans.) 2387 (ii).
—— Montreal Branch, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13300 (vii).
—— and N.T. Ry., Disputed Question (Ans.) 6236 (iv).
—— Policy *re* Police Patrol (remarks) 7997 (iv).
—— Prohibition Zone, Reduction of (Ans.) 517 (i).
—— Protest *re* Land Acquisitions (Ans.) 6640 (iv).
—— Purchase of Rails, &c., for Eastern Div. (Ans.) 9264 (v).
—— Resignation of Major Hodgins, &c. (Ans.) 359 (i).
—— Return, on Inquiry for, 6288 (iv).
—— Steel Rail Contracts, Importations, &c. (Ans.) 12775 (vii).
—— Steel Rails, Names of Manufacturers, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 10790 (vi).
—— Steel Rails, Purchases, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 10738 (vi).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

G.T.P. Ry., Steel Rails purchased, Corrected Answer, 13065 (vii).

—— Supplies to Prince Rupert via American Routes (remarks) 9026 (v).

—— Transcontinental Commission, Salaries, Expenses, &c. (Ans.) 13226, 13517 (vii).

—— Transportation of Supplies, Contract, &c. (Ans.) 1932 (i).

—— Winnipeg to Moncton Section, Number of Miles completed, &c. (Ans.) 6643 (iv).

Gunnip, Mr. James, Pet. *re* Claims for Injuries (Ans.) 3844 (ii).

Halifax and South-western Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13296 (vii).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3226, 3621, 3702, 3726 (ii),4225; on M. for 3°, 4363, 4542 (iii).

Harlaka Junction, Ry. Connection (remarks) 434 (i), 3317 (ii), 10179 (v).

Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Political Interference (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6648 (iv).

Hillsborough Bridge, Total Cost *re* Construction (Ans.) 1686 (i).

—— Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) 1739 (i).

—— on Inquiry for Ret., 2882, 3042, 3690 (ii).

Hodgins, Major, Resignation from G.T.P. Staff (Ans.) 516 (i).

Holland River Dredging, Divisional Engineer, &c. (Ans.) 4767 (iii).

—— Name of Inspector (Ans.) 3037 (ii).

—— Payments to Lake Simcoe Dredging Co. (Ans.) 2980 (ii).

Hunter, Henry C., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1292 (i), 3237 (ii).

I.C.R., Accidents, Letter *re*, &c. (remarks) 6987 (iv).

—— Amqui Station, Cost of Construction (Ans.) 10012 (v).

—— Amqui Station, Vote *re* Construction, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 12774 (vii).

—— Asphalt Platforms: *See* 'Stations.'

—— Audit System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10151, 10214 (v).

—— Book-keeping System, Cor. *re* Par. in St. John Daily Telegraph, 5260 (iii).

—— Cars sent to U.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10222 (v).

—— Circular *re* Payment of Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10127 (v).

—— Claims Agent, Mr. E. H. Allen, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 3481 (ii).

—— Claims *re* Damages, Settled and unsettled (Ans.) 5793 (iii), 7196 (iv).

—— (remarks) 6002 (iii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Concrete Pipe Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 6640 (iv).

—— Connections with Quebec Central at Lévis (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10179 (v).

—— Dartmouth Branch Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13290 (vii).

—— Delays to 'Maritime Express' (Ans.) 8615 (v).

—— Deterioration in Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10149 (v).

—— Earnings and Expenses (Ans.) 13511 (vii).

—— (remarks) 13415 (vii).

—— Employees and Civic Elections in Halifax (remarks) 6845 (iv).

—— Increased Wages, &c. (Ans.) 2981 (ii).

—— Employees, and Municipal Elections (remarks) 2884 (ii).

—— Employees, Number and Names of Persons taken in N.B. during Jan. and Feb. (Ans.) 5793 (iii).

—— Employees Provident Fund Act, Names on List (Ans.) 4582 (iii).

—— Employees Provident Fund Amt. (B. 117) 1° m., 4576; in Com., 4994 (iii).

—— Employees and Provincial Elections (remarks) 9777 (v).

—— Gross Earnings for 1908 (Ans.) 13225 (vii).

—— Harlaka Junction, Ry. Connections, &c. (remarks) 434 (i), 3317 (ii), 10179 (v).

—— Horses killed at Truro, Compensation &c. (remarks) 434 (i), 3317 (ii), 10179 (v).

—— Ice Supply Contract (Ans.) 5259 (iii).

—— Ice supplied by J. A. McDonald, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 7446 (iv).

—— Lac Saumon Station (Ans.) 12652 (vii).

—— Moncton Workshops, Tenders *re* Leasing (Ans.) 5800 (iii).

—— Motor Cars, Test *re* Operation, &c. (Ans.) 566 (i).

—— Newcastle Station, Inspector of Work, &c. (Ans.) 13511 (vii).

—— Notices printed in French, &c. (Ans.) 7936 (iv).

—— 'Ocean Limited,' Number of Trips, &c. (Ans.) 6054 (iii).

—— O'Shaughnessy, Pass to (Ans.) 11936 (vi).

—— Oxford and Pictou Branch, Total Expenditure *re* Construction (Ans.) 10733 (vi).

—— Painsec Junction and Pointe du Chene Train Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10158 (v).

—— Passes issued to Mr. P. S. Archibald, &c. (Ans.) 2387 (ii).

—— Pictou Branch, Transfer from Halifax Division, &c. (Ans.) 12774 (vii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

I.C.R., answer to question (remarks) 12661 (vii).

—— Pictou and Copper Crown Co., Total Expenditure *re*, &c. (Ans.) 10734 (vi).

—— Pictou Engine House, Contract *re* Construction, &c. (Ans.) 1683 (i).

—— Pictou Station, Concrete Sidewalk, Total Cost of Construction (Ans.) 10790 (vi).

—— Rates, Increase in Winter to P.E.I. (Ans.) 5995 (iii).

—— Receipts and Expenditures (Ans.) 10514 (vi).

—— Revenue from Terminals, &c. (Ans.) 5471 (iii).

—— Riviere du Loup Station Master (Ans.) 7445 (iv).

—— Rolling Stock, &c. (statement) in Com. of Sup., 5697 (iii).

—— Ste. Monique Gates, Number to be made (Ans.) 11936 (vi).

—— Stations, Asphalt Platforms, Contracts, *re* (Ans.) 5466 (iii).

—— Steel Rails purchased from Algoma Steel Co., Contracts *re* (Ans.) 9269 (v).

—— Stellarton to Pictou, Total Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 10734 (vi).

—— Stewart, Mr. James A., Emplymt. of (Ans.) 9712 (v).

See 'Audit,' &c.

—— Sunday Trains, Instructions *re* (Ans.) 10735 (vi).

—— Tatamagouche, Delay in Train Service (Ans.) 1292 (i).

—— Ties delivered, Change *re* Inspection (Ans.) 12052 (vii).

—— Trains, Hauling of Private Cars (Ans.) 5474 (iii).

—— Train Service, Explanations *re* Delays, on M. (Mr. Reid) for Ret., 6242 (iv). 10149 (v).

—— Transportation, &c. (annual statement) on M. for Sup., 4420 (iii).

—— Trois Pistoles Station (Ans.) 12652 (vii).

—— Truro Buildings, Name of Tenderers (Ans.) 6233 (iv).

—— Truro Engine House, Contract to Rhodes & Co. (Ans.) 1936 (i).

—— Truro Station, Unsanitary Condition (Ans.) 7211 (iv).

—— Williams, Mr., Emplymt. (Ans.) 2388 (ii).

—— Unopposed Returns (remarks) 5914 (iii).

International Ry., N.B., Directors, Stock, &c. (Ans.) 4246 (iii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

Inverness County Ry. Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12235 (vii).

Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12404 (vii).

Kettle River Valley Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13287 (vii).

Lyall, Mr. Peter, Name of Contractor of G.T.P. Terminals at Winnipeg (Ans.) 7991 (iv).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidies, &c. (Ans.) 893 (i).

—— Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13290 (vii).

Moncton Shops, Payments to E. A. Wallberg (Ans.) 8892 (v).

Moosejaw-Lacombe Branch of C. P. Ry., Extension, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7659 (iv).

N.B. Coal and Ry. Co.'s Claim against Ry. Dept. (Ans.) 9270, 9714 (v).

N.B. Elections, and Govt. Employees (remarks) 3317, 3579 (ii).

—— Interference by Dom. Govt. on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 3662 (ii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 5049 (iii); on Senate Amts., 10512 (vi).

Nipigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13288, 13289 (vii).

Nixon, Jos., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 12390 (vii).

Official Cars, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10330 (vi).

Otonabee Power Co., Amount of Payment *re* Horse Power (Ans.) 5471, 5656 (iii).

—— (remarks) 5567 (iii).

Ottawa, Brockville & St. Lawrence Ry. Co.'s B. 74 (Mr. Grant) on Senate Amts., 6189 (iii).

Owen Sound and Meaford Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13287 (vii).

Owen Sound Dredging, Inspector Telford, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 3038 (ii).

Pacific and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 153 (Mr. Dyment) in Com., 9070 (v).

Port Colborne Elevator, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 4245 (iii).

Port Maitland Piers, Amount of Mr. Battle's Tender (Ans.) 691 (i).

—— Appmt. of Mr. W. W. Krick as Inspector (Ans.) 6919 (iv).

Port Mulgrave, N.S., Wharfs, Preventing Boats landing Cargoes (Ans.) 9274 (v).

P.E. I. Ry., Alma Station, Pet. *re* Construction (Ans.) 6642 (iv).

—— Bear River Stationmaster's Dwelling, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 1737 (i).

—— Branch Lines, Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 3264 (ii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

P.E.I. Ry., Branch Lines (remarks) in Com. on B. 215, 13485 (vii).
——— Claims of Mr. James Maher, &c. (Ans.) 3834 (ii).
——— Complaints *re* Excessive Charges, &c. (Ans.) 1123 (i).
——— Contract *re* News Agency (Ans.) 8444 (v).
——— Dundas and Avondale Extension, Pet. *re* (Ans.) 8383 (v).
——— Earnings and Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 848 (i).
——— Harmony and Elmira Branch Line (B. 202) prop. Res., 12052; in Com. on Res., 12408; 2° m., 12628; in Com., 12631 (vii).
——— Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* M. J. Haney's Claims (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2751 (ii).
——— Hillsborough Bridge, Mr. Haney's Claim (remarks) 7100 (iv).
——— Montague Branch Extension (M.) to dsch. Bill, 11405 (vi).
——— Stanley Bridge Branch, Reps., Surveys, &c., on M. for Ret., 850 (i).
——— Stanley Bridge Extension, Pet. *re* (Ans.) 4829 (iii).
——— Station Agents, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 3236 (ii).
——— Time-Table, Protest *re* (Ans.) 1124 (i).
——— Train Service between Charlottetown and Murray Harbour (Ans.) 569 (i).
——— Tunnel, Rep. *re*, on Inquiry for (Mr. Lefurgey) 9893 (v).
——— Tunnel, Information *re* (Ans.) 562 (i).
——— Winter Communication, Mail Service, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 1206 (i).
Provincial Elections, and Federal Ministers' Speeches (remarks) 8851 (v).
Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s (B. 217) prop. Res., 13080; in Com. on Res., 13416; in Com., 13491 (vii).
Quebec Bridge Accident, Material on Hand, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 1291 (i).
——— Apptmt. of Engineer Hoare (Ans.) 8173 (iv).
——— Names of Jurymen (Ans.) 7991 (iv).
Quebec Bridge, Agreement *re* Rentals, &c. (remarks) 13227 (vii).
——— Horse or Vehicle Traffic (Ans.) 10739 (vi).
Quebec Bridge Commissioners' Report (presented) 4566 (iii), 10915 (vi).
——— on Inquiry for Rep., 946, 1739 (i), 3043 (ii), 6223 (iv).
——— Distribution of Printed Copies (remarks) 5914 (iii).
——— Printing, &c. (remarks) 6924, 7099, 8171 (iv), 8608 (v).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

Quebec Bridge, Distribution of Printed Evidence (remarks) 10302 (vi).
Quebec Bridge Co., Salaries to Officials (Ans.) 13517 (vii).
Quebec and Lake St. John (branch lines) Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13300 (vii).
Quebec and N.B. Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13291 (vii).
Quilty, H. A., Examination *re* Train Despatcher (Ans.) 13225 (vii).
Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 581 (i); on Amt. to Senate Amts., 12192 (vii).
——— (construction) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Turriff) on M. for 2°, 3412 (ii).
——— (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3389 (ii).
——— (fire damages) Amt. B. 18 (Mr. Kennedy) on M. for 2°, 939 (i).
——— (telegraph and telephones) Amt. (B. 118) 1° m., 4658 (iii); 2° m., 10625, 10633; in Com., 10636; 3° m., 10777; on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) 10783, 11124; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11622; on Amt. (Mr. Macdonell) 11633; on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 11607 (vi).
Railway Commission Act (Ass't Chief, &c.) Amt (B. 112) prop. Res., 3751; in Com. on Res., 3903; 1° m., 3933 (ii); in Com., 4964 (iii), 8510 (v).
Railways and Canals, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Ry. Charters and Land Grants, Renewals of (Ans.) 9271 (v).
Railway Commission, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
——— Total Expenditure *re* Counsel Fees (Ans.) 10257 (v).
Railway Estimates, Vote for (remarks) 10007 (v).
Ry. Land Grants, Amounts and Names, &c. (Ans.) 9271 (v).
Railways and Municipal Agreements, &c. (remarks) 6988 (iv).
Rails purchased from Govt. by N.B. Coal and Ry. Co., Amounts paid and still due (Ans.) 9269 (v).
Ry. Semaphores, Iron Ladders and Posts, &c. (Ans.) 239 (i).
Railway Statistics Report (presented) 1346 (i).
Railway Subsidies (B. 215) prop. Res., 13066; in Com. on Res., 13285; 1° m., 13315; in Com., 13478 (vii).
——— (stmnt.) re Railways under Construction, 13478 (vii).
——— Applications for, Memorandum *re*, in Com. on Res., 13304 (vii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

Railway Subsidies, Bridge Construction (remarks) in Com., 13309 (vii).

Ry. Surveys in Colchester County, Subsidies, &c. (Ans.) 2981 (ii).

——— Correction *re* Answer, 5046 (iii).

Ry. Tracks crossed by Water Mains, &c. (Ans.) 690, 1109 (i).

Richibucto Wharf, Length, Purchase Price, &c. (Ans.) 12412 (vii).

Riviere du Loup Station, Improvement to (Ans.) 5468 (iii).

Ste. Barbe, Damages *re* Floods (remarks) 6987 (iv).

St. Lawrence Power Co., and Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. Gervais) for Plans, Surveys, &c., 3005 (ii).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8562 (v).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4234, 4546, 4579 (iii).

Sault Ste. Marie Steel Works, Closing of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 13474 (vii).

Sauve, Alfred, Rep. of Investigation *re* (Ans.) 9278 (v).

Semaphores at Interlocking Plant, London, Construction, &c. (Ans.) 9714 (v).
See 'Ry. Semaphores.'

Sharbot Lake to Carleton Place, Railway Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13288 (vii).

Soulanges Canal, Electric Power, Contract with Govt., &c. (Ans.) 10011 (v).

——— Investigation *re* Overseer (Ans.) 6407 (iv).

——— Rep. of Mr. Boyer, on Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 9890 (v).

——— Rep. of Mr. Boyer (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10304 (vi).

———(Ans.) 12413 (vii).

——— Total Expenditure *re* Investigation (Ans.) 10513 (vi).

Souris Wharf, Permission to Build, &c. (Ans.) 7728 (iv).

South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 16 (Mr. Calvert) on M. for 3°, 1930 (i).

Stewart, Mr. James, Inspecting Auditor on I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10151 (v).

Stoney Lake, Damage Claims (Ans.) 5565 (iii).

Stoney Lake Dock, Construction by Govt. (Ans.) 5649 (iii).

Sydney to Sydney Mines Branch Ry., Total Cost (Ans.) 7201 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Canals (additional remuneration) 13174 (vii).

Canals—Chambly (tow paths) 12226 (vii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Canals—Galops (upper entrance) 5671 (iii).

Canals—Generally (extra remunerations) 5697 (iii); (salaries) 10325; (staff and repairs) 10304; (statistical branch) 10317; (surveys) 10340 (vi).

Canals—Cornwall (break in bank) 12768; (gate lifter) 12226 (vii).

Canals—Lachine (repairs) 5672; (slope walls) 5663; (staff salaries) 5696 (iii); (walls) 12226 (vii).

Canals—Murray (houses) 12227 (vii).

Canals—Quebec (steam road roller) 12225 (vii).

Canals—Rideau (improvements) 12227 (vii).

Canals—St. Lawrence (District office) 12225 (vii).

Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 12223 (vii).

Canals—Soulanges (improvements) 12225 (vii); (Manning & Macdonald's claim) 5668 (iii).

Canals—Trent (Buckhorn dam) 12227; (construction) 12225 (vii); (damages) 10308 (vi); (damages) 12768; (improvements) 12227; (Lindsay lock) 12227 (vii); (surveys) 10338 (vi).

Canals—Welland (dredging slide) 5673 (iii); (electric lighting) 12195; (piers and bridges) 12207 (vii); (Port Colborne) 10312 (vi), 12211 (vii); (Port Maitland piers) 5673 (iii); (surveys) 12207; (widening) 12210 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Railways (Butler, M. J.) 12755 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston) 10913 (vi); (Owen Sound) 7822; P.E.I. (Georgetown) 7185; Que. (Dominion Arsenal) 7437 (iv).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11085 (vi).

Railways—C.P.R. (compensation) 5561 (iii).

Railways—G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10378; (inspection) 10390 (vi).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys, &c.) 12764 (vii).

Railways—I.C.R. (advertising) 10187 (v); (Amherst) 12233; (Antigonish) 12229; (bridges) 12259; (Chatham diversion) 12757 (vii); (claims dept.) 10177 (v); (collection of revenue) 5694 (iii); (double tracking) 12236, 12250; (facilities, &c.) 12259; (Fredericton) 12758 (vii); (Halifax, accommodation) 5548 (iii), 12227; (Indiantown branch) 12258 (vii); (legal costs) 5557 (iii), 10190; (locomotives) 10150 (v); (machinery) 12257; (Moncton, car shops) 12250; (Moncton-Truro, additional line) 12760; (Mulgrave) 12229; (New Glasgow) 12230; (North Sydney) 12229; (Petit Rocher spur) 12759 (vii); (Pictou) 5558 (iii), 12230 (vii); (rolling stock) 5549 (iii), 12257; (St. Cyrille, diversion) 12756; (St. John, accommodation) 12257 (vii); (St. Rosalie, improvements) 5558 (iii); (Ste. Rosalie) 12259; (Sackville) 12236 (vii); (salaries) 10127 (v); (Springhill junction) 12233 (vii); (stationery) 10181 (v); (Stellarton) 12230; (surveys, branch lines) 12764; (Sydney Mines) 12229; (Sydney Mines, diversion) 12759; (Truro) 12231 (vii); (Windsor branch) 10145 (v).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Railways — Miscellaneous (arbitrations) 10329; (extra clerks) 10342; (inspections, &c.) 10341; (litigation) 10357; (statistical branch) 10328; (unprovided items) 10328 (vi).

Railways—P.E.I. (Haney, M. J., claim) 12762 (vii).

Railways—Ry. Commission (legal expenses) 10362; (maintenance, &c.) 10385 (vi); (Quebec Bridge) 12769 (vii).

Talbot, Mr. Evariste, Emplymt. on I.C.R. (Ans.) 6400 (iv).

Telephone Wires, Application to cross R. Tracks (Ans.) 690 (i).

See 'Ry. Tracks,' &c.

Trans-Canada Ry. Co.'s B. 107 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 5387 (iii).

Transcontinental Ry. Commissioners' Rep. (presented) 7 (i).

See 'G.T.P.,' &c.

Transportation: *See* 'I.C.R.,' &c.

Trent Canal, Bradford Canal, Building of (remarks) 13476 (vii).

—— Cameron Lake, Water Level, &c. (Ans.) 9772 (v).

—— Contracts, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 1735 (i).

—— Holland River Extension (remarks) 11940 (vi).

—— Tributaries, Completion of Works, &c. (Ans.) 1115 (i).

—— Tributary Works, Maintenance, &c. (Ans.) 1114 (i).

—— Surveys, Rep. *re* (remarks) 6988 (iv).

Trois Pistoles Station, I.C.R., Construction of (Ans.) 12652 (vii).

Tusket Wedge, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13296 (vii).

Valleyfield Floods, Damages, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7808, 7996 (iv).

—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10339 (vi).

Vancouver Island and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 87 (Mr. Sloan) in Com., 4545 (iii).

Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Ry. Co.'s Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13308 (vii).

Welland Canal, Cost of Construction (Ans.) 4245 (iii).

—— Culvert and Dock, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 4245 (iii).

—— Investigation *re* Water Rents, &c. (Ans.) 175 (i).

—— Resignation of John E. Scott (Ans.) 6059 (iii).

White Horse Pass Ry. Co., Appeal of Dawson Board of Trade (Ans.) 10736 (v).

Wilberforce Dam, Obstruction to Traffic, &c. Cor., Plans, &c., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Copies, 2989 (ii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*

Williams, Thos., Emplymt. on I.C.R. (Ans.) 2388 (ii).

Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. 125 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6185 (iii).

Yukon Freight Rates, Rep. of Ry. Commission *re* (Ans.) 894 (i).

GRANT, Mr. G. D., *Ontario, N.*

Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Ry. Co.'s (B. 74) 1°*, 1584 (i); on Senate Amts., 6189 (iii).

GREENWAY, Mr. T., *Lisgar.*

Dominion Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 7880 (iv).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 11992 (vi).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1355 (i).

GUTHRIE, Mr. H., *Wellington, S.*

Anglo-Canadian and Continental Bank incorp. (B. 141) 1°*, 6054 (iii); in Com., 7724 (iv).

Budget, The, 6011 (iii).

Civil Service Commission Report, Investigation, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Power, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7608 (iv).

Commercial Travellers, Provincial Tax, Agreement *re* Abolition, &c. (Ques.) 5794 (iii).

Companies Act Amt. (B. 104) 1°*, 3653 (ii).

Eastern Trust Co.'s (B. 103) 1°*, 3653 (ii).

Foresters Subsidiary High Court, &c. (B. 62) 1°*, 1283 (i); in Com., 5174 (iii).

Hamilton Electric Radial Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3697 (ii).

—— on Mr. Speaker's Ruling, *re* Ref. back to Committee, 3362 (ii).

Northern Bank and Crown Bank (B. 156) 1°*, 6525 (iv).

Ry. Act (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3339 (ii).

South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 16) 1°*, 350 (i).

Technical Education, Commission of Inquiry (prop. res.) 2856 (ii).

HAGGART, Hon. J. G., *Lanark, S.*

Address, The, 548 (i).

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3864 (ii).

Belleville and North Hastings Ry., and G. T. Ry., on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Cor., 2816 (ii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co's B. 214 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13285 (vii).

C.P.R. Plaster Rock Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13299 (vii).

HAGGART, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*

Civil Service Commission Report, Investigation *re* Depts., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn., 6153 (iii).

——— (remarks) on Presentation, 5643 (iii).

Debates, Official, Rep. of Com., Conc. without Notice (remarks) 8899 (v).

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1175 (i).

——— Production of to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1655 (i).

——— on M. for Sup., 1778 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11882 (vi).

Dom. Lands (surveys) B. 9 (Mr Oliver) in Com., 758 (i).

Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6774 (iv).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13278 (vii).

Employees of Parliament, Religion, &c., on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Ret., 5484 (iii).

Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13299 (vii).

Fort William Terminals Ry. Co.'s B. 101 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6224 (iv).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Res., 1240 (i).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3632, 3803 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal Surveys, Inquiry for, 1739 (i).

G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2238 (ii); in Com., 12062 (vii).

G.T.P. Ry., Branch Line Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 8746, 9462 (v).

——— Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12717 (vii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12249 (vii).

——— Montreal Branch Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13300 (vii).

——— Port Arthur Branch, in Com. on Res., 13303 (vii).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3748 (ii), 4228 (iii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6431 (iv).

Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale of, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13128 (vii).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 1743 (i).

I.C.R., Circular *re* Payment of Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10128 (v).

——— Rolling Stock (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5698 (iii).

HAGGART, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Transportation, &c. (reply) to Annual Statement, 4448 (iii).

Interprovincial Bridge Co., N.B., Construction Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13308 (vii).

Nipigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13289 (vii).

Land Titles Act Assurance Fund B. 168 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 8481 (v).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11245 (vi).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12802 (vii).

Man. Voters' Lists, Affidavits quoted, Ruling *re* Laying on Table, 7948 (iv).

Occidental Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 131 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 7724 (iv).

Ordnance Lands Sale B. 218 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 13418 (vii).

Pacific Coast Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 40 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6228 (iv).

P.E.I. Ry., Branch Lines, Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 3270 (ii).

——— Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2744 (ii).

Quebec Bridge Disaster, ref. to in Debate on Address, 548 (i).

Quebec Bridge Report, Inquiry for, 6223 (iv).

Quebec and Lake St. John (branch lines) Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13300 (vii).

Quebec and New Brunswick Ry Co.'s B. 128 (Mr. Michaud) in Com., 6227 (iv).

——— Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13292 (vii).

Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3907 (ii); in Com., 4980 (iii).

Ry. Act (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118, on Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 10664 (vi).

St. Lawrence Power Co., and Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. Gervais) for Cor., 3011 (ii).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 7723 (iv).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4579 (iii).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5450 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Chambly (tow paths) 12226 (vii).
Canals—Cornwall (gate lifter) 12226 (vii).
Canals—Galops (upper entrance) 5671 (iii).
Canals—Generally (extra remuneration) 5697 (iii); (surveys, &c.) 10340 (vi).
Canals—Lachine (repairs) 5672 (iii); (walls) 12226 (vii); (slope walls) 5663 (iii).

HAGGART, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Canals—Soulanges (Manning & Macdonald's claims) 5668 (iii).

Canals—Trent (improvements) 12227; (Lindsay lock) 12227 (vii).

Canals—Welland (dredging slide) 5673 (iii); (electric lighting) 12196 (vii); (Port Maitland piers) 5673 (iii); (surveys) 12207 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries, &c.) 617 (i).

Justice (salaries) 5505 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Mint) 1452 (i).

Railways—G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10381; (inspection) 10392 (vi).

Railways—I.C.R. (bridges) 12259 (vii); (collection of revenue) 5693 (iii); (double tracking) 12237; (facilities, &c.) 12259 (vii); (Halifax, accommodation) 5548 (iii), 12228 (vii); (locomotives) 10149 (v); (Moncton car shops) 12253; (North Sydney) 12229 (vii); (Pictou) 5559 (iii), 12230 (vii); (rolling stock) 5549, 5550 (iii), 12257; (St. John, accommodation) 12258 (vii); (St. Rosalie) 5558 (iii); (Sackville) 12236 (vii); (salaries) 10128; (supplies) 10202 (v); (Truro) 12231 (vii).

Railways — Miscellaneous (arbitrations) 10329; Ry. Commission (maintenance, &c.) 10386 (vi).

Temiskaming Ry. Subsidy (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Res., 13305 (vii).

Tenders, *re* Opening of, Ques. of Priv., 2738 (ii).

Timber Limits, Leasing, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2339 (ii).

Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Bridge Construction Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13308 (vii).

HALL, Mr. R. R., *Peterborough, W.*

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (moved) 9 (i).

Dominion Lumbering and Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 172) 1°*, 9021 (v).

——— Pet. (presented) 1731 (i).

Petition (M.) to Present, 1731 (i).

HARTY, Mr. W., *Kingston.*

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clark) in Com., 3731 (ii).

Sharbot Lake to Carleton Place, Railway Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13288 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11091 (vi).

HENDERSON, Mr. D., *Halton.*

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 134 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 2°, 5763 (iii).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4398, 4517 (iii).

See 'National,' &c.

Binder Twine Bounty, Amount paid from 1903 to 1907, &c. (Ques.) 4583 (iii).

HENDERSON, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Bounties paid on Binder Twine, Lead, &c. (Ques.) 4583 (iii).

Brockville and Ottawa Ry. Service (remarks) on M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn., 191 (i).

Bronte Harbour Dues for Wharfage, Amount collected (Ques.) 13064 (vii).

Canada and France Ocean SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6166, 6174, 6195 (iii); in Com., 6411 (iv).

Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 67 (Mr. Pardee) on Senate Amts., 5955 (iii).

C.P.R., Papineauville Branch Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13304 (vii).

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. 187 (Mr. Black) in Com., 13507 (vii).

Cattle exported to U. S., Fees *re* Thoroughbreds (remarks) 2767 (ii).

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11257 (vi).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5119 (iii).

Customs and Trade Returns, Duplicate Printing, &c. (remarks) 9734 (v).

Detroit River Tunnel, and Customs Tariff, &c., on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10488 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13022; on M. for 3°, 13229; on Amt. (Mr. Sproule) to M. for 3°, 13256 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11194 (vi).

Draper, P. M., Candidate for Municipal Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 613 (i).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4545 (iii).

——— B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13268; in Com. on Res., 13280 (vii).

Estimates, Preparation of Insufficient Votes, &c. (remarks) in Com., 5920 (iii).

Fire Extinguishers, Purchase of, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) 7665 (iv).

——— Cor. quoted by Minister, Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7797 (iv).

Fort William Ry. Terminals B. 101 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6180 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3584 (ii).

Fruit Marks Inspection and Sale B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 10557, 10568 (vi).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3794 (ii).

Gold and Silver Marking B. 197 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12557 (vii).

'Grafter,' Use of, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Pugsley) 10994 (vi).

HENDERSON, Mr. D.—*Con.*

G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2236 (ii).

G.T.P., Branch Lines B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 7141 (iv), 8751 (v).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 95 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3194, 3621, 3712, 3735, (ii), 4226; on M. for 3°, 4542 (iii).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10499 (vi).

Immigration Bonuses, on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1323 (i).

Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale of, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13137 (vii).

Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6901 (iv).

Land Titles Act Assurance Fund B. 168 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10528 (vi).

Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 3035 (ii).

Moosejaw-Lacombe Branch of C.P.R. Extension (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7661 (iv).

National Battlefields (lands) B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 13504 (vii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 5076 (iii).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Bonuses, &c. (remarks) 797 (i).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4698 (iii).

Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Ry Co.'s B. 74 (Mr. Grant) on Senate Amts., 6189 (iii).

Pacific Coast Fire Insurance B. 40 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6182 (iii).

Postal Arrangements between Canada and the U.S., on Statement (Mr. Lemieux) to Com. of Sup., 3164 (ii).

Postal Rate Reduction, &c. (remarks) 3159 (ii).

Post Office Act (drop letter) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 7932 (iv); in Com., 10704 (vi).

Presbyterian College Board, Halifax, B. 154 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 7667 (iv).

Presbyterian Ministers', Widows' and Orphans' Funds B. 23 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 2788 (ii).

Public Works, Estimated Cost, Extravagant Expenditure, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7145 (iv).

—— Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., Ques. of Order, 4939 (iii).

HENDERSON, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3913 (ii).

Ry. Act (telephones) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10669 (vi).

Railways and Municipal Agreements, Penalties *re* Violations (remarks) 6987 (iv).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 7676, 7723 (iv).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4235, 4546 (iii).

Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2934 (ii).

—— in Com. of Sup., 2777 (ii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12611 (vii).

Standard Plate Glass Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 41 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 6183 (iii).

Sugar Imports for 1908, Total Amount (Ques.) 13064 (vii).

Supply, Estimates, Total Appropriations, 5919 (iii).

Supply (seed grain) B. 96 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 2782 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Agriculture (dairying, &c.) 10398; (exhibitions) 10572 (vi); (seeds) 12891 (vii).

Canals—Lachine (repairs) 5672; (staff salaries) 5696 (iii).

Civil Govt.—Interior (astronomical survey) 9748 (v); Printing and Stationery (salaries, &c.) 613; Sec. of State (salaries) 612 (i).

Excise (distilleries) 814; (tobacco stamps) 816 (i).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4207 (ii); (ice-breakers) 1896 (i).

Militia (annual drill) 10293 (v); (customs) 5662 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Prince Fushimi's visit) 5783 (iii); (seed grain) 2777 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 5764 (iii); (wrecks) 3197 (ii).

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5526; (maintenance) 5514 (iii).

Public Works (ass't. dep. min.) 5699 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Cumberland) 10864; (Ladysmith) 10867; (Vancouver) 10868; (Vernon) 10870; (Victoria, immigration) 10876 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10887 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg, military) 10973 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax) customs) 7143; (Halifax, immigration) 7143; (Halifax, miltary) 7143 (iv); (Parrsborough) 13327 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 7498; (Guelph, armoury) 7680; (Hamilton, drill hall) 7694; (Hamilton, post office) 7696; (North Bay) 7714; (Owen Sound) 7818; (Sarnia) 7829; (Simcoe) 7830; (Welland) 7831 (iv).

HENDERSON, Mr. D.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (rents, &c.) 10983, 10994 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal pneumatic postal) 5704 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Bronte, dredging) 5708 (iii); (Bronte) 12091 (vii); (Tiffin, dredging) 5712 (iii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11080; (Deep Waterways Commission) 11108 (vi).

Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, &c.) 12728 (vii).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10696 (vi).

Tobacco, Canadian, Protection to, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor., &c., 914 (i).

Tobacco Duties, Total Amount for 1908 (Ques.) 13064 (vii).

Vancouver Bank incorp B. 32 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 4582 (iii).

Water Carriage of Goods B. 178, on M. for 2°, 13508 (vii).

Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. 125 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6185 (iii).

Winnipeg Bank incorp. B. 19 (Mr. Bole) in Com., 2787 (ii).

HERRON, Mr. J., *Alberta.*

Blairmore Townsite (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10087 (v).

Blood Indian Reserve, Lease to McEwan Cattle Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12741 (vii).

Blunden, Fred. W., Imprisonment of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12908 (vii).

——— on M. (Mr. Ward) for Cor., 3475 (ii).

Buffalo Herd, Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10103 (v).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10547 (vi).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11367 (vi).

Coal and Govt. Lands, Acres in Possession of Govt. (Ques.) 843 (i).

Cold Storage Plants, Construction in Alberta, &c. (Ques.) 1685 (i).

Cowly and Highwood, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13300 (vii).

Customs Officers at Windsor, Age, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 12655 (vii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11915 (vi).

Dom. Lands (surveys) B. 9 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 761 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11136; in Com.,11164, 11169, 11410, 11504 (vi); on M. for 3°, (amt.) 12397 (vii).

Fire Guardians, Number employed in Alberta, &c. (Ques.) 3433 (ii).

HERRON, Mr. J.—*Con.*

Fishery Inspectors in Alberta, Names, &c. (Ques.) 12390 (vii).

Fishing Leases granted between Lake Superior and Rocky Mountains, Names, &c. (Ques.) 1683 (i).

Grain Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 203 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 13214 (vii).

Grazing Leases, Irrevocable for 21 years, Application for, &c. (Ques.) 1511 (i).

Homesteaders for Sections 16, 15, 27, &c., Issue of Patents, &c. (Ques.) 7503 (iv).

Hough, Campbell & Ferguson, Applications, &c. *re* Coal Mining Lands, (M. for copies*) 698 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3319 (ii).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6386 (iv).

Immigration Expenditure from March, 1907, 1908 (Ques.) 5080 (iii).

Irrigation Act Amt. B. 99 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4674 (iii).

Japanese Immigration, Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2141 (ii).

Lands applied for by Mr. Aylwin under Irrigation Regulations (Ques.) 7209 (iv).

Land Patents, S.E. ¼ Sec. 2, Cor., &c. (M. for ret.*) 2171 (ii).

——— (Ques.) 2169 (ii).

Lewis, N.W.M. Policeman, Murder of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8867 (v).

Macleod, Cardston and Montana Ry. Co.'s (B. 22) 1°*, 430 (i).

Macleod Post Office, Report re Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9110 (v).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12565, 13223 (vii).

Newspapers in Alberta, Amounts paid to by Govt. (M. for ret.*) 1690 (i).

——— (Ques.) 1511 (i).

Nixon, Jos., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 12390 (vii).

Piegan Reserve, Cattle Shipping, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 632 (i).

Railway Act (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3402 (ii).

School Lands Exchange B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 8470 (v).

Section 14, South-east Quarter, Application for, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 5476 (iii).

Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2921 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1360 (i).

Seed Grain Supply Bill, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2782 (ii).

Southern Alberta Land Co., Application *re* Change of Lands, &c. (Ques.) 7729 (iv).

HERRON, Mr. J.—*Con.*

S.A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3810 (ii), 12596; in Com., 12620; in Com., 13048 (vii).

S.A. Volunteers, Land Grants (remarks) on M. for Sup., 11205 (vi).

Squatters' Claims in Alberta (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9996 (v).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10617 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries, &c.) 632 (i).

Dom. Lands (agents) 10044; (coal lands) 10072; (forest rangers) 10049; (salaries) 10044 (v).

Immigration (agents) 9881; (agents, U.S.) 9967; (deportations) 9884 (v).

Indians—B.C. (land sales) 12753 (vii).

Interior — Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5758 (iii).

Militia (annual drill) 5743 (iii).

N.W.M. Police (pay of force) 8867 (v).

Post Office (inspectors) 9109 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vernon) 10874 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (cattle quarantine stations) 11008; (experimental farm, repairs, &c.) 10907; (quarantine stations) 11008 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Knowlton) 7292 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask., &c. (Edmonton) 8580; (Humboldt) 8587 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Alberta (Old Man's River) 12142 (vii).

Public Works—Slides and Booms (surveys) 11076 (vi).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys, &c.) 12765 (vii).

Timber Limits, Leasing, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2373 (ii).

White Pass Ry. Co., Appeal of Dawson Board of Trade, &c. (Ques.) 10736 (vi).

Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. 125 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6183 (iii).

HUGHES, Mr. J. J., *Kings (P.E.I.)*

Address, The, 380 (i)

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3878 (ii).

Budget, The, 6097 (iii).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1709 (i).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name of I.C.R., &c. (prop. res.) 6243, 6284 (iv).

I.C.R. Extension to Great Lakes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2449 (ii).

Labour Organizations *re* Ry. Employees, Par. in Halifax 'Herald,' Ques. of Priv., 8289 (v).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12826 (vii).

Nipissing Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 170) 1°*, 8694 (v).

HUGHES, Mr. J. J.—*Con.*

P.E.I. Ry., Branch Lines, Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 3258 (ii).

—— Harmony-Elmira Branch B. 202 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 12635 (vii).

—— Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2747 (ii).

P.E.I., Ice-Breaker, Contract for Construction, &c. (Ques.) 365, 1734 (i); 5796 (iii); 8444 (v).

—— Telegraphic Communication, Com. from Commercial Cable Co. *re* (remarks) 8515 (v).

—— Winter Comunication, Tunnel Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 4628 (iii).

Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, on M. (Mr. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7752 (iv).

S.A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3762 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2943, 2953; (wrecks) 3191 (ii).

Wheat Transportation from N. W., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2212 (ii).

HUGHES, Mr. S., *Victoria and Haliburton.*

Advertisements in Montreal 'Star' (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7479 (iv).

'Arctic,' Str., Cruise in Northern Waters, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4030 (ii).

Balsam Lake and Gull River Ret., Incomplete, &c. (remarks) 6059 (iii).

Balsam Lake Section, Trent Canal, Damages (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10308(vi). *See* 'Trent,' &c.

Battlefields of Quebec B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 3902 (ii); in Com., 4399, 4417, 4527 (iii).

'Bessie Butler,' Str., Dimensions, &c., Use of by R. C. Clergy (Ques.) 12411 (vii).

Board of Trade Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11988 (vi).

Bobcaygeon Dam, Flooding of Highways, Protection *re* (prop. res.) 2992 (ii).

—— Transfer of Power Plant, &c. (Ques.) 1114 (i).

Booms in International Streams, Regulation B. 105 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for 1°, 3655 (ii).

Canadian Naturalization and British Rights, on M. for Sup., 12084 (vii). *See* 'Naturalization.'

C.P.R. Papineauville Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13304 (vii).

C.P.R., Saskatchewan Bridge Construction, Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13305 (vii).

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*

Canadian Patriotic Funds B. 216 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 13320 (vii).
Cattle exported to U.S., Fees *re* Thoroughbreds (remarks) 2769 (ii).
Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11256 (vi).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10745 (vi).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 11317; in Com., 11544, 11639 (vi).
Civil Service Commission Report, Investigations, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Powers, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7579, 7596 (iv)
Cornwall Canal, Breakage, Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 13085 (vii).
Customs Estimates, Obstruction in Sup., (remarks) 10136 (v).
Debates, Official (translators) 4th Rep., on M. (Mr. Monk) to ref. back to Com., 10247 (v).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11808, 11837 (vi); 12955 (vii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B.181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11127; in Com., 11170, 11950; on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to M. for 3°, Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 11978 (vi).
Drill Shed, Lindsay, Date of Construction, &c. (Ques.) 1111 (i).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13281 (vii).
Fishing Licenses in B.C., Grants to Japanese (Ques.) 7445 (iv).
Fruit Inspection, Apples, &c., Complaints *re*, 2757 (ii).
G.T.R., Hotel, Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 12078 (vii).
G.T.P., Accidents on Construction (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6657 (iv).
——— (remarks) 6850 (iv).
G.T.P., Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12680 (vii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10396 (vi).
G.T.P., Supplies, Transportation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10378 (vi)
——— Ties purchased in U.S. (remarks) 1448 (i).
Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Political Interference, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6653 (iv).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6435 (iv).
Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6706 (iv).
Immigration Regulations *re* British Subjects, Deportation, &c. (Ques.) 9772 (v).

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*

Indian Dept., Extravagent Management, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11045 (vi).
I.C.R., Accidents, Letter *re* (read) 6986 (iv);
——— Audit System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10218 (v).
——— Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4422 (iii).
Japanese Immigration, on Stmt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1601 (i).
Labour unemployed, Protection to (Ques.) 10735 (vi).
Lancaster, Cadet, R.M.C., Investigation *re* Conduct, &c., on M. for Sup, 1019 (i).
Lee-Enfield Rifles, Accident at Rockliffe Range (Ques.) 10014 (v).
Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Ry. Co.'s (B. 34) 1°*, 606 (i).
Lumber Duties from U.S., on M. for Sup., 9504 (v).
Lumber Industry, Duty, &c. (remarks) 10259 (v).
Militia Rations, Cost per Day (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).
National Battlefields (lands) Amt. B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 13505 (vii).
Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com.,11992 (vi).
See 'Canadian Naturalization.'
Newmarket Canal, Rep. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10306 (vi).
Peace River Col. and Land Development Co., on M. for Sup., 10403 (vi).
Peace River Timber Limits, Cor., &c., *re* Granting (M. for copies) 3851 (ii).
Peace River Valley and Land Co., Cancelling of Grant (remarks) 11018 (vi).
——— Homesteads leased, sold, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1295 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 2769 (ii), 6010 (iii).
Peace River Valley Lands, Terms and Regulations *re* Sale, &c. (Ques.) 1111 (i).
Postal Service in the House of Commons (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7481 (iv).
P.E.I. Ry., Harmony-Elmira Branch B. 202 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, Ques. of Order, 12629 (vii).
P.E.I. Ry. Branch Lines, in Com. on B. 215 (remarks) 13485 (vii).
Prince Rupert Customs Collector, Transfer of Mr. B. R. McDonald (Ques.) 6401 (iv).
Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4953 (iii).
Quebec Tercentenary, Attendance of Militia (remarks) 8696 (v).
——— City Corps., &c. (remarks) 8386 (v).

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*

Quebec Tercentenary, Transportation of Volunteers (remarks) 8377, 8384 (v).
Ques. of Priv. *re* Doukhobors, &c., 7321 (iv).
Railway Act (construction) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Turriff) on M. for 2°, 3413 (ii).
Rama Indian Fund, Payments *re* (Ques.) 8610 (v).
Religious Fanatics (remarks) 12161 (vii).
Ross Rifle, Accident at Rockliffe Range, Report *re* (Ques.) 11494 (vi).
——— Contract for Bayonets (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13543 (vii).
——— Deficiency in Manufacture, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Worthington) to Com. of Sup., 9028 (v).
——— Par in Ottawa Citizen, *re* Accident at Rockliffe Ranges (Ques.) 10515 (vi).
——— Ques. of Priv. *re* Mr. Bergeron's denial of Stmnt., 9330 (v)
——— Tests, &c. (remarks) 8169 (iv).
See 'Lee-Enfield,' &c.
R.M.C., Investigation *re* Conduct of Cadet Lancaster, on M. for Sup., 1019 (i).
School Statutes *re* Saskatchewan Prov., on M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6864 (iv).
Seed Grain for Settlers in N.W., Extension, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2903, 2935 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1360 (i).
Seed Grain for Settlers, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2775 (ii).
Shipping Rings, Combinations, &c. (remarks) 5919 (iii).
S. A. Contingent, Medals for 3rd Contingent (Ques) 1110 (i).
S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) on prop. Res., 3759 (ii); in Com. on Res, 12596 (vii).
S. A. War, Land Scrip for Volunteers, &c. (Ques.) 1110 (i).
South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 16 (Mr. Calvert) on M. for 3°, 1930 (i).
Stewart, James, Inspecting Auditor, I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10152 (v).
Supply B. 96 (seed grain) in Com., 2783 (ii).

SUPPLY—
Agriculture (dairying, &c.) 10399 (vi).
Canals—Cornwall (repairs to bank) 12768 (vii).
Canals—Generally (statistical branch) 10319 (vi).
Canals—Trent (damages) 12768 (vii); (repairs, &c.) 10305 (vi).
Canals—Welland (Port Colborne) 12219 (vii).
Customs—Miscellaneous (printing, &c.) 9577 (v).
Excise (methylated spirits) 823 (i).
Geological Survey (oil borings) 13162 (vii).
Indians—N.B. (schools) 13170; Ont. and Que. (land sales) 12751 (vii).

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4030 (ii).
Militia (annual drill) 10293 (v); (customs dues) 12156; (Dom. arsenal) 12154; (provisions, &c.) 12152; (R. M. College) 12152 (vii).
Miscellaneous (Chinese riots) 13156; (Civil Service Commission) 13168; (cotton strikers) 13158; (Olympic Games) 13167; (Oriental immigration) 13156 (vii); (seed grain) 2775 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10886 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 7495 (iv); (Kingston, magazine) 10907; (Kingston) 10913 (vi); (London, military) 7707; (Markham) 7709; (North Bay) 7712 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (mint) 1459 (i); (ventilation) 11010 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (commissioner's house) 10885 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis) 11210; (Porter's Lake) 11263; (Port Hastings) 11266; (Port Hilford) 11267; (Port Hood) 11270; (Yarmouth) 11291 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Beaverton) 12090; (Belle River) 12090; (Blanche River) 12090; (Chute à Blondeau) 12092; (Colborne) 12095; (Collingwood) 12096; (Winnipeg River) 12138 (vii).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11093; (engineering branch) 11095; (unprovided items) 11119 (vi).
Public Works—Slides and Booms (surveys) 11071 (vi).
Public Works—Telegraphs (operating) 13178; (Yukon) 13179 (vii).
Railways—G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10384; (inspection) 10390 (vi).
Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys, &c.) 12765 (vii).
Railways—I.C.R. (Moncton-Truro, additional line) 12760; (Petit Rocher spur) 12760; (Sydney Mines diversion) 12759 (vii).
Railways—Ry. Commission (Que. Bridge) 12769 (vii).

Tobacco Prohibition, &c., Ques. of Order *re* Resolution from Moral Reform Associations, 11302 (vi).
Trent Canal, Cameron Lake Water Level, Purchase of Lands, &c. (Ques.) 9772 (v).
——— Extension to Gull River, Reps., Plans, Surveys, &c. (M. for copies) 2991 (ii).
See 'Balsam,' 'Bobcaygeon,' 'Newmarket.'
——— Tributary Works, Completion of, &c. (Ques.) 1115 (i).
——— Tributary Works, Maintenance, &c. (Ques.) 1114 (i).
Wilberforce Dam., Obstruction to Traffic, &c., Cor., Plans, &c. (M. for copies) 2988 (ii)

HUNT, Mr. A. B., *Compton.*

Pulp Wood Export Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 4818 (iii).

JACKSON, Mr. S. J., *Selkirk.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8242 (iv); in Com., 13007 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11173, 11442, 11526, 11954 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act, Man. Voters' Lists, Polling Divisions made by Judges (remarks) 13139 (vii).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10819 (vi).

Grazing Lease of H. Riviere, Location, &c. (Ques.) 13060 (vii).

Hudson Bay Ry., Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6386 (iv).

Indian Dept., Extravagant Management, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11035 (vi).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12583 (vii).

Manitoba Voters' Lists, Ques. of Priv., 10793 (vi).

Ques. of Privilege, Letter from Mr. Cyr (read) 8460 (v).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1365 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12611 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Immigration (agents) 9881 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8526; (Selkirk) 8548; Sask. (Prince Albert penitentiary) 8602 (v).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys, &c.) 12767 (vii).

JACKSON, Mr. W., *Elgin, W.*

Address, The, 412 (i).

Budget, The, 5959 (iii).

Cattle Embargo in G. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12899 (vii).

Cattle sold at Central Experimental Farm, Sale of (Ques.) 2389 (ii).

Experimental Farm (Central) Amounts paid for seeds, &c. (M. for ret.*) 556 (i).

——— Sale of Cattle, &c. (Mr. for ret.*) 2795 (ii).

Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Book-keeping, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4003 (ii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6900 (iv).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Amount of Expenditure for Cleaning, &c. (Ques.) 8888 (v).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 5076 (iii).

JACKSON, Mr. W.—*Con.*

Port Stanley Breakwater, Contractors, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 239 (i).

Quebec Bridge, Vehicle Traffic (Ques.) 10739 (vi).

St. Lawrence River Route, Wrecks and Collisions (Ques.) 10739 (vi).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10576 (vi); (live stock) 12899 (vii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 4758 (iii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4086 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 3220 (ii); (Govt. steamers) 1077 (i); (naval schools) 3224; (wrecks) 3205 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Yarmouth) 7181 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 8594 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Stanley) 12136 (vii).

'Vigilant' Cruiser, Investigation *re* Collision (Ques.) 682 (i).

JOHNSTON, Mr. A., *Cape Breton, South.*

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 13056 (vii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5254 (iii).

Committee Meeting, Rep. *re*, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bennett) Ques. of Order, 2383 (ii).

Co-Operation B. 5 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 4565 (iii).

Debates, Official (translators) 4th Rep., on M. (Mr. Monk) to ref. back to Com., 10248 (v).

Fort William Terminals B. 101 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6180 (iii).

Govt. Employees, Interference in Dom. Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 615 (i).

'Hansard,' Extra Copies, Distribution of (remarks) 9129 (v).

Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Political Interference, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6651 (iv).

Immigration Bonuses, on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1337 (i).

I.C.R., Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4487 (iii).

Keewatin Diocese Synod incorp. (B. 179) 1°*, 9330 (v).

Kun, Agnes Ballum, Release of from Gaol (remarks) 9335 (v).

Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal (B. 185) 1°*, 10008; M. for 2°, 10122 (v).

JOHNSTON, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Marine and Fisheries, Purchase of Supplies for 1892-1896 (M. for ret.*) 6241 (iv).

Metal Shingle and Siding Co.'s Patent (B. 210) 1° m., 12649 (vii).

Obstruction to Supply, Ques. of Order, 10024 (v).

Old Age Pension Scheme, on M. (Mr. Pringle) for Sel. Com., 2429 (ii).

Presbyterian College, Halifax, B. 154 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 7667 (iv).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3128, 3139 (ii).

——— 3rd Rep. (M.) to conc., 9890 (v).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4949 (iii).

Public Works, &c., in N. S., Irrelevancy of Debate (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7129 (iv).

Railway Act Amt. B. 27 (Mr. Macdonald) on order for 2° (remarks) 5211 (iii).

Sessional Papers and Returns: Number ordered, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2796 (ii).

——— Number presented, &c. (Ques.) 2592 (ii).

Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, on M. (Mr. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7748 (iv).

Supplies purchased for Govt., &c., Ques. of Order, *re* Investigation by Pub. Accounts Com., 5830 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Lachine (slope walls) 5667 (iii).

Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9253 (v).

House of Commons (contingencies) 10502 (vi).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 4759 (iii).

Marine (ice-breakers) 1906 (i).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 1053 (i); (ice-breakers) 2958 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Digby) 11226 (vi); Ont. (Stanley Island pier) 5720 (iii).

Railways—I.C.R. (Campbellton) 12258 (vii); (supplies) 10201 (v).

Water Carriage of Goods (B. 178) 1°*, 9330 (v); on M. for 2°, 13509 (vii).

KEMP, Mr. A. E., *Toronto, East.*

Address, The, 434 (i).

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3878 (ii).

All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12460 (vii).

Boundary Surveys (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9738 (v).

Canadian Bank of Commerce, Letter of B. E. Walker (read) 6008 (iii).

KEMP, Mr. A. E.—*Con.*

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12877 (vii).

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6889 (iv).

Customs and Trade Returns, Duplicate Printing, &c., on M. for Sup. (remarks) 9735 (v).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12932; on M. for 3°, 13230 (vii).

Election Corruption, Charges of Hon. Mr. Pugsley, ref. to in debate on Address, 435 (i).

Gold and Silver Marking B. 197 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12554 (vii).

G.T.P., Montreal Branch, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13301 (vii).

——— Winnipeg and Moncton Route, Miles Located, &c. (Ques.) 2386 (ii).

I.C.R., &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4422 (iii).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11247 (vi).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12567 (vii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6894 (iv).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9487 (v).

Ordnance Lands Sale B. 218 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 13418 (vii).

Port Colborne Elevator and Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12218 (vii).

Postal Arrangements between U. S and Canada, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 3893 (ii).

Ry. Act (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3346 (ii).

Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3906, 3922 (ii).

Returns, Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv., 4665 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Trent (constrution) 12226; (Port Colborne) 12212; (surveys) 12209 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Interior (astronomical surveys) 9738; (salaries) 9699 (v).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5773 (iii); (Point Pelee lightship) 13325 (vii).

Miscellaneous (Chinese riots) 13155; (cotton strikers) 13162 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt steamers) 5764 (iii); (ice-breakers) 2962; (life-saving stations) 2972 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (new deptl. building) 5701; (post office) 5705; (rents, &c.) 5706 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal, pneumatic postal) 5704 (iii); (Montreal,

KEMP, Mr. A. E.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

postal station B) 7419; (Montreal, post office) 7411; (Montreal, warehouse) 7424; (Point St. Charles) 7419; (St. John's, military) 7440 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (St. Andrew's rapids) 5702; Ont. (Stanley Island pier) 5721 (iii).

Public Works—Marine Dept. (gratuities) 13321 (vii).

Railways—I.C.R. (salaries) 10146 (v).

Thanksgiving Day, Change from Thursday to Monday (remarks) 13085 (vii).

Toronto Harbour, (western entrance) Contract Price, &c. (Ques.) 10014 (v).

KENNEDY, Mr. J. B., *New Westminster.*

B. C. Fishing Licenses to Packer's Association, Issue of (Ques.) 8173 (iv).

Customs Defalcations in B. C., on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10485 (vi).

——— Ques. of Priv., 9459 (v).

Debates of the House, Time occupied by Speakers (remarks) 13537 (vii).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1725 (i).

Indian Dept., Extravagant Management, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11031 (vi).

Japanese Immigration, &c., Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2144 (ii).

——— on prop. Res. (Mr. R. Smith) 748 (i).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9501 (v).

Obstructions *re* Supplies, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9943 (v).

Ry. Act, 1903 (fires, &c.) Amt. (B. 18) 1° m., 350; 2° m., 938 (i).

KNOWLES, Mr. W. E., *Assiniboia, West.*

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11549 (vi).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11132; in Com., 11413, 11958 (vi).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10826 (vi).

G.T.P., Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 8128 (iv), 9382 (v).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, &c., on M. for Sup., 6291 (iv).

Lumber Duties from U. S., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to Com. of Sup., 9510 (v).

Moosejaw-Lacombe Branch of C. P. Ry., Extension of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7654 (iv).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 9068 (v).

KNOWLES, Mr. W. E.—*Con.*

Seed Grain for Settlers in N. W., Extension of Time for Payment, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2918 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1368 (i).

Seed Wheat in N. W., Charges by Mr. Macdonell, M.P., Ques. of Priv., 1438 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12595 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries) 9700 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.W. (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10976 (vi); Sask. (Humboldt) 8596 (v).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys, &c.) 12765 (vii).

Yeomans, Indian Agent, Complaints by John Franklin, &c., Letters, &c. (M. for copies*) 1513 (i).

Yukon Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9668 (v).

LAKE, Mr. R. S., *Qu'Appelle.*

Address, The, 459 (i).

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4713 (iii).

Autonomy Act Validity, Return, Inquiry for, 5727 (iii).

Blood Indian Reserve, Lease to McEwan Cattle Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12740 (vii).

Bonn Post Office, Application *re* Mail Service, &c. (Ques.) 10516 (vi).

Buchanan Townsite, Applications *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10079 (v).

Budget, The, 5605 (iii).

Cameron, John, Homestead Inspector, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 4769 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry., Erwood and Pas Mission Branch, Rep. of Engineer (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 13309 (vii).

——— Rep. of Engineer *re* Erwood and Pas Mission (remarks) 13475 (vii).

C.P.R. Taxation, Test Cases, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 2170 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 5049 (iii).

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6882 (iv).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10550 (vi).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11367 (vi).

Coal Areas, Agents for Applicants, &c. (Ques.) 5468 (iii).

Coal Lands, Timber, &c., Dates of Regulation, O.Cs., &c. (Ques.) 12656 (vii).

LAKE, Mr. R. S.—*Con.*

Coal Mines Royalty, Sums received by Govt. (Ques.) 12391 (vii).

Crooked Lake Indian Reserve, Sale of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 634 (i).

——— (remarks) 10916 (vi).

Documents, Original, Production of, to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1637 (i).

——— on M. for Sup., 1839 (i).

Documents, Original, *re* Timber Berths (M. for papers, &c.) 2855 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8150 (iv), 11791; in Com., (amt.) 11898 (vi).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11127; in Com., 11158, 11168 11415, 11505, 11942; on M. for 3° (amt.) 11976 (vi), 12395; Neg. (Y. 39; N. 65) 12395; on Senate Amts., 13522 (vii).

Dom. Lands (surveys) B. 9 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 754 (i).

Dom. Lands, Area disposed of by Govt. (Ques.) 3431 (ii).

——— Sales of during 1907 (M. for ret.*) 3435 (ii).

——— Return, Inquiry for, 5727 (iii).

——— Total Area disposed of from 1896 to 1905 &c. (M. for ret.) 3852 (ii).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10816 (vi).

Doukhobor Prisoners at Fort William, Pardon by Justice Dept. (remarks) 6847 (iv).

——— Tels. *re* Pardon by Justice Dept. (Ques.) 6983 (iv).

Doukhobors at Yorkton, Tel. *re* Conduct, &c. (remarks) 7621 (iv).

Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, 6752 (iv).

Eagle Lake Coal Lands, Surrender of (Ques.) 694 (i).

Estevan Quarantine Lands, Disposal of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10093 (v).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3651 (ii).

Grain Commission's Rep., Inquiry for, 2381 (ii), 4224, 4316 (iii).

Grain Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 203 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 13208 (vii).

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 9469 (v).

Harbottle, N. F., Emplymt. in Excise Dept., &c. (Ques.) 7730 (iv).

Homestead Cancellations, Unfair Methods (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10100 (v).

Homestead Entries, Declarations, &c., by R. Cruickshank, of N. W. (M. for copies*) 698 (i).

LAKE, Mr. R. S.—*Con.*

Homestead Entry for S. W. ¼ Section 16-28-1, Issue of Patent, Duties performed, &c. (Ques.) 2167 (ii).

Homestead Entries N. E. ¼ Sec. 28, Permissions *re* Grants (Ques.) 1941 (i).

Homestead Entries in N. W. Quarter Section 35, &c. (Ques.) 4762 (iii).

Homestead Entry by Mr. Tanguay (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10087 (v).

Homesteads, Sale of in Township 13, Range 13 (Ques.) 7206 (iv).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6368 (iv).

Indian Lands, Sale of, Ret., Inquiry for, 4495 (iii).

Irrigation Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 962 (i).

Land Patents, Entry of Dates, Applications, Inspections, &c., of ¼ section 16, &c. (Ques.) 3432 (ii).

Land Patents, Sections 36, &c., Issue of (Ques.) 3481 (ii).

Land Sales in N. W. Indian Reserves, Applications, Advertisements, &c. (M. for copies*) 2170 (ii).

Lands in Sections 2, 10, 14, 22 and 24, Disposal of (Ques.) 5083 (iii).

Land Titles Act Assurance B. 168 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 8481 (v).

Livingstone, Wm. G., Sale of Sections 22, 28 and 32, &c. (Ques.) 9475 (v).

Lumber manufactured in N. W., Royalties, &c. (Ques.) 3835 (ii).

McKenzie, Mr. K. W., Apptmt. as Dom. Lands Agent at Edmonton (Ques.) 6981 (iv).

Mackinnon Post Office, Establishment of, &c. (Ques.) 10516 (vi).

McLeod, Roderick, Date of Homestead Entry (Ques.) 6401 (iv).

Mail Matter lost in C.P.R. Accident at Kenora, Rep. *re* (remarks) 9281, 9723 (v).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12559, 13221 (vii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6890 (iv).

Moberly, Mr. H. J., Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 3848 (ii).

Moose Mountain Buffalo Herd (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10102 (v).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9493; (amt.) 9494 (v).

Muskoday Indian Reserve, Negotiations *re* Sale (Ques.) 5082 (iii).

Pasqua Indian Reserve, Sale of Lands (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12729, 12737 (vii).

LAKE, Mr. R. S.—*Con.*

Peace River Colonization and Land Development Co., Surveys, Reps., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10001 (v).

'Phoenix' Saskatoon, Number ordered, Payments, &c. (Ques.) 6920 (iv).

Post Office Act (postage) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 10713 (vi).

Postal Arrangements between Can. and U. S., on Statement (Mr. Lemieux) to Com. of Sup., 3166 (ii).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake & Saskatchewan Ry. and SS. Co., Last Deficit, &c. (Ques.) 6459 (iv).

Quarter Sections 35, 31, 6, &c., Public and Private Sale, &c. (Ques.) 8176 (iv).

Railway Act (construction) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Turriff) on M. for 2°, 3410 (ii).

——— (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3401 (ii).

Ramsland Homestead Entry, Improvements, &c. (Ques.) 5209 (iii).

Returns, Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv., 4664 (iii).

Samovici, A., and H. Bolacan, Applications for Cancellation of Homestead Rights, &c. (M. for copy*) 557 (i).

Saskatchewan Act, May 23rd, 1906, Constitutionality of, Cor., &c. (M. for copy*) 3435 (ii).

———.Report *re* (Ques.) 6400 (iv).

Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Conditions of Sale, &c. (Ques.) 4761 (iii).

See 'Timber,' &c.

School Lands Exchange B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 8472 (v).

Scrip and Money received by Govt. *re* Lands, Mines, &c. (M. for ret.) 3852 (ii).

——— (Ques.) 3431 (ii).

School, Timber and Coal Lands in Man., &c. Average Price, &c. (Ques.) 3430 (ii).

Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, Extension of Payment, &c. (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 2896; Neg (Y. 58; N. 98) 2937 (ii).

Seed Grain, Distribution to Settlers in N. W. (Ques.) 692 (i).

——— on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1352 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 2772 (ii).

Six Nation Indians, Negotiations *re*, Pets., &c. (M. for copies*) 6242 (iv).

——— Refusal of Inspection of Memorials, &c. (Ques.) 6239 (iv).

S. A. Volunteers B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3790, 3831 (ii); in Com. (amt.) 12621; on Senate Amts., 13524 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Interior (astronomical surveys) 9764 (v).

Dom. Lands (agents) 10041; (homesteads) 10082; (salaries) 10041 (v).

LAKE, Mr. R. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Geological Survey (specimens) 12261 (vii).

Immigration (agents) 9858; (deportations) 9882; (Doukhobors) 9956; (hospitals) 9983; (relief to settlers) 9983 (v).

Indians—Ont. and Que. (land sales) 12733 (vii).

Inspection of Staples (inspectors) 12264 (vii).

Miscellaneous (seed grain) 2772 (ii).

N. W. M. Police (pay of force) 8869 (v).

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5527 (iii).

Post Office (inspection) 9114 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally Experimental Farms (repairs, &c.) 10906 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8531 (v); (Winnipeg, hospital) 10957 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—N.W. (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10976 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston) 10910 (vi); (North Bay) 7715 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Alta (Edmonton) 8579; (Battleford) 8577; (Estevan) 8581; (Humboldt) 8582; (Regina) 8602 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.W.T. (Lesser Slave) 5719 (iii).

Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys) 12764; I.C.R. (surveys, branch lines) 12764 (vii).

Timber Berths, Nos. 1220-1272, on Order for Ret. (amt.) 849 (i).

Timber Licenses cancelled from May, 1905, to Nov., 1907, &c. (Ques.) 181 (i).

Timber Licenses, Conditions and Forms in force at present (Ques.) 359 (i).

Timber Licenses and Renewals in N. W., Number of Miles, &c. (Ques.) 181 (i).

——— (M.) for Com. of Investigation, 2260, 2269; Amt. Neg. (Y. 55; N. 111) 2736 (ii).

Timber Sales, &c., on Amt. to Com. of Sup., 8769; (amt.) 8778; Amt. neg. (Y. 46; N. 91) 8833 (v).

Vacant Land Reservation, Instructions to Agents *re*, &c. (Ques.) 1935 (i).

Wheat Feed Shipments, Special Arrangements with Ry. Cos. (Ques.) 893 (i).

Wheat Transportation, Financial Assistance, &c. (Ques.) 1938 (i).

Yukon Act (Govt.) Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10531 (vi).

Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8484 (v).

LALOR, Mr. F. R., *Haldimand.*

Address, The, 292 (i).

Apple and Fruit Inspectors, Number of Apptmts. (Ques.) 353 (i).

Apples seized by Inspectors at Montreal, Value, &c. (Ques.) 1508 (i).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6177, 6197 (iii).

Canada-Germany Trade Relations (remarks) 13081 (vii).

LALOR, Mr. F. R.—*Con.*

Cattle exported to U. S. during 1900-7, Value, &c. (Ques.) 1507 (i).

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11252 (vi).

Cold Storage Cos., Grants to (Ques.) 1937 (i).

Dauphin Public Building, Valuation of Site (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10866 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13039 (vii).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13265 (vii).

Fisheries Regulations, Violation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5781 (iii).

Fruit Inspection, Complaints *re* Packing of Apples (remarks) 2760 (ii).

Gelinas, Mr., Repayment of Travelling Expenses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 669 (i).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11249 (vi).

Meat and Canned Food Inspectors, Number of Apptmts. (Ques.) 352 (i).

Militia Stores and Arms, Care of for Rural Battalions (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5736 (iii).

Port Maitland, Piers, Amount of Mr. Battle's Tender (Ques.) 690 (i).

——— Apptmt. of W. W. Krick as Inspector (Ques.) 6919 (iv).

——— Tenders, &c. (M. for copies*) 1294 (i).

Post Office Act (postage) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 10714 (vi).

Quebec Tercentenary, Mobilization of Militia, &c. (remarks) 8862 (v).

Ry. Act (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10676 (vi).

St. John Cold Storage Co., Names of Stockholders, &c. (Ques.) 1938 (i).

Seed Inspectors, Number of Apptmts. (Ques.) 353 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census, &c.) 677 (i).
Canals, 10319 (vi); Welland (Port Maitland) 5676 (iii).
Civil Govt.—Trade and Commerce (salaries) 652 (i).
Militia (annual drill) 5735; (stores, care of) 5736 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Ladysmith) 10867; (Vernon) 10870 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8522 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Leamington) 7815; (Owen Sound) 7822; (St. Mary's) 7826; (Welland) 7832 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Port Hood) 11275; (Pugwash wharf) 11281 (vi).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2671 (ii).

LALOR, Mr. F. R.—*Con.*

Welland Canal, Feeder, Rep. of Judge Madden *re* Investigation (M. for copy*) 852 (i).

——— Investigation *re* Water Rents, &c. (Ques.) 174 (i).

——— Resignation of John R. Scott (Ques.) 6058 (iii).

Wheat Transportation from N. W., Financial Aid, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2189 (ii).

Wilson Cordage Co., Charges against A. Smith (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 657 (i).

Woollen Industry, Deputations *re* (remarks) 13082 (vii).

LANCASTER, Mr. E. A., *Lincoln & Niagara.*

Accounts and Claims against Govt., Total Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 362 (i).

Admiralty Court Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 4865 (iii).

Belleville and North Hastings Ry. and G. T. Ry., on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Cor., 2816 (ii).

Blunden, Frederick, Trial and Conviction, on M. (Mr. Ward) for Cor., 3473 (ii).

Campaign Literature, franking by Depts., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10351 (vi).

Canada Shipping Act: *See* 'Masters and Mates.'

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. 187 (Mr. Fielding) on M. to place on Order Paper (remarks) 13494 (vii).

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6875 (iv).

Cannon, Catherine Ann Relief B. 175, on M. (Mr. Galliher) to remit Fees, 13510 (vii).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10744 (vi).

Cooper & White, Payments *re* Rental for Govt. Lands, Welland (Ques.) 3841 (ii).

Cornwall Canal, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12204 (vii).

Documents, Original, Production of, to Members, on M. for Sup., 1814 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 11726; in Com. (amt.) 11816; (amt.) 11841 (vi), 12967 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11177 (vi).

Electrical and Gas Power Licenses granted under Statute, c. 16, &c. (Ques.) 360 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trades Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3532 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3801 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal, on M. (Mr. McCool) for Plans, &c., 5239 (iii).

——— Rep. *re* (remarks) 12836 (vii).

Georgian Bay Canal Scheme (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10313 (vi).

LANCASTER, Mr. E. A.—*Con.*

G.T.P., Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 8746, 9382 (v).

—— Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup. 12707 (vii).

—— Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 12318 (vii).

G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2246 (ii); in Com., 12076 (vii).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3718 (ii).

I.C.R. Employees Provident Fund Amt. B. 11 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4995 (iii).

Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12400 (vii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12566 (vii).

Masters and Mates Act Amt. (B. 2) 1° m., 90 (i); 2° m., 3014; in Com., 3034 (ii).

—— on Order for 2° (remarks) 570 (i).

National Battlefields (lands) B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 13501 (vii).

N.B. Cold Storage Co., &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9367 (v).

N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference of Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3057 (ii).

Niagara Lands, Purchase for Military Purposes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13542 (vii).

Niagara Military Camp, Holding of (remarks) 9779 (v).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 5002 (iii).

Obstruction *re* Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9906 (v).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10854 (vi).

Order, Ques. of, Discussions *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4103 (ii).

Port Colborne Elevator, Total Expenditure (Ques.) 4245 (iii).

Port Colborne, Total Expenditure *re* improvements (Ques.) 4403 (iii).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. (B. 3) 1° m., 91; 2° m., 570; in Com., 583 (i); (amt.) on Senate Amts., 12191, Neg. (Y. 42; N. 85) 12192 (vii).

—— (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3353 (ii).

——(compensation) Amt. B. 27 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 5247 (iii).

Railway Commission (ass't chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3909 (ii); in Com., 4967 (iii).

LANCASTER, Mr. E. A.—*Con.*

Ry. Act (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10645; on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 11607; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 3°, 11624; on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to M. for 3°, 10784, 11595 (vi).

—— (Ry. Commission) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to M. for 3°, 10784, 11595 (vi).

Ry. Act (mortgages) Chap. 38, B. 204 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 1°, 12550 (vii).

S.A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12601 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Generally (repairs) 10309; (statistical branch) 10319 (vi).

Canals—Welland (electric lighting) 12195; (Port Colborne) 12221; (surveys) 12208 (vii).

Civil Govt.—Interior (astronomical surveys) 9753 (v).

Customs—Inspectors (travelling expenses) 9540; Miscellaneous (legal expenses) 9578; Outside Service (salaries) 9439 (v).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4050, 4103 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Colborne) 12096; (Collingwood) 12096; (Gore's Landing) 12101 (vii).

Railways — Miscellaneous (inspections) 10342 (vi).

Timber Marking Act Amt. (B. 193) in Com., 12408 (vii).

Water Carriage of Goods B. 178, on M. for 2°, 13509 (vii).

Waterways Commission *re* International Boundary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9753 (v).

Welland Canal, Cost of Construction, &c. (Ques.) 4245 (iii).

—— Deepening, Estimated Cost (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10311 (vi).

—— Culvert and Dock, Total Expenditure (Ques.) 4245 (iii).

Wheat Transportation from N.W., Financial Aid by Govt., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2190 (ii).

LANCTOT, Mr. R., *Laprairie-Napierville.*

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (seconded) 17 (i).

Annapolis and Digby Mail Service, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 12653 (vii).

Ouimet, Hon. J. A., Retirement of (Ques.) 516 (i).

—— O.C. *re* (M. for copy*) 557 (i).

Ry. Act (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3373 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay Patrol) 4027 (ii).

LAPOINTE, Mr. E., *Kamouraska.*

Experimental Farms, Establishment of, Names of Provinces (Ques.) 7990 (iv).

——— Number under Control of Dom. Govt. (Ques.) 3897 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4029 (ii).

LAURIER, Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid (Prime Minister) G.C.M.G., *Quebec East.*

Address, The, (M.) *re* Precedence, 8 (i).

Address, The 40 (i).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Barker) 544 (i).

——— (M.) to present, 554 (i).

Adjournment for Christmas: (M.) 754 (i).

See 'Business,' &c.

Advertisements for Tenders of Public Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4706 (iii).

All-Red Line (prop. res.) 12414, Agreed to (Y. 109; N. 47) 12501 (vii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12495 (ii).

All-Red Route, Authority *re* Negotiations, &c. (statement) 366 (i).

——— Canadian Representatives in England, &c. (Ans.) 353 (i).

——— Irish Route, Opposition by Govt. (Ans.) 10254 (v).

——— Letter to Mr. Sifton (remarks) 948 (i).

——— Purposes of Mr. White's Presence in London (remarks) 608 (i).

——— Mr. White's Duties in England (Ans). 694 (i).

——— Resolutions (remarks) 12162 (vii).

——— Mr. Sifton's Address *re* Canada's Attitude (remarks) 947 (i).

——— Tenders, Proposals, Cor. *re* (Ans.) 6460 (iv).

Anglo-American Cable between P.E.I. and Mainland, Breaking of (remarks) 8440 (v).

Anglo-American Treaties, Cor. &c. (remarks) 9715 (v).

——— Further Information *re* (remarks) 7447 (iv), 8516 (v).

——— on Inquiry for Cor., 10120 (v).

——— Submitted to Can. Govt. (remarks) 6926 (iv).

——— Tel. from Mr. Bryce *re* (remarks) 6985 (iv).

Anglo-Japanese Treaty Cor, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copies, 599 (i).

See 'Japanese.'

'Arctic' Str., Cruise in Northern Waters, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4012 (ii).

Ash Wednesday Adjournment (M.) 4221, 4314 (iii).

Australian Mission of Sir Mackenzie Bowell, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 2218 (ii).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*

Bate & Co., and W. C. Edwards & Co., Payments to (Ans.) 3234 (ii).

Battlefields of Canada (B. 111) prop. Res., 3579, 3901; 1° m., 3902 (ii); 2° m., 4376; in Com., 4393, 4408, 4497; 3° m., 4530, 4534, Agreed to (Y. 90; N. 11) 4535 (iii).

Battlefields Commission (lands) Amt. B. 219 1° m., 13495; in Com., 13501 (vii).

Beauharnois Canal Water Power, New Lease (remarks) 947 (i).

Belleville and North Hastings Ry., and G.T. Ry. Co., on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Cor., 2820 (ii).

Binder Twine, Lead, &c., Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 4583 (iii).

Blue Books, Distribution to Members, &c. (remarks) 241 (i).

Blunden, Frederick, Trial and Conviction, on M. (Mr. Ward) for Cor., 3471 (ii).

Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5949

Bounties paid by Govt. since 1896 (remarks) 895 (i).

Bounties paid on Binder Twine, Lead, &c (Ans.) 4583 (iii).

Brier Island Fog Alarm, Contract *re* Installation (Ans.) 9474 (v).

Business of the House (M.) to take in Wednesdays, 5135 (iii), 9480 (v), 11232 (vi).

——— Public Bills, &c. (remarks) 2982 (ii)

See 'Govt. Business,' &c.

Cabinet Appointments, &c. (remarks) in debate on Address, 44 (i).

Campaign Funds, Charges and Investigation *re* (remarks) in debate on Address 65 (i).

Canada-Australian SS. Subvention, Discontinuance of (Ans.) 941 (i).

——— Yearly Subsidies, &c. (Ans.) 1289 (i).

Canada and France SS. Communication, Provision *re* Treaty (Ans.) 12391 (vii.)

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 6418 (iv).

Canada and U. S. Treaties, on Inquiry (Mr R. L. Borden) 7835 (iv).

See 'Anglo-American,' &c.

Canadians at Niagara, Indignity by Customs Officer of U. S. (remarks) 11122 (vi).

Canadian Press Association Subsidy B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 12849 (vii).

Cassels, Mr. Justice, Acceptance *re* Investigation of Marine Dept. (remarks) 6060 (iii).

——— Conditions *re* Investigation of Marine Dept., 6143 (iii).

——— Cor. *re* Investigation of Marine Dept. Laid on Table, 6464 (iv).

See 'Civil Service,' &c., 'Marine and Fisheries.'

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*

Cattle Embargo by G. B., Cable *re* Removal (remarks) 13228 (vii).

'Champlain,' Str., Use in Quebec for Political Purposes (remarks) 9127, 9343, 9460 (v).

Chilvers, Messrs., Emplymt. of (Ans.) 8894, 9266 (v).

Chinese Immigration, Decision of N. S. Supreme Court *re* Evasion of Poll Tax (Ans.) 514 (i).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on M. to resume adjn. debate, (remarks) 5246, 5251 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11562 (vi).

Civil Service Commission's Report, Investigation *re* Depts., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn., 6148 (iii).

Civil Service Commission Report, Investigation, Enlargement of Judge Cassels' Powers, on Amt. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7535 (iv).

—— Marine, Deptl. Dismissals (announcement 6003 (iii).

—— Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to Adjn. House, 5887 (iii).

—— Report, (remarks) on Presentation, 5633 (iii).

—— Translation of (remarks) 11312 (vi).

Civil Service List (presented) 93 (i).

Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9200 (v).

Cold Storage, Papers on, Inquiry for, 3690 (ii).

See 'N.B. Cold Storage, &c.

Colonial Conference (remarks) in debate on Address 41 (i).

See 'Travelling,' &c.

Commercial Travellers Tax, Condition *re* Abolition of (Ans.) 5794 (iii).

Committees, Sel. Standing (M.) 6 (i).

—— (M.) to conc. in Rep., 90 (i).

—— Organization of (remarks) 505 (i).

—— (M.) to add Names, 1207 (i), 3315 (ii).

Companies Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5493 (iii).

Co-operative Societies B. 5 (Mr. Monk) on Order for 2°, 583 (i); (M.) to transfer to Govt. Orders, 3654 (ii).

Copyright Act Amt. B. 28 (Mr. Macdonald) on M. for 2°, 940 (i).

Criminal Code Amendments, on Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 9283 (v).

Dairy and Cold Storage Commissioner's Rep. (presented) 2786 (ii).

Debates of the House, Average Price per Column (Ans.) 3479 (ii).

—— 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 7834 (iv).

—— (remarks) 12505 (vii).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*

Debates of the House, 4th Rep. (translaters) on M. to ref. back to Com. (remarks) 8900, 9710, 9889, 10119, 10242 (v).

Debates, Official, French Edition, Delays in Printing (Ans.) 2978 (ii).

—— Distribution, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Beland) 3491 (ii).

—— French Supt. of Printing (Ans.) 2978 (ii), 12411 (vii).

Dillon, Gerald P., Apptmt. to N.W.M. Police Force (Ans.) 6001 (iii).

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1137 (i).

—— Instruction *re* Laying on Table (remarks) 7810 (iv).

—— Production of to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1623 (i).

—— Production of to Members, on M. for Sup., 1775 (i).

—— (remarks) on M. to adjn. debate, 1845 (i).

—— Papers laid on Table, 1927 (i).

—— on Notice being called, 2794 (ii).

See 'Public Documents,' 'Timber,' &c.

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 29 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 2°, 5247 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8296 (v); in Com., 11807 (vi), 12922; on M. for 3°, 13231 (vii).

Dom. Election Bill, 1903, Preparation of (remarks) &c., 8393 (v).

Dom. Elections Act, and Govt. Measures, Proceeding with (remarks) 7721 (iv).

Dom. Guarantee Co.'s B. 127 (Mr. Pringle) on Senate Amts., 12773 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to M. for 3°, Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 11977 (vi).

Doukhobors, Prisoners at Fort William (remarks) 6848 (iv).

Doukhobors at Yorkton, Violation of Laws (remarks) 7620 (iv).

Dredging Companies, Investigation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5928 (iii).

—— O.Cs. *re* Renewals without Tenders (remarks) 6747 (iv).

Dredging in Quebec Harbours in 1907, Tenders, Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 3240 (ii).

Drury, R. L., Apptmt. as Japanese Agent (remarks) 4769 (iii).

Dunsmuir, Lt. Gov. of B.C., Assent to Natal Act, Interference of Dom. Govt. (remarks) 1738 (i).

—— Tel. of Sec. of State (read) 1859 (i).

See 'Immigration,' &c.

Easter Adjournment (M.) 6464 (iv).

Eclipse Manufacturing Co., Payments to (Ans.) 3239 (ii).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13276 (vii).

Elder-Dempster SS. Subsidy to S. Africa (Ans.) 2792 (ii).

Empire Day and Ascension Day, Adjnmt. (M.) 8894 (v).

Employees of Parlt. and Printing Bureau, Names, Salaries, Religions, &c. (remarks) 5206 (iii).

——— on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Ret., 5485

Fisheries Act (trials) Amt. B. 31 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 5249 (iii).

Fisheries Negotiations, &c., between U. S. and Canada (remarks) 2023 (ii).

Fisheries Treaty Boundaries with U.S., Information *re* (remarks) 6632, 6740, 6844 (iv).

Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, Apptmt. to Hague Tribunal (remarks) 8295 (v).

Franco-Canadian Treaty (remarks) in debate on Address, 43 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty Bill (remarks) *re* 3°, 3754 (ii).

See 'Canada and France,' &c.

French Translation of Govt. Documents, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3181 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 4230 (iii).

Govt. Business, (announcement) 7834 (iv).

——— Introduction of Bills (remarks) 10258 (v).

——— Legislation (remarks) 10303, 10511, 11123, 11826 (vi).

——— Stmnt. *re* Legislation, 12049, 12163 (vii).

Govt. Business, Precedence on Mondays (M.) 6287 (iv).

Govt. Officials and Interference in Elections (remarks) 11903 (vi).

Govt. Ownership of Rys., &c. (remarks) in debate on Address, 51 (i).

Grain Commission, Number of Members, &c. (Ans.) 3486 (ii).

Grain Commissioner's Report (Ans.) 180 (i).

——— on Inquiry for, 609 (i), 2381 (ii).

Grain Inspection, Total Expenditure and Receipts in 1906 (Ans.) 4586 (iii).

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 9465 (v).

G.T.P. Ry., Eastern Division, Recent Estimate of Cost (Ans.) 5259 (iii).

G.T.P. Ry., Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, Amt. to M. to ref. to Special Com., 7320 (iv).

——— Charges *re* Classification (remarks) 6844, 6925 (iv).

——— Statement from Mr. Parent (remarks) 6985, 7097 (iv).

——— (M.) to ref. to Com., 7213 (iv).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*

G.T.P. Ry., Location, Conference in Montreal, Par. in Toronto 'World' (remarks) 7809 (iv).

G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2224 (ii); in Com., 12071 (vii).

G.B. and U.S. Treaties, Papers laid on Table, 8694 (v).

See 'Anglo-American,' &c.

Guelph-Goderich Mail Service, Arrangements with C.P.R. (Ans.) 184 (i).

Halifax Garrison, Disbandment of (remarks) 1208 (i).

Halifax Platform, *re* Conservative Speeches (remarks) in debate on Address, 47 (i).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3695 (ii), 4226 (iii).

Hansard, Extra Copies, Distribution of (remarks) 9131 (v).

Hillsborough Bridge Claims, on Inquiry for Ret., 3691 (ii).

Hindus, Immigrants and Contract Labour (remarks) 4407 (iii).

Hindus in B.C., Protests *re* Treatment (remarks) 5489 (iii).

Hodgins, Major, Retirement of (remarks) 366 (i).

See 'G.T.P.,' &c.

House of Commons Act Amt. B. 66 (Mr. R. L. Borden) on M. for 2°, 5226 (iii).

House of Commons, Allottment of Rooms in New Wing (remarks) 5729 (iii).

——— Employees, Apptmts. and Recommendations, &c. (Ans.) 3899 (ii).

——— Rules *re* Hours of Adjournment, on prop. Res. (Mr. Wright) 588 (i).

House of Commons and Senate, Cost of outside of Indemnities (Ans.) 4760 (iii).

Hudson Bay Co., Lord Selkirk's Estate, Original Land Registers, &c. (Ans.) 4403 (iii).

Hyman, Hon. C. S., Date of Resignation, Payments to, &c. (Ans.) 166 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 5657 (iii); in Com., 6432 (iv).

Immigration Act, B.C., known as Natal Act, Disallowance of (Ans.) 567 (i).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 7077 (iv).

——— on Notice of M. (Mr. Monk) 6289 iv).

——— Par. in 'Canadian Gazette' (remarks) 7454 (iv).

Immigrants, Fraudulent Circular issued, &c. (remarks) 607 (i).

Imperial Treaties, Status of Canada *re* Negotiations (Ans.) 1939 (i).

Indian Lands, Sale in Algoma, Tel. from Mr. Sifton (read) 13416 (vii).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*
Indian Lands (remarks) 13532 (vii).
Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6479 (iv).
Insurance, Supt. of, Salary (prop. res.) 12162 (vii).
I.C.R., Claims for Damages by A. W. Belyea (Ans.) 9472 (v).
——— Freight Rate *re* Fredericton, on M. (Mr. Crocket) for Cor., 2562 (ii).
——— Moncton Shops, Contractor, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 1509 (i).
Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 7 (i).
International Boundary Line, Representation *re* Placing of Buildings (Ans.) 356 (i).
——— Correction of Answer, 519 (i).
Italy, Commercial Treaty with (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10596 (vi).
Japanese Immigration, Announcement of Mr. Lemieux's Mission (remarks) 1208 (i).
——— (remarks) 1424 (i).
Japanese Immigration into B.C. (remarks) on debate on Address, 58 (i).
——— Debate in Japanese Diet, *re* (remarks) 4738 (iii).
——— Information *re* (remarks) 947 (i).
——— Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2090 (ii).
Japanese and Oriental Immigration, O.Cs., Cor., Papers, &c., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Ret., 864 (i).
——— Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 1929 (i).
See 'Anglo-Japanese,' &c., 'Dunsmuir.'
Kun, Agnes Ballum, Release of, from Gaol (remarks) 9335 (v).
Labour Rep. (presented) 841 (i).
Library of Parlt., Com. (M.) 312 (i).
Literary Aid Fund, Establishment of, by Govt. (Ans.) 1287 (i).
Lovell, Mr. H., Decease of (remarks) 230 (i).
Lumber Duty, &c. (remarks) 10259 (v).
Mackenzie, Mr. Jas. H., Emplymt. in Inland Rev. Dept. at Toronto and Sub-Postal Stations (Ques.) 5798 (iii).
Mackenzie, Mr. Wm., Par. in 'Toronto Globe' *re* (remarks) 6986 (iv).
Major's Hill Park and G.T.R. Hotel (remarks) 1425 (i).
See 'G.T.R.,' &c.
Manitoba Boundaries (prop. res.) 12776 (vii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Consent of Legislature, &c. (remarks) 936 (i).
——— Bill *re* Extension (remarks) 1741 (i).
——— Legislation *re* (remarks) 2882 (ii), 7506 (iv), 11706 (vi).
Marier, J. E., Emplymt. on G.T.P. Commission (Ans.) 2162 (ii).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*
Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Book-keeping, &c., ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4006 (ii).
——— Dep. Minister, Resignation of (remarks) 7996 (iv).
Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Appointment of Ass't. Judge (remarks) 11312 (vi).
——— Delay in Investigation, on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn. House, 8453 (v).
——— Delay *re*, on M. for Sup., 9731 (v).
——— Evidence transmitted day by day to House (remarks) 8293 (v).
——— Evidence, Distribution of (remarks) 10789 (vi).
——— Issue of Judge Cassels' Commission (remarks) 6466 (iv).
——— Postponement of by Judge Cassels (remarks) 8385 (v).
Marine Deptl. Officials, Suspension, &c. (remarks) 6003 (iii).
Members appointed to Offices, &c. (remarks) in debate on Address, 46 (i).
Midland Harbour Dredging, Tenders, Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 3240 (ii).
Midland 'Times,' Truro, Amounts paid for Advertising (Ans.) 3235 (ii).
Montreal Directory in Library of House, (Ans.) 4764 (iii).
Montreal Examining Warehouse, on Inquiry for Ret., 3319 (ii).
Montreal and Quebec Ports, Expenditures *re* for the last fifty years (Ans.) 3482 (ii).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3441, (amt.) 3442, Agreed to (Y. 108; N. 53) 3464 (ii).
——— Claim of Govt. *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3465 (ii).
Morning Sittings (M.) 9477; on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 9495 (v).
Naturalization Act Amt. (B. 130) 1°*, 5256 (iii); in Com., 11990 (vi).
Naval Defences, Imperial, Contributions by Canada (Ans.) 1118 (i).
N.B. Cold Storage Co. and Ministerial Connections *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to Com. of Sup., 9415 (v).
N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference of Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3049, 3075 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 3675 (ii).
Newspaper Advertising, Amounts paid, &c (remarks) 509 (i).
Oaths of Office (B. 1) 1°*, pro forma, 3 (i).
Obstruction Tactics *re* Dom. Elections Bill (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9225 (v).
Obstruction to Supply, on M. (Mr. Fowler) to Com. of Sup., 10035 (v).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*

Office Specialty Co., and Eclipse Mfg. Co., Payments to (Ans.) 4244 (iii).

Old Age Pensions (M.) for Sel. Com., 2786 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. Pringle) for Sel. Com., 2423 (ii).

Ontario, Northern Division of Prov. (remarks) 8294 (v).

Order Paper, French and English Editions (remarks) 6852 (iv).

——— Printing in French (remarks) 5407 (iii).

Pardoning Power *re* Criminals released since 1896, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 2853 (ii).

Peace Interparliamentary Union, Meeting at Ottawa (remarks) 13581 (vii).

Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, on M. (Mr. Sloan) to Com. of Sup., 3971 (ii).

Petroleum Bounty Bill (prop. res.) 12162 (vii).

Pinette Harbour Dredging, Pet. *re* (Ans.) 9474 (v).

Postal Service, Complaints *re* Inadequacy, &c. (Ans.) 352 (i).

Postmasters, Rural, Salary Increases, &c. (Ans.) 183 (i).

Post Office, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 93 (i).

Presbyterian Ministers', Widows' and Orphans' Fund B. 23 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 2788 (ii).

P.E.I., Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2742 (ii).

——— Mail Service, on M. (Mr. Martin) for Cor., &c., 1206 (i).

P.E.I. and Nova Scotia SS. Service, Re-Establishing of (Ans.) 8383 (v).

P.E.I., Queen's County, Complaints *re* Mail Service (Ans.) 355 (i).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Tunnel Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 4650 (iii).

Printing and Lithographing outside of Canada, Amounts expended (Ans.) 1732, 1931 (i).

Printing, Supt. of, Apptmt. of a Frenchman (Ans.) 2978 (ii), 12411 (vii).

Printing of Parlt., Joint Com. (M.) 312 (i).

Private Bills Com., Extension of Time (M.) 891 (i).

Private Bills Fees, Discrepancy between Senate and House of Commons (remarks) 10123 (v).

Provincial Subsidies, &c. (remarks) in debate on Address, 61 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3075 (ii).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*

Public Accounts Com., Production of Original Documents (remarks) 1384 (i).

Public Accounts Rep. and Aud. Gen.'s Rep. (M.) to ref. to Public Accounts Committee, 311 (i).

Public Bills and Orders, Priority of Procedure (remarks) 2940 (ii).

Public Documents, Announcement *re* (remarks) 1426 (i).

——— Production in Committees, 1428 (i). *See* 'Documents.'

Quebec Bridge, Change of Plans *re* Height (Ans.) 5203 (iii).

——— Change of Site, &c. (remarks) 7931

Quebec Bridge Co., Govt. Grants, Investigation *re*, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Sel. Com., 2557 (ii).

——— Ref. to, in debate on Address, 544 (i).

Quebec Bridge Rep., Ques. of Order, 13403 (vii).

——— (remarks) 3901 (ii).

Quebec Bridge Subsidy, Apptmt. of Committee, 8440 (v).

Quebec Judges, Apptmt. of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 12190 (vii).

Quebec Tercentenary, Army and Navy Veterans (remarks) 7448 (iv).

——— Legal Holidays (Ans.) 7934 (iv).

——— Transportation of Volunteers remarks) 8378 (v).

Quebec Tercentenary, and Visit of Prince of Wales, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 5210 (iii).

Quebec Tercentenary: *See* 'Battlefields.'

Questions, Precedence of (Ans.) 350 (i).

Railway Act (water mains, &c.) Amt. B. 43 (Mr. Barr) on M. for 2°, 5225 (iii).

——— B. 85 (Mr. A. Lavergne) on M. for 2°, 5243 (iii).

——— (passenger tickets) Amt. B. 90 (Mr. J. D. Reid) on M. for 2°, 5245 (iii).

——— (telephones) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10644; on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to M. for 3°, 11605 (vi).

——— (working hours) Amt. B. 157 (Mr. R. Smith)—(remarks) 10121 (v).

Ry. Subsidies (remarks) 12504 (vii).

——— on Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12772 (vii).

Returns, Inquiry for 569, 1739 (i), 2024 (ii), 6010 (iii). *See* 'Sessional.'

Rolla L. Crain, Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 3239 (ii).

Ross Rifle, Report from Public Accounts (remarks) 5914 (iii).

——— Target Practice, Suspension by N. W. M. Police (Ans.) 3848 (ii).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*

Rules of the House, on prop. Res. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) to amend, 2986 (ii).

Russian Seizures of Canadian Vessels, Compensation *re* (Ans.) 2391 (ii).

St. Boniface Public Building, Contract Price, &c. (Ans.) 4246 (iii).

Ste. Hyacinthe, 84th Regiment, Amount of Pay unpaid, &c. (Ans.) 844 (i).

St. Lawrence Power Co. and Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. Gervais) for Cor., 3012

St. Louis, H., Emplymt. by Govt., Payments to (Ans.) 2977 (ii).

Saturday Sittings (M.) 11501 (vi).

School Statutes *re* Saskatchewan Prov., on M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6866 (iv).

Seed Grain Distribution, Extension *re* (remarks) 5408 (iii).

Senate Reform, on prop. Res. (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 1567 (i).

Sessional Returns, Number presented, &c. (Ans.) 2592 (ii).

Shipping Cos., Pacific Coast, Amount of Subsidies (Ans.) 6920 (iv).

Souris Ry. Wharf, P.E.I., Contract for (Ans.) 2386 (ii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants Bill, in Com. on Res., 3757 (ii).

S. A. School Teachers, Recognition by Govt. (Ans.) 2791 (ii).

South Huron Elections Expenses, Payment by Ret. Officer (Ans.) 11935 (vi).

Speech from Throne, Reply from Gov. Gen. (presented) 1584 (i).

Stanstead Election Papers, Disappearance of, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 8846 (v).

Stanstead By-election Papers, Destruction of (remarks) 8087 (iv).

——— Ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elections (M.) 8887 (v).

Sub-Target Machines, on submitting Papers to Pub. Accts. Com. (remarks) 946 (i).

Suburban Mail Delivery, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3286 (ii).

Superannuation and Retirement Acts, Payments under (Ans.) 7989 (iv).

Supplies purchased by Govt., Apptmt of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5816 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10594 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Privy Council (salaries, &c.) 611 (i).

N. W. M. Police (compensations) 8870; (pay of force) 8863; (pensions) 8870; (salaries, &c.) 8863 (v).

Railways—Ry. Commission (legal expenses) 10364 (vi).

LAURIER, Sir W.—*Con.*

Telegraph and Telephone Bill, and Man. Boundaries (remarks) 3043 (ii).

Thanksgiving Day, Change from Thursday to Monday (remarks) 13085 (vii).

Timber Berths, Original Papers, on M. (Mr. Lake) for Ret. (amt.) 2856 (ii).

——— Returns, on Inquiry for, 1739 (i).

Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on Amt. (Mr. Barker) 921; Ques. of Order, 921 (i).

Trade and Commerce, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 5199 (iii).

Travelling Expenses of Ministers to Colonial Conference, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3993 (ii).

Treaty Negotiations between Canada and U. S., &c. (remarks) 937 (i).

See 'Anglo-American.'

Trent Canal Extension, &c., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Cor., 2992 (ii).

Truro, N.S., Tax Bill, &c. (Ans.) 3480 (ii).

Turgeon, Hon. A., Apptmt. to Senate (Ans.) 7936 (iv).

U. S. Training Ships passing through St. Lawrence Canals, Number, &c. (Ans.) 5789 (iii).

——— (remarks) 5338 (iii).

——— Inquiry as to Armaments, &c. (Ans.) 7502 (iv).

Vancouver Bank incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 4582 (iii).

Wednesday Evening Sittings (M.) 9480 (v), 11232 (vi).

Winnipeg Bank Co.'s incorp. B. 19 (Mr. Henderson) in Com., 2788 (ii).

Wood and Pulp Industry, Preservation of (remarks) 7452 (iv).

Woollen Industry Relief, Legislation (remarks) 12772 (vii).

——— Memorandum from Mfg. Ass'n. read 13518-19 (vii).

——— Specific Duties (remarks) 6988 (iv).

Yukon Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9648 (v).

——— Finance Ret., on Inqiury for, 6464

——— Moral Reform, Letter of Rev. Dr. Shearer, on Inquiry for (Mr. Sproule) 10689 (vii).

——— (remarks) 10303 (vi).

Yukon Sunday Observance Law, Instructions to N. W. M. P. (remarks) 565 (i).

LAVERGNE, Mr. A., *Montmagny.*

Address, The, 476 (i).

Battlefields of Quebec B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 3902 (ii); in Com., 4410, 4499; on M. for 3° (amt.) 4533 (iii).

LAVERGNE, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Belgian Syndicate, Commission *re* Investigation (Ques.) 842 (i).

Bellechasse Islet Lighthouse Keeper, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 4830 (iii).

Cimon, Mr. Justice, Apptmt. to Quebec District (Ques.) 2978 (ii).

——— Jurisdiction of Justice Dept. *re* Residence (Ques.) 2545 (ii).

——— Payments *re* Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 2978 (ii).

——— Residence in District, &c. (Ques.) 2218 (ii).

Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. Hse., 5900 (iii).

Criminal Code (libel) Amt. B. 161 (Mr. Beauparlant) on M. for 1°, 7319 (iv).

Customs Dues on French Books, Reduction *re* French Treaty (Ques.) 2160 (ii).

Debates, French Edition, Delay in Distribution, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Beland) 3487 (ii).

——— Delays in Printing (Ques.) 2978 (ii).

——— French Supt. of Printing, &c. (Ques.) 2978 (ii).

Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on M. for Sup., 1827 (i).

French Language, Par. in 'La Presse,' Ques. of Priv., 8291 (v).

——— Pet. *re* (read) 8886 (v).

——— Ques. of Privilege *re* Par. in 'Le Soleil,' 1209 (i).

——— Use of on Railway Crossings, &c. (B. 85) 1° m., 2021 (ii).

Halifax Garrison, Replace by Imp. Troops (Ques.) 1288 (i).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3716 (ii).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6718 (iv).

——— on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1303 (i).

Immigration Premiums, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 1287 (i).

I.C.R., Notices printed in French, &c. (Ques.) 7936 (iv).

Japanese Immigration, Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2137 (ii).

——— on Stmt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1603 (i).

Japanese Syndicate *re* Purchasing of Land in Alberta (Ques.) 2162 (ii).

Judges of Supreme Court, Quebec, Apptmnt. on Commissions (Ques.) 357 (i).

Justice, Administration of, in Quebec, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 842 (i).

Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R. M. C., on M. for Com. of Sup., 1026 (i).

LAVERGNE, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Marconi Station, Glace Bay, Interruption of Services, &c. (Ques.) 2161 (ii).

Marier, J. E., Emplymt. on G. T. P. Commission (Ques.) 2162 (ii).

Montmagny and Cap St. Ignace Wharfs, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 1288 (i).

Montreal Liquor Licenses, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fisher) 4070 (ii).

Order Paper, Printing in French (remarks) 5407 (iii).

Postage Stamps, Designs for Quebec Tercentenary, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 7934 (iv).

——— New Series, Issue of (Ques.) 6397 (iv).

Public Accounts Com., Investigations, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3095 (ii).

Quebec Superior Court, Apptmt. of Additional Judge (Ques.) 1288 (i).

Quebec Tercentenary, Legal Holidays (Ques.) 7934 (iv).

——— Par. in 'Le Canada,' Ques. of Priv., 4669 (iii).

——— Postage Stamps, Printing in French and English (Ques.) 7935 (iv).

——— Postage Stamps (remarks) 8895 (v).

——— Rep. of Commission (remarks) 7449 (iv).

——— Visit of Prince of Wales, Par. in Halifax 'Chronicle,' Ques. of Priv., 5209 (iii).

Ques. of Privilege, Par. in 'La Presse' *re* Vote on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) 2022 (ii).

——— Voting of French Members (remarks) 7993 (iv).

Railway Act (dual language) Amt. (B. 85) 1° m., 2021 (ii); 2° m., 5242 (iii).

——— (scheduled time) Amt. (B. 106) 1° m., 3655 (ii).

Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3914 (ii).

Revised Statutes, French Version, Date of Completion (Ques.) 357 (i).

R.M.C., Investigation *re* Conduct of Cadet Lancaster, on M. for Sup., 1026 (i).

Salvation Army Immigrants, Letter from Dr. Nadeau, Ques. of Priv., 7094 (iv).

School Acts, Saskatchewan, Disallowance of (Ques.) 6644 (iv).

——— Notice of Discussion, 6647 (iv).

——— (M.) to adjn., 6854 (iv).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants Bill, in Com. on Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3758 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4131 (ii).

Tercentenary at Quebec, Apptmt. of French Canadians as Commissioners, Ques. of Priv., 4770 (iii).

LAVERGNE, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Turgeon, Hon. A., Apptmt. to Senate (Ques.) 7935 (iv).

LAVERGNE, Mr. L., *Drummond & Arthabaska.*

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10494 (vi).

'La Gazette d'Arthabaska,' Postal Privileges *re* (Ques.) 6058 (iii).

P.E.I. Ry. Branch Lines, Construction of, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 3269 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Railways—I.C.R. (St. Cyrille diversion) 12756 (vii).

LAW, Mr. B. B., *Yarmouth.*

Presbyterian College Board (B. 154) 1°*, 6525 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 4758 (iii); (tidal service) 3215; (wrecks) 3189 (ii).

LEFURGEY, Mr. A. A., *Prince (P.E.I.)*

Adjournment of the House (M.) 4495 (iii).

Alberton Fire, Damage Claims, Inquiry for Ret., 1209 (i).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 13053, 13055 (vii).

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. 187, on M. (Mr. Fielding) to place on Order Paper, 13494 (vii).

Cascumpec Harbour Buoys, Tenders for Placing, &c. (Ques.) 681 (i).

Chapel Point Ferry Wharf, Tenders re Construction, &c. (Ques.) 513 (i).

Charlottetown, Pipe Line to Tank, Contracts *re* (Ques.) 5655 (iii).

Clifton Wharf Repairs, Extension of Contract (Ques.) 4831 (iii).

Dom. Revenue from 1873 to 1907 (Ques.) 1733 (i).

Edmonton, Yukon anl Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13276 (vii).

Estimates, Discussion on Resolutions (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3154 (ii).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1726 (i).

Fisheries Jurisdiction between Dom. and Provs., Instructions to Agent (Ques.) 3429 (ii).

——— Conference *re* (Ques.) 3235 (ii).

Fish Island Lighthouse, Name of Present Keeper (Ques.) 6058 (iii).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6261 (iv).

Grand River Wharf, Tenders, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 8382 (v).

LEFURGEY, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

Higgin's Shore, P.E.I., Wharf, Pet. *re* Extension (Ques.) 694 (i).

Hillsborough Bridge Construction, Land Purchases, &c., Reps., &c. (M. for copies*) 2170 (ii).

——— (Ques.) 1686 (i).

——— Return, Inquiry for, 6160 (iii).

Howard's Cape Wharf, Pet. *re*, &c. (Ques.) 11702 (vi).

Ice-breaker for Northumberland Straits (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2944 (ii).

——— (Ques.) 10254 (v).

I.C.R., Extension to Great Lakes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2444 (ii).

——— Motor Cars, Tests *re* Operation, &c. (Ques.) 565 (i).

Lennox Island Wharf, Contract *re* (Ques.) 8444 (v).

Lobster Fisheries, P.E.I., Pet. *re* Issue of Licenses (Ques.) 2388 (ii).

Lobster Fishing Fines, Names and Amounts (Ques.) 10256 (v).

Mail Service between Darnley and Kensington, P.E.I. (Ques.) 4828 (iii).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9502 (v).

Old Age Pension Scheme, on M. (Mr. Pringle) for Sel. Com., 2430 (ii).

Postal Arrangements between U. S. and Canada, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 3892 (ii).

P.E.I. Fisheries Protection Service, Annual Cost, &c. (Ques.) 359 (i).

P.E.I. Life-saving Stations, Establishment of (Ques.) 681 (i).

P.E.I. and Nova Scotia SS. Service, Re-establishment of (Ques.) 8383 (v).

P.E.I. Public Works, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 1686 (i).

——— (M. for ret.) 2171 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 8696, 9893 (v).

——— (remarks) 11679 (vi).

P.E.I. Ry., Alma Station, Pet *re* Construction (Ques.) 6642 (iv).

——— Branch Lines, Cor., &c., *re* Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Copies, 3254 (ii).

——— (remarks) in Com. on B. 215, 13490 (vii).

P.E.I. Ry., Dundas and Avondale Extension, Pet. *re* (Ques.) 8383 (v).

——— Station Agents, Salaries, Pets., &c. (Ques.) 3236 (ii).

——— Tenders *re* News Agency (Ques.) 8444 (v).

P.E.I. Tunnel Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 4606 (iii).

——— Rep. *re*, Inquiry for, 9893 (v).

LEFURGEY, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Contract *re* Construction of Steamer (Ques.) 2546 (ii).
—— Discussion, &c., 4496 (iii).
—— Ice-breaker Str., Rep. *re* Plans, &c. (Ques.) 4583 (iii).
See 'Ice-breaker.'
P.E.I. Winter Service, Str. 'Stanley,' Route, &c. (Ques.) 172 (i).
—— Withdrawal of Steamer, &c. (remarks) 1208 (i).
Quahaug and Clam Fishing, Contemplated Changes (Ques.) 1940 (i).
Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3920 (ii); in Com., 4975 (iii).
Representation of the Mar. Provinces in H. of C., on M. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 9821 (v).
Returns, Detention of by Members, Ques. of Priv., 5048 (iii).
Seed Grain Purchases, Apptmt. of Agent in P.E.I. (remarks) 3690, 3752 (ii).
S. A. Volunteers Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3777 (ii); in Com., 13047 (vii).
'Stanley,' Str., Passenger Accommodation (Ques.) 687 (i).
Summerside Harbour and Str. 'Stanley' (remarks) 6160 (iii)

SUPPLY—
Marine (ice-breakers) 1899 (i).
Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2944, 2949 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg, P. O.) 8576 (v); Ottawa (Mint) 1459 (i); Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Buctouche) 11679 (vi).

Tignish Breakwater Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 3229 (ii).
Tignish Harbour, Pet. *re* Extension (Ques.) 682 (i).
—— Repairs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11679 (vi).
Tobacco Infractions of Inland Revenue Act. in P.E.I., on M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 9526 (v).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R. (Postmaster General and Min. of Labour) Gaspe.

Alien Labour Regulations, Pet. *re* from Sault Ste Marie (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12159 (vii).
Annapolis and Digby Mail Service, Amounts paid to (Ans.) 12653 (vii).
Arsenault, Mr. Auguste, Charges *re* Customs, Montreal (Ans.) 1347 (i).
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s Bridge Construction, in Com. on Res., 13306 (vii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 134) 2° m., 5763 (iii).
Australian Representative from Canada in 1901, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 2168 (ii).
Bonanza Post Office Theft, Investigation *re* (Ans.) 1291 (i).
Bonn P. O., Application *re* Mail Service (Ans.) 10516 (vi).
Brass, Mr. Albert, Postmaster at Rusagornis, Charges *re* Political Activity (Ans.) 6642 (iv).
Brewster and Park Hill Mail Route, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 6404 (iv).
Brockville and Ottawa Ry. Connections (remarks) 1436 (i).
Canadian Newspapers, Refund *re* American Surtax (Ans.) 5203 (iii).
C.P.R., Papineauville Branch, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13303 (vii).
Canadian Press Association Subsidy B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 12489 (vii).
Chambly Canton, Complaints *re* Postmaster (Ans.) 5654 (iii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11403, 11636 (vi), 12179 (vii).
Civil Service Commission Report (remarks) *re* Distribution to Press, 5723 (iii).
Conciliation Boards, Applications *re* Industrial Disputes Investigations, Number, &c. (Ans.) 3482 (ii).
Co-Operative Societies B. 5 (Mr. Monk) 2° m., 4547; in Com., 4564; 3°*, 4566 (iii).
Cotton Strikers, Disputes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13156 (vii).
Criminal Code (ry. mortgages) Amt. B. 212 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13317 (vii).
Debates, Official, Rep. of Com., Conc. without Notice (remarks) 8897 (v).
Denis, Mr. Gaspard, Postmaster at St. Denis des Saintes, Charges *re* (Ans.) 9474 (v).
Desaulniers, Mr. Gonzalve, Emplymt. as Translator, &c. (Ans.) 1121 (i).
Digby to Westport, Mail Contractor, Name, &c. (Ans.) 7203 (iv).
Dom. Coal Co.'s Labour Dispute, Settlement Tel. (read) 4995 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11914 (vi), 13043 (vii).
Drop Letter One-cent Rate (remarks) 3159 (ii).
Egypte and St. Ephrem d'Upton Mail Contract, Renewal of (Ans.) 5257 (iii).
Farnell, Gordon, Contractor for Halifax Mails (Ans.) 7731 (iv).
French Translation of Govt. Documents, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3183 (ii).
Glencoe Post Office Building, Contract *re* (Ans.) 3846 (ii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*
Govt. Steamers, Number purchased, &c. (Ans.) 10733 (vi).
Harlaka Ry. Connections (remarks) 1437 (i).
Hindoo Immigrants, and Contract Labour (remarks) 4407 (iii).
House of Commons Post Office, Delays in Mails (remarks) 11939; (stmnt.) 12044 (vi).
Hull Post Office, Total Revenue for 1906-8 (Ans.) 11704 (vi).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6444 (iv).
Immigration Agents in France (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9848 (v).
Japanese in B.C., Ques. of Priv. and Political Pamphlets, 12659 (vii).
Japanese Colony in the West, C.P.R. Application *re* (Ans.) 7197 (iv).
Japanese Immigration, Rep. of Mr. King laid on Table, 1550 (i).
——— Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2144 (ii).
——— Result of Mission (statement) 1585 (i).
Johnston, Mr. W. J., Extra Remuneration, Leave of Absence, &c. (Ans.) 5201 (iii).
Labour Gazette, Cost of Printing, &c. (Ans.) 6407 (iv).
Labour Dept. (Japanese Investigation) Rep. (presented) 1583 (i).
'Lady Evelyn,' Date and Place of Wintering, &c. (Ans.) 7937 (iv).
Langevin Block Basement, Number of Employees, &c. (Ans.) 3483 (ii).
'La Gazette d'Arthabaska,' Postal Privileges to (Ans.) 6058 (iii).
Letter Carriers, Hours of Service, Pay, &c. (Ans.) 7728 (iv).
Literature distributed through Mail (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9096 (v).
Londonderry and Bass River Mail Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 2980 (ii).
Mackinnon Post Office, Application *re* Establishment (Ans.) 10517 (vi).
Mail from Canada to Europe, Quantity arrived, &c. (Ans.) 12653 (vii).
Mail Contract between Darnley and Kensington, P.E.I. (Ans.) 4828 (iii).
Mail Contract at Rimouski, Payments to Str. 'Rhoda' (Ans.) 5799 (iii), 8176 (iv).
Mail Matter, Fraudulent Weighing of, Inspection *re* (Ans.) 4827 (iii).
Mail Matter delayed by C.P.R. Accident (remarks) 9724 (v).
——— (remarks) 9281 (v).
Mail Matter mutilated in Transmission, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 2215 (ii).
Mail Service to Atlantic Steamers, Cost per Annum (Ans.) 5656 (iii).
Mail Service in B.C. (remarks) 3754 (ii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*
Mail Steamer, Purchase of (Ans.) 4827 (iii).
Mail Service, Soulanges county, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 9278 (v).
Mail Service by Steamers, via Coteau Landing (Ans.) 9277 (v).
Mail Tenders at Rimouski, Complaints *re* 'Rhoda,' &c. (Ans.) 5799 (iii), 8176 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12830 (vii).
Mattawa Postmaster, Place of Residence (Ans.) 7200 (iv).
Montreal Postal Service, Irregularities, Delays, &c. (Ans.) 9275 (v).
Montreal P. O. Building Strike, Settlement of (remarks) 8608 (v).
Montreal Post Office Defalcations, Investigation *re* (Ans.) 7198 (iv).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3446 (ii).
N. B. Election, Patronage of Federal Govt., &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3046 (ii).
Newspaper Mail Regulations, Complaints *re* Delivery, &c. (Ans.) 11298 (vi).
——— Postal Arrangements *re* (Ans.) 6460 (iv).
Nicolet Post Office, Completion, Postmaster's Name, &c. (Ans.) 11499 (vi).
North Grove Post Office Ret., on Inquiry for, 5491 (iii).
Old Age Pensions Com., Progress *re* (remarks) 7722 (iv), 12660 (vii).
Opium Prohibition (B. 205) prop. Res., 12503; in Com. on Res., 12550; 2° m., 12851; on Senate Amts., 13523 (vii).
O'Shaughnessy, Mr. John, Emplymt. on I.C.R. (Ans.) 11498 (vi).
Owen Sound Strike, Settlement of (remarks) 8606 (v).
Pakenham Mail Bags, Throwing off of Train (remarks) 1425 (i).
Port au Pique Mail Contracts, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 3232 (ii).
Port Medway and Medway Station Mail Service, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 11300 (vi).
Postage Stamps, New Series issued *re* Quebec Tercentenary (Ans.) 6398 (iv).
——— Tenders *re* (Ans.) 7934 (iv).
——— Special Issue (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9115 (v).
Postal Arrangements between Canada and U.S., Re-arrangements of (remarks) 3040 (ii).
——— (statement) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3159 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 3886 (ii).
Postal Notes Business, Commissions, Expenditure *re* Maintenance, &c. (Ans.) 9279 (v).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*

Postal Rates on Letters at Confederation (Ans.) 8175 (iv).

Postal Rates on Weekly Newspapers, Tel. *re* (Ans.) 3484 (ii).

——— Complaints *re* (Ans.) 5201 (iii).

Postal Revenue, One Cent Rate (Ans.) 8381 (v).

Postal Service, Delays, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 7263 (iv).

Postal Service Improvements (Ans.) 8891 (v).

——— Ret., on Inquiry for, 4832 (iii).

Postmasters' Assessments, Amounts collected, &c. (Ans.) 6459 (iv).

Post Office Act (P. O. supt., &c.) Amt. (B. 162) 1° m., 7931 (iv); 2°*, and in Com., 10703 (vi); on Senate Amts., 12393 (vii).

Post Offices built since 1904, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 4761 (iii).

Post Office Irregularities in Western Canada (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8873 (v).

Post Office Returns, Number, &c. (Ans.) 6405 (iv).

Post Offices, Ret., on Inquiry for, 6288 (iv).

P.E.I. Ry. Mail Service, Delay in Distribution (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9094 (v).

Printing, Postal Service, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 5472 (iii).

Quebec, Montreal and Southern Ry. Co.'s Bridge Construction Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13306 (vii).

Quebec Religious Feuds, Letter of Rev. Mr. Dumesnil to Papal Ablegate, signed 'P. M. G., Ques. of Priv., 11501 (vi).

Quebec Tercentenary, Postage Stamps, &c. (Ans.) 7935 (iv), 8895 (v), 12414 (vii).

Returns, Inquiry for, 5491 (iii).

Ricard, Mr., Emplymt. on I.C.R. (Ans.) 11498 (vi).

Riviere du Loup Postmaster, Resignation and Salary (Ans.) 6399 (iv).

Round Bay, N.S., Removal of Post Office, Pet. *re* (Ans.) 11297 (vi).

Ryan, Mr. G. M., Apptmt. of a Successor (Ans.) 7504 (iv).

St. Francois Xavier Post Office, Apptmt. *re* Postmaster, Pet., &c. (Ans.) 5797 (iii).

St. Gabriel de Brandon Post Office Savings Bank, Recommendation *re* (Ans.) 4828 (iii).

St. Irenee des Bains, Apptmt. of Mr. Geo. Girard as Postmaster (Ans.) 5795 (iii).

St. Paschal and Kamouraska Mail Contracts, Tenders, Bondsmen, &c. (Ans.) 3236 (ii).

St. Peter's Bay Mail Contract with H. B. Finlay, Amount, &c. (Ans.) 1687 (i).

St. Peters Post Office, on Inquiry for Ret., 2787 (ii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*

Sacred Heart Post Office, Establishment of Six Offices (Ans.) 5472 (iii).

Sandy Cove Mail Service, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 8891 (v).

Scotch Hill East, Post Office, Establishment of (Ans.) 2793 (ii).

Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, on M. (Mr. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7747 (iv).

Shortt, Prof., Amounts paid *re* Industrial Disputes, &c. (Ans.) 4766 (iii).

Southvale, N.S., Post Office, Pet. *re* Removal (Ans.) 4829 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10599 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Labour Dept. (salaries) 12159 (vii); Post Office (clerical assistance) 8872; (salaries) 8872 (v).

Immigration (agents, &c.) 9848 (v).

Labour Dept. ('Gazette') 12261 (vii).

Miscellaneous (Chinese riots) 13155; (cotton strikers) 13156 (vii); (Japanese riots, B.C.) 5783 (iii); (Oriental immigration) 13156 (vii); (Prince Fushimi's visit) 5783 (iii).

Post Office (contingencies) 5562; (Durston, R., promotion) 5561 (iii); (extra assistance) 9112; (inspectors) 9092 (v), 13155 (vii); (mail service) 5561 (iii); (North Bay inspectors) 13152 (vii); (outside service) 9092; (stamps, &c.) 9111; (uniforms, &c.) 9111 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Brantford) 7459; (Hamilton, post office) 7697 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Levis) 7298; (Montreal, barracks) 7408; (Montreal, examining warehouse) 7427 (iv); (Montreal, pneumatic postal) 5705 (iii); Montreal post office) 7411; (Montreal, station C) 7420; (Montreal station B) 7419; (Quebec drill hall) 7431; (St. Rochs) 7439 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Midland and Tiffin) 12129 (vi).

Railways—Ry. Commission (legal expenses) 10371 (vi).

Tenders, Advertisements *re*, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7477 (iv).

Toronto Postmaster, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 2594 (ii).

Town Site, Erection of Public Buildings (Ans.) 1348 (i).

Trent Canal, Clearing of Logs, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10310 (vi).

Valleyfield, P.E.I., Change of Mail Route. (Ans.) 11297 (vi).

Woodstock, N.B., Postmaster L. C. Smith and Interference in Elections (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2887 (ii).

——— Salary, &c. (Ans.) 2794 (ii).

Yukon Mail Service, Complaints *re*, 2022 (ii).

——— Service during Winter (remarks) 5137 (iii).

LENNOX, Mr. H., *Simcoe, S.*

Advertisements for Tenders of Govt. Works, &c., on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4708 (iii).

Alberta Closed Leases, Number granted, &c. (Ques.) 3037 (ii).

Architects Institute of Canada incorp. B. 88 (Mr. Walsh) in Com., 5379 (iii).

Battlefields of Canada (B. 111) in Com. on Res., 3901 (ii); in Com., 4507; on M. for 3°, 4530 (iii).

Belleville and North Hastings Ry. and G. T. Ry., on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Cor., 2818

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7671 (iv).

Bills of Exchange Act Amt. B. 142 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6522 (iv).

Britton, Mr. Justice, Payment *re* Treadgold Commission (Ques.) 5474 (iii).

Campaign Literature sent from Ry. Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10346 (vi).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6164, 6215 (iii).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12874 (vii).

Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 67 (Mr. Pardee) on Senate Amts., 5955 (iii).

Canadian Press Association Subsidy B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 12348 (vii).

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6875 (iv).

Cattle Embargo in G. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12882 (vii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 11361; on M. for 1°, 10729; in Com., 11394, 11553, 11659 (vi), 12183 (vii).

Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9203 (v).

Criminal Code (ry. act.) Amt. B. 212 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13318 (vii).

Devil's Elbow, Canal Work (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1155 (i).

——— on M. for Sup., 1776 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11869 (vi), 13020 (vii).

Dominion Guarantee Co.'s B. 127 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 6231 (iv).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 9333 (v).

Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6750 (iv).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4678 (iii); in Com., 6912 (iv).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13263 (vii).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4545, 4577 (iii).

Foreign Purchases, Customs Collection *re* (Ques.) 5475 (iii).

Fort William Terminals B. 101 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6180 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3615 (ii).

Fritz Cirkel, Mining Engineer, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 7202 (iv).

Gammell, Edith Maud Rosario Relief B. 129 (Mr. Galliher) on M. for 2°, 6190 (iii); in Com., 7141 (iv).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3622, 3794 (ii).

Gold and Silver Marking Act Amt. B. 123 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5497 (iii).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6270 (iv).

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 7141, 7667, 8125 (iv), 8609, 8741, 9377 (v).

G.T.P., Classification of District 'B' and 'F,' Inspections *re* (Ques.) 12051 (vii).

——— Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12675 (vii).

——— Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 12271; (amt.) Minority Rep., 12291. (Neg. (Y. 53; N. 98) 12388 (vii).

G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2233 (ii); in Com., 12062 (vii).

Grazing and Irrigation Lands, Reserved by Govt. (Ques.) 3479 (ii).

Grazing Lands Reservations, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3850 (ii).

Grazing Ranches, Names and Addresses of Lessees in Township 12 to 19 (Ques.) 7210 (iv).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3226, (M.) to ref. back to Com. on Rys., &c., 3228, in Com., 3692; on M. for 3°, 4540 (iii).

——— on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) to ref. back to Com., 3362 (ii).

High Commissioner's Office, Increase of Salaries (Ques.) 10737 (vi).

Holliday, Mr. P., Payments of additional Living Allowance (Ques.) 5475 (iii).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10497 (vi).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6446 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt., O.C. *re* (Ques.) 7500 (iv).

——— Inquiry for, 8607, 8696, 9890 (v).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Immigration, O.C. *re* B.C. (remarks) 8171 (iv), 11018 (vi).
Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 7029 (iv).
Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6902 (iv).
I.C.R. Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4492 (iii).
Japanese Immigration, Restriction *re* B.C. Legislation, on M. for Sup., 1752 (i).
Japanese and Oriental Immigration, &c., on (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Copies of O.Cs., &c., 881 (i).
Judges' Salaries, Application *re* Payments (remarks) 11018 (vi).
Land Titles Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6519 (iv).
Land Titles Act Assurance Fund B. 168 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 10526; in Com., 10527 (vi).
Lockerby & McCombe, Amounts *re* Extra Harbour Dues (Ques.) 11935 (vi).
Lyall & Sons, Storage of Refuse on Harbour Property (Ques.) 11936 (vi).
McInnes, Hon. W. B., Employment in the Yukon, Total Amount paid to, &c. (Ques.) 5794 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12801 (vii).
Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Brodeur) to Com. of Sup., 7342 (iv).
Members and Senators appointed to Offices of Emolument, &c. (M. for ret.*) 556 (i).
Mining Regulations, published in 'Yukon World and Official Gazette' (M. for copy*) 5801 (iii).
Ministers of Crown and Govt. Contracts and Subsidies (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 9415 (v).
National Battlefields (lands) B. 219 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 13501 (vii).
Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11997 (vi).
N.B. Cold Storage Co and Ministerial Connections *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9398; (amt.) 9415 (v).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Ref. to Mr. Blair's Letter *re* (Ques.) 2392 (ii).
Obstruction to Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9935 (v).
——— on M. (Mr. Fowler) to Com. of Sup., 10020 (v).
Order, Ques. of, Discussions *re*, in Com. of Sup., 4108 (ii).
Order, Ques. of (Mr. Fisher) *re* Montreal Liquor Licenses, 4065 (ii).
Pacific Coast Insurance B. 40 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6182 (iii), 6230 (iv).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Post Office Act (drop letter) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 7932 (iv).
Presbyterian College Board, Halifax, B. 154 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 7669 (iv).
Quebec Bridge Rep., on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 13403 (vii).
Quebec Harbour Improvements, Specification, &c., Stmnt. of Expenditure, &c. (M. for copies*) 5802 (iii).
Quebec and New Brunswick B. 128 (Mr. Michaud) in Com., 6226 (iv).
Quebec Tercentenary, Rural Corps, Letter from Mr. G. W. Stoddart (read) in Com. of Sup., 10292 (v).
Railway Act (construction) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Turriff) on M. for 2°, 3412 (ii).
———(demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean on M. for 2°, 3369 (ii).
——— (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3905 (ii); in Com., 4964 (iii).
——— (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, 10625; in Com., 10639 (vi).
Ross Rifle Factory, Pet. *re* Establishment on Plains of Abraham (remarks) 3903 (ii).
——— Extension of Cove Field Lands, &c. (Ques.) 4404 (iii).
Saskatchewan Power Co.'s B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 7677 (iv).
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4546, 4580 (iii).
Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2910 (ii).
Seed Grain Distribution, O.C. *re* Advances (remarks) 6634 (iv).
——— O.C. amending Regulations, &c. (Ques.) 6981 (iv).
Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5409, 5519; (amt.) 5445 (iii).
S. A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3767 (ii).
Supply B. 96 (seed grain) in Com., 2785 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Canals (repairs) 10306 (vi); Trent (construction) 12225 (vii); (surveys) 10339 (vi).
Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9257 (v).
Excise—(travelling expenses, &c.) 814 (i).
House of Commons (Library of Parlt.) 10504 (vi).
Immigration (agents) 9854 (v).
Justice (salaries) 5505 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (pensions) 13324 (vii).
Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol, 3996 (ii).
Militia (annual drill) 10292 (v).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Post Office (inspectors) 13154 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vancouver) 13339 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Guelph) 13331; (Markham) 13331; (Walkerville) 13333 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal Barracks) 7409 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Richelieu) 12039 (vi).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (Deep Waterways Commission) 11103 (vi).
Railways (extra clerks) 10346; G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10380; (inspection) 10390 (vi).
Railways—Hudson Bay (surveys, &c.) 12766 (vii).
Railways—I.C.R. (salaries) 10129 (v).
Railways—Miscellaneous (litigation) 10357 (vi).

Railways—Ry. Commission (maintenance, &c.,) 10388 (vi); (Quebec Bridge) 12769 (vii).

Timber Berths, Nos. 1413, 1414 and 1415, Applications, Cor. *re* (M. for copies*) 2398 (ii).

——— Inquiry for, 4833 (iii).

Trans-Canada Ry. Co.'s B. 107 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 5386 (iii).

Travelling Expenses of Ministers to Col. Conference, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3996 (ii).

Trent Canal, Bradford, Building of (remarks) 13476 (vii).

——— Engineer's Rep., Inquiry for, 6925 (iv).

——— Newmarket, Extension to Devil's Elbow (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10306 (vi).

——— Holland River Extension (remarks) 11939 (vi).

——— Surveys, Inquiry for 6988 (iv).

Vancouver Bank incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Macpherson) on Order for 2°, 779 (i); in Com., 4581 (iii).

Vancouver Island and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 77 (Mr. Sloan) on Senate Amts., 6190 (iii).

Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. 125 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6187 (iii).

Whale Fishing Cos. in B.C., Licenses granted, &c., on M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10275 (v).

Winding-Up Act Amt. B. 144 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6523 (iv).

Woodstock, N.B., Postmaster L. C. Smith, and Interference in Elections, on M. for Sup., 2889 (ii).

Yukon Act (Govt.) Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10531 (vi).

Yukon, Judges Salaries (remarks) 11123 (vi).

——— Official Administrators, Charges against *re* Settlement of Estates, &c. (M. for copies*) 1690 (i).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Yukon Placer Claims, Renewals by Gold Commissioner, Fees, &c. (Ques.) 4245 (iii).

——— (M. for ret.*) 4588, 4589 (iii).

——— Public Administrators, Charges against, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2170 (ii).

LEONARD, Mr. J. E. E., *Laval.*

Bridge Subsidies to Rys. (amt.) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies Res., 13310 (vii).

Chambly Canton, Complaints *re* Postmaster (Ques.) 5653 (iii).

Chambly Common, Area, Rental &c. (Ques.) 5652 (iii).

Lobster Fishery Overseers in Lunenburg, &c., Names, &c. (Ques.) 2793 (ii).

Montreal Directory in Library of House (Ques.) 4764 (iii).

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3442 (ii).

Rifles purchased by Govt. since 1896, Number, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 5654 (iii).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Holidays for Officers (Ques.) 2791 (ii).

——— Officials interfering in Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5538 (iii).

——— Votes of Officers in Municipal Affairs (Ques.) 2791 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4029 (ii).
Penitentiaries— (binder twine) 5522, 5530; St. Vincent de Paul (meat contracts) 5519; (officials) 5538 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Longueuil) 7305 (iv).

LEWIS, Mr. E. N., *Huron, W.*

Address, The, 242 (i).

Civil Service Commission Report, Distribution to Press (remarks) 5723 (iii).

Criminal Code Amendments, Placing on Govt. Orders (remarks) 9281 (v).

Criminal Code (offensive weapons) Amt. (B. 78) 1° m., 1668 (i).

——— (assaults) Amt. (B. 79) 1° m., 1670 (i).

——— (hunting) Amt. (B. 93) 1° m., 2590 (ii).

——— (motors) Amt. (B. 140) 1° m., 5993 (iii).

Immigration Act (concealed weapons) Amt. (B. 65) 1° m., 1284 (i).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12789 (vii).

Pulp Wood, Export Duty on (prop. res.) 4774 (iii).

Railway Commission (Ass't. Chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3923

Senate Reform, on prop. Res. (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 1530 (i).

Wood and Pulp Industry, Preservation of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7449 (iv).

LOGAN, Mr. H. J., *Cumberland.*

All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12480 (vii).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4386 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3512 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal, Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. McCool) for Copies, 1992 (i).

I.C.R., Extension to Great Lakes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2460 (ii).

——— Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4460 (iii).

N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference of Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3066 (ii).

Old Age Pension Scheme, on M. (Mr. Pringle) for Sel. Com., 2417 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Pugwash wharf) 11280 (vi); Railways—I.C.R. (train service) 10165 (v).

LOGGIE, Mr. W. S., *Northumberland, N.B.*

Budget, The 6553 (iv).

Canada and France Ocean SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6169 (iii).

Canada Eastern Ry., Cattle killed, Compensation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13175 (vii).

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. 187 (Mr. Black) on M. for 2°, 13507 (vii).

Cigarettes, Sale and Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5253 (iii).

France and Canada SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6195 (iii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7230 (iv).

MACDONALD, Mr. E. M., *Pictou.*

Admiralty Court Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 4863 (iii).

Bills of Exchange Act Amt. B. 142 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6522 (iv).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 12648; in Com., 13056 (vii).

Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. House, 5895 (iii).

Conciliation Boards, Application *re* Industrial Disputes Investigations Act, Number, &c. (Ques.) 3482 (ii).

Documents in Dept., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1160 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13012 (vii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3626 (ii).

MACDONALD, Mr. E. M.—*Con.*

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6256 (iv).

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 9467 (v).

G.T.P., Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12723 (vii).

——— Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 12340 (vii).

——— counsel fees, payment of (M.) 13578 (vii).

I.C.R., Employees and Municipal Elections, on M. (Mr. Sproule) to Com. of Sup., 2895 (ii).

——— Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4479 (iii).

MacIlreith, Mr., Legal Agent for Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11222 (vi).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12827 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel, for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7381 (iv).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9489 (v).

Phoenix Assurance Co.'s (B. 167) 1°*, 8603 (v).

P.E.I. Ry., Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2745 (ii).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Tunnel Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 4647 (iii).

Railway Act (liability) Amt. (B. 27) 1° m., 430 (i); on Order for 2°, 5211; in Com., 5246 (iii).

Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, on M. (Mr. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7745 (iv).

S.A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3783 (ii); in Com., 12602 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4138 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (icebreakers) 2966 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston military buildings) 10909 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Caribou Island) 11225; (Round Hill) 11286 (vi).

Railways — I. C. R. (Campbellton) 12258; (double tracking) 12250; (Moncton, additional line) 12760; (Moncton, car shops) 12250 (vii); (rolling stock) 5558 (iii).

Railways—Railway Commission (Quebec Bridge) 12770 (vii).

Sutherland Rifle Sight Co., Patent Relief (B. 63) 1°*, 1283 (i).

MACDONALD, E. M.—*Con.*

Timber Limits, Disposal of, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2712 (ii).

Timber Sales to Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 8778 (v).

MACDONELL, Mr. A. C., *Toronto, S.*

Canada-Australian SS. Subvention, Continuance of (Ques.) 941 (i).

Canadian Naval Stations, Maintenance of, Arrangement with G. B. (Ques.) 1117 (i).

Canadians entering U.S., Deportation of Macedonians, &c. (remarks) 2738 (ii).

——— Letter form Messrs. Allen, Cassels & Defries (read) 2739 (ii).

Copyright Act Amt. (B. 28) 1° m., 508; 2° m., 939 (i).

Cosgrave, Mr. J. J., Total Cost of Investigation (Ques.) 5797 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act (compulsory voting) Amt. (B. 29) 1° m., 508 (i); 2° m., 5247 (iii).

Dom. Notes Outstanding, Total Amount 1907, &c. (Ques.) 691 (i).

Dredging Contract, Basis of Payments, &c. (Ques.) 9710 (v).

Drop Letter, One-cent Rate (remarks) 3158 (ii).

Electrical Power exported at Niagara Falls, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 2397 (ii).

Fisheries Protection, Amounts expended since 1885, &c. (Ques.) 1118 (i).

Foss, C. O., Apptmt. on G.T.P. Engineering Staff, &c. (Ques.) 358 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3500 (ii).

Garrison Commons, Toronto, Date of Sale, &c. (Ques.) 353 (i).

Govt. Steamers, Number purchased, &c. (Ques.) 10731 (vi).

G.T.P., Apptmt. of Engineer at Kenora (Ques.) 895 (i).

——— Changes in Engineering Staff (Ques.) 509, 681 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 853 (i).

——— Resignation of Major Hodgins, Appointment of Successor (Ques.) 358 (i).

G.T. Ry., Entrance into Toronto, O.Cs., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 556 (i).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3194, 3700 (ii); on M. for 3°, 4358 (iii).

Hydrographic Surveys, Amounts expended, &c. (Ques.) 1128 (i).

Immigrants, Bulgarians, Stranded in Toronto, Tel. (read) &c. 185 (i).

——— (remarks) *re* Questions, 242 (i).

Immigration Act, B.C., known as Natal Act, Disallowance of (Ques.) 567 (i).

MACDONELL, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Insurance Bill, Introduction of (Ques.) 9272 (v).

Insurance Commission, Exhibits of Commercial Travellers' Mutual Benefit Society, Originals, asked for, 7988 (iv).

Insurance Companies' Deposits, -Total Amount, Securities, &c. (Ques.) 241 (i).

Japanese Trade with Canada, Total Amount for 1905-6-7 (Ques.) 897 (i).

Letter Carriers, Hours of Service, Pay, &c. (Ques.) 7728 (iv).

Mackenzie, Mr. Jas. H., Emplymt. in Toronto Inland Revenue Dept. (Ques.) 5797 (iii).

Militia—Board of Officers, Rep. *re* Pay and Allowance, &c. (Ques.) 2165 (ii).

Militia Permanent Corps, Commission *re* Pay, &c. (Ques.) 1292 (i).

Naval Defence, Imperial, Contributions by Canada, &c. (Ques.) 1118 (i).

Naval Instructions, Drilling of Canadian Seamen, &c. (Ques.) 1119 (i).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 4996 (iii).

Postal Arrangements between Canada and the U.S., on Statement (Mr. Lemieux) to Com. of Sup., 3166 (ii).

Printing and Lithographing, Expenditure by Govt. outside of Canada (Ques.) 1506, 1732, 1931 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 2397 (ii).

Quebec Tercentenary, Mobilization of Militia, Abandonment of (remarks) 8851 (v).

Railway Commission (Ass't Chief) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3928 (ii); in Com., 4985 (iii).

Railway Commission, Total Expenditure in Counsel Fees, &c. (Ques.) 10256 (v).

Returns, Inquiry for, 569 (i), 2885 (ii).

Smith, Wm. R., Patent Relief (B. 198) 1°*, 12393 (vii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3820 (ii).

Standard Accident and Guarantee Co.'s incorp. (B. 132) 1°*, 5337 (iii).

Standard Plate Glass Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 41) 1°*, 754 (i); in Com., 6183 (iii).

Sugar Manufacture, Regulation *re* Saccharine Standards (Ques.) 351 (i).

SUPPLY—

Militia (annual drill) 5745 (iii).

Temperance Colonization Society, Land Grants to, Term of Settlement, &c. (M. for ret.*) 4774 (iii).

Toronto Barracks, Approval of Plans by Militia Dept. (Ques.) 7203 (iv).

MACDONELL, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Toronto Harbour Life Saving Station, Establishment of (Ques.) 4586 (iii).

Toronto Harbour, Murray & Cleveland's Contract *re*, Tenders, &c. (M. for copies*) 2397 (ii).

Toronto Harbour (eastern gap) Amount of Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 354 (i).

——— Date of Murray & Cleveland's Contract, Total Cost, Changes, &c. (Ques.) 1507 (i).

Toronto Harbour (western gap) Construction of Entrance, &c. (Ques.) 354, 518 (i), 4587 (iii).

——— Delay in Contract (remarks) 5915 (iii).

Toronto Postmaster, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 2594 (ii).

Winding-Up Act Amt. (B. 95) 1° m., 2974 (ii).

Woollen Industry, Number of Employees, Value of Output, &c. (Ques.) 7504 (iv).

Yukon Gold Co., Holdings by Guggenheims, &c. (Ques.) 7725 (iv).

Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8486 (v).

MACLAREN, Mr. A. F., *Perth, N.*

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11255 (vi).

Goderich Military Camp, Holding of (remarks) 9779 (v).

Guelph-Goderich Mail Service, Arrangements with C.P.R. (Ques.) 184 (i).

International Tunnel, Windsor, Customs Duty *re* Construction Material, &c. (Ques.) 3840 (ii).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11248 (vi).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11080 (vi).

MACLEAN, Mr. A. K., *Lunenburg.*

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12870, 13052 (vii).

Civil Service Commission Report (remarks) 5648 (iii).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1718 (i).

Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3021; in Com., 3035 (ii).

N.B. Cold Storage Co. and Ministerial Connection *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9363 (v).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigations, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3113 (ii).

——— Ques. of Order, 3083 (ii).

MACLEAN, Mr. A. K.—*Con.*

Quebec Bridge Commission, Rep., Evidence, &c. (M.) to ref. to Special Committee, 10401 (vi).

——— Rep. of Sel. Com. (M.) to conc., 13353; on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 13373 (vii).

Rules of the House, Amendments to (prop. Res.) 2984 (ii).

Shipping Act Amt. (B. 12) 1° m., 313 (i).

Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, on M. (Mr. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7754 (iv).

Supplies purchased by Govt., &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5834 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Bridgewater) 7136 (iv); Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (dredging) 13341 (vii); (Tancook island) 11230 (vi).

MACLEAN, Mr. M. Y., *Huron S.*

Budget Speech by Fin. Min., Distribution, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10351 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11871 (vi).

MACLEAN, Mr. W. F., *York (O.) S.*

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10935, 10941 (vi).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 3902 (ii); in Com., 4504; on M. for 3°, 4532 (iii).

Belleville and Hastings Ry., Cor. with G.T. Ry. Co., on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Cor., 2808 (ii).

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7670 (iv).

Brockville-Ottawa Ry. Connections (remarks) 433 (i).

Buildings, Administrative, Erection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10984 (vi).

Business of the House, Precedence on Tuesday (remarks) 2982 (ii).

——— Public Bills, &c. (remarks) *re* Procedure, 2786 (ii).

Canadian Press Association Subsidy B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 12845; in Com., 12849 (vii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 10718, 10729; in Com., 11635 (vi).

Companies Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5493 (iii).

Criminal Code (trade restraint) Amt. B. 96 (Mr. Gervais) on M. for 1°, 2976 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11126; in Com., 11170 (vi).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1692 (i).

Foresters' Subsidiary High Court B. 62 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 5175 (iii).

MACLEAN, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. *re* (remarks) 12836 (vii).
G.T.P., Accidents on Construction (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6658 (iv).
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3726 (ii).
——— on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) to ref. to Com., 3362 (ii).
Hindus in B.C., Protest *re* Treatment (remarks) 5490 (iii).
House of Commons Chamber, Ventilation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10979 (vi).
I.C.R., Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4484 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12787 (vii).
Marconi System, Regulation of Rates, &c. (Ques.) 174 (i).
Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3031 (ii).
Moosejaw-Lacombe Branch of C.P. Ry., Extension, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7657 (iv).
Public Bills and Orders, Precedence of (remarks) 2939, 3405 (ii).
Ry. Act (demurrage, &c.) Amt. (B. 6) 1° m., 93; on Order for 2° (remarks) 938 (i); 2° m., 3320 (ii).
——— (tel. cos.) Amt. (B. 11) 1° m., 231 (i).
Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3904 (ii).
Ry. Act (ry. comn.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to M. for 3°, 10783; (amt.) 11602; on M. for 3°, 11613; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11619; on Amt. (Mr. Macdonell) 11633 (vi).
Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2903 (ii).
Seed Grain purchased, Quantity, Price, &c. (Ques.) 8185 (iv).
Standard Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 71) 1°*, 1424 (i).
Suburban Mail Delivery, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3282 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Immigration (agents, &c.) 9851 (v).
Militia (annual drill) 10291 (v).
Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2965 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (rents, &c.) 10981 (vi); Ont. (Guelph, armoury) 7678 (iv).
Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor., 907 (i).
Toronto and Schomberg Ry. Blockade (remarks) 3901 (ii).
Toronto Ordnance Lands Sale B. 218 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 13417

MACLEAN, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Water Carriage of Goods Bill (remarks) 13415 (vii).

MACPHERSON, Mr. R. G., *Vancouver City.*
All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12472 (vii).
Architects Institute of Canada incorp. B. 88 (Mr. Walsh) in Com., 5380 (iii).
Boundary Surveys (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9741 (v).
British Columbia Chartered Bank incorp. (B. 59) 1°*, 1283 (i).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10745 (vi).
Chinese Immigration, Decision of N. S. Supreme Court *re* Evasion of Poll Tax (Ques.) 513 (i).
Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5132 (iii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11384 (vi).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13032 (vii).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4578 (iii).
Fort William Terminal Ry. and Bridge Co.'s (B. 101) 1°*, 3477 (ii); in Com., 6180 (iii), 6223 (iv).
G.T.P., Supplies to Prince Rupert via Seattle (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10376 (vi).
Hindus, Deportation from B.C., Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' (remarks) 5337 (iii).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6435 (iv).
Indian Dept., Extravagent Management, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11031, 11062 (vi).
Indian Lands, B.C. Provincial Rights, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 627 (i).
Japanese entering B.C., Passports, &c. (Ques.) 4243 (iii).
Japanese and Oriental Immigration into B.C., Restriction of, on prop. Res. (Mr. R. Smith) 719 (i).
——— Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2087 (ii).
——— on Stmnt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1605 (i).
Japanese Immigration Restriction and B.C. Legislation, on M. for Sup., 1760 (i).
Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3018 (ii).
Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6894, 7231; on M. for 3°, 7219 (iv).
Pacific Coast Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 40) 1°*, 754 (i); in Com., 6182 (iii), 6227 (iv).
Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4983 (iii).

MACPHERSON, Mr. R. G.—*Con.*

Ross Rifle, Defects, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Worthington) to Com. of Sup., 9086 (v).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries, &c.) 627 (i); Interior (astronomical surveys) 9741 (v).

Ocean and River Service (wrecks) 3187 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Cumberland) 10865; (Quesnel) 10868; (Vancouver) 10868; (Vernon) 10871 (vi); N.S. (Antigonish) 7121 (iv).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10703 (vi).

Vancouver Bank incorp. (B. 32) 1°*, 606 (i); in Com., 4580 (iii).

Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s (B. 125) 1°*, 5255; in Com., 6183 (iii).

Yukon Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9662 (v).

McCARTHY, Mr. L. G., *Simcoe, N.*

Canada Shipping Act (marine engineers) Amt. (B. 17) 2° m., 3414 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 11360; in Com., 11382 (vi).

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1143 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12986 (vii).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10762 (vi).

Gammell, Edith Maud Rosario Relief B. 139 (Mr. Galliher) on M. for 2°, 6190 (iii).

Georgian Bay Fisheries Commission, Payments to Messrs. Birnie and Noble (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 987 (i).

Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12405 (vii).

Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3017 (ii).

St. Lawrence Power Co., and Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. Gervais) for Cor., &c., 3012 (ii).

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. (B. 17) 1° m., 349 (i).

SUPPLY—

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2947, 2949 (ii).

Railways—G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10379 (vi).

Supreme Court Act Amt. B. 121 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5497 (iii).

McCARTHY, Mr. M. S., *Calgary.*

Buffalo imported from Montana for Game Preserve, Alberta, Payments *re* (Ques.) 847 (i).

Buffalo Herds for Parks (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5758 (iii).

Buildings in Man. and N.W. Amounts paid by Govt., &c. (M. for ret.*) 698 (i).

McCARTHY, Mr. M. S.—*Con.*

Calgary Town Sites (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9775 (v).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10546 (vi).

'Coquitlam,' Str., Seizure of, Compensation *re* (Ques.) 2389 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11133; in Com., 11159, 11177, 11426, 11524, 11957; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 11975 (vi).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13280 (vii).

Game Preserve, Alberta, Buffalo imported from Montana, Payments *re* (Ques.) 847 (i).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6326 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6443 (iv).

Irrigation Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 955 (i).

Irrigation Act Amt. B. 99 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4671 (iii).

Irrigation in West, Investigations *re* Measurements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9989 (v).

Japanese Immigration, &c., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for O.Cs., &c., 881 (i).

Japanese and Oriental Immigrants in B.C., Number, &c. (Ques.) 692 (i).

Land Titles Act Assurance Fund B. 168 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10527 (vi).

Life-Boats in B. C., Purchase of, from U. S. (Ques.) 683 (i).

McDougall, Rev. John, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 688 (i).

Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4981 (iii).

Returns, Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv., 4666 (iii).

Russian Seizures of Canadian Vessels, Compensation *re* (Ques.) 683 (i), 2391 (ii).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1376 (i).

S. A. Veterans, Land Grants to, &c. (Ques.) 563 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12605 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Dom. Lands (forest reserves) 10049; (surveys) 9989 (v).

Immigration (agents, &c.) 9967; (Doukhobors) 9956 (v).

Indians—Ont. and Que. (land sales) 12750 (vii).

Interior—Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5756 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10979 (vi).

McCARTHY, Mr. M. S.—*Con.*

Timber Berths in Man. and N. W. Ters., under Licenses, Applicants' Names, Amounts paid, &c. (M. for ret.*) 852 (i).

Timber Limits, Leasing, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2347 (ii).

Wireless Tel. Station on Pacific Coast, Erection of (Ques.) 683 (i).

McCOLL, Mr. J. B., *Northumberland, W. (O.)*

Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5950 (iii).

Budget, The, 6073 (iii).

Campbellford, Lake Ontario & Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 14) 1°*, 350 (i).

Quebec Tercentenary Postage Stamps, Issue of Denominations (Ques.) 12414 (vii).

McCOOL, Mr. C. A., *Nipissing.*

Copper Cliff Postmaster and Elections (remarks) in Com. on B. 115, 11916 (vi).

Dokis Indian Reserve, Sale of Timber, on M. for Sup., 7805 (iv).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11914 (vi), 12973 (vii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3626 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal, Plans, Reports, &c. (M.) for Copies, 1941 (i).

Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5438 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (North Bay) 7811 (iv); Ottawa (Museum) 1503 (i).

McCRANEY, Mr. G. E., *Saskatchewan.*

Boards of Trade Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11988 (vi).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11463, 11948 (vi).

Doukhobors, Manner of Living (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5753 (iii).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6323 (iv).

Keewatin Diocese incorp. (B. 179) 1°*, 9889 (v).

Moosejaw-Lacombe Branch of C. P. Ry., Extension of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7658 (iv).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 153) 1°*, 6525; in Com., 7675, 7722 (iv), 8560, 8610, 9068, 9166 (v).

Seed Grain for Settlers in N. W., Extension of Time for Payment, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2924 (ii).

—— on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1363 (i).

McCRANEY, Mr. G. E.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Immigration (general expenses) 5752 (iii).

Timber Berths, Nos. 652, &c., Applications, &c., &c., (M. for copies*) 4589 (iii).

—— Nos. 645, &c., Original Tenders, &c. (M. for ret.*) 4247 (iii).

McINTYRE, Mr. G. H., *Perth, S.*

Address, The, 455 (i).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5130 (iii).

Employees of Parliament, Religion, &c., on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Ret., 5482 (iii).

Hogs slaughtered, Compensations paid, &c. (remarks) 13094 (vii).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6842, 6928 (iv).

Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R.M.C., on M. for Sup., 1024 (i).

Patent Medicine B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 12623 (vii).

Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4970 (iii).

Rules of the House, Amendments to, on prop. Res. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 2986 (ii).

Senate Reform (prop. res.) 1513 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12607 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (mint) 1458 (i).

Wheat Transportation in N. W., Financial Aid by Govt., &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2211 (ii).

McINTYRE, Mr. W., *Strathcona.*

Address, The, 445 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s (B. 81) 1°*, 1732 (i); in Com., 4231 (iii).

C. P. Ry. Co.'s (B. 45) 1°*, 891 (i).

Diseases and Public Health Bureau, on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2585 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11171, 11420, 11502 (vi).

Dom. Land Grants to Rys. prior to 1896, Total Acreage (Ques.) 8182 (iv).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4577 (iii).

Hudson Bay Ry., Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6390 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6436 (iv).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6735, 6956 (iv).

Indian Dept., Extravagant Management, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11034 (vi).

Inspection and Sale Act (oats) Amt. (B. 114) 1° m., 4312 (iii).

McINTYRE, Mr. W.—*Con.*

Postal Services, Delays, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 7262 (iv).

Ruthenian Catholic Mission, &c., incorp. (B.69) 1°*, 1424 (i).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 70) 1°*, 1424 (i); in Com., 4231, 4546, 4579 (iii).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1358 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants Bill, in Com. on Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3760 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5528 (iii).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2327 (ii).

McKENZIE, Mr. P. H., *Bruce, S.*

Agriculture Com.'s Rep. (M.) to conc., 12409 (vii).

Brockville-Ottawa Ry. Service (remarks) 191 (i).

Budget, The, 6573 (iv).

Cattle Embargo in G. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12883 (vii).

G.T. Ry. and C.P.R., Connection at Wingham (remarks) 191 (i).

McLEAN, Mr. A. A., *Queens, P.E.I.*

Address, The, 420 (i).

'Arctic,' Str., Expenditure *re* Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4168 (ii).

Bear River Station Dwelling, Tenders, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 2161 (ii).

Brier Island Fog Alarm, Installation of, Contract *re* (Ques.) 9473 (v).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6204 (iii).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 12648 (vii).

Canadian Press Association Subsidy B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 12842 (vii).

Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7246 (iv).

Charlottetown Ry. Station, Contract Price *re* Construction, &c. (Ques.) 517 (i).

——— (M. for copies*) 3241 (ii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com., 11984 (vi).

Dog Fish Reduction Plant, Operation at Canso, &c. (Ques.) 5651 (iii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5777 (iii).

Draper, Mr., and Mr. Pepper, Candidates for Municipal Offices (Ques.) 687 (i).

Exchequer Court Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 8503 (v).

Fishing Licenses, River John, Inquiry for Ret., 10511 (vi).

Forchu Fish Hatchery, Duties of Supervisor, &c. (Ques.) 3427 (ii).

McLEAN, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6252 (iv).

Gunnip, Mr. James, Pet. *re* Claims for Injuries (Ques.) 3844 (ii).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10490 (vi).

——— Post Office, Delays in Mails (remarks) 11939 (vi).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6389 (iv).

Inland Revenue Act, Violations, Inquiry for Ret., 4964 (iii).

I.C. Ry. Rates, Increase in Winter to P. E. I. (Ques.) 5995 (iii).

Legal Agents for Govt. in P. E. I., Names, &c. (Ques.) 4764 (iii).

Lobster Fisheries, Pet. from Fishermen's Union of N. S. *re* Regulations (Ques.) 6644 (iv).

Lobster Fishing in Lunenburg, &c., N.S., Reps. *re* Undersized Fish (Ques.) 2792 (ii)

Lobster Hatchery, License to E. H. McLennan and G. A. Redmond, Pets., Cor. &c. (M. for ret.*) 2983 (ii).

Louisburg, Harbour, N.S., Amount of Harbour Dues, 1906, &c. (Ques.) 7503 (iv).

——— Harbour Master, Remuneration, &c. (Ques.) 3428 (ii).

——— Marine Hospital, Condition of, &c. (Ques.) 4401 (iii).

McLeod, Alex., Dismissal from Valleyfield, P.E.I., Post Office (M. for cor.*) 5087 (iii).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12813 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Book-keeping, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4002 (ii).

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7333 (iv).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6892 (iv).

Mess Pork, Quantity imported from U. S., &c. (Ques.) 5650 (iii).

'Montague,' Dredge, Amounts paid for Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 182 (i).

Naval Schools, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3154 (ii).

Obstruction Tactics (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9221 (v).

Pinette Harbour Dredging, Pet. *re* (Ques.) 9474 (v).

Point Prim Wharf, P.E.I., Completion of, &c. (Ques.) 3898 (ii).

Port Hood Fishery Officer, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 10254 (v).

McLEAN, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

Port Hood Harbour Works, Closing of Northern Entrance (Ques.) 10255 (v).

P.E.I., Lighthouse Supplies, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 358 (i).

——— Souris Breakwater, Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 1685 (i).

——— Subsidy, Deduction *re* Hillsborough Bridge (Ques.) 5079 (iii).

——— Terms of Union with Dom., Nonfulfilment of, &c., Memorials, &c. (M. for copies*) 5801 (iii).

——— Winter Communication, Tunnel Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 4620 (iii).

P.E.I. Ry., Bear River Station Master's Dwelling, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 1737 (i).

——— Branch Lines, Construction re, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 3261 (ii).

——— Construction of Freight Sheds, &c., Specifiations, &c. (M. for Cor.*) 5086 (iii).

——— Harmony-Elmira Branch B. 202 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 12631 (vii).

——— Mail Service, Delay in Distribution (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9092 (v).

——— Stanley Bridge Branch, Surveys, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 850 (i).

——— (Ques.) 4829 (iii).

Post Office Act (postage) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 10715 (vi).

Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3907 (ii).

Representation of the Mar. Provinces in H. of C., on M. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 9806 (v).

Scotch Hill East Post Office, Establishment of, &c. (Ques.) 2793 (ii).

Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, &c., on M. for Sup., 7732 (iv).

Souris Harbour Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 1939 (i).

Souris Ry. Wharf, Contract *re* (Ques.) 2386 (ii).

——— Permission to Build, &c. (Ques.) 7728 (iv).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3767, 3825 (ii); in Com., 12611 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Interior (astronomical surveys) 9770 (v).

Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9221, 9237 (v).

House of Commons (accommodation) 10490 (vi).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (wireless stations) 5045 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 5768 (iii); (ice-breakers) 2947, 2949; (obstructions) 3212; (winter mail service) 3216; (wrecks) 3195 (ii).

McLEAN, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Post Office (inspectors) 9092 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Experimental Farms (repairs, &c.) 10905 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Elmwood) 13335 (vii); (Winnipeg, warehouse) 8572 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston, militia clothes) 10908 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (St. John) 12027 (vi).

Public Works—Marine (ship channel 5038 (iii).

Railways—I.C.R. (claims dept.) 10177 (v) P.E.I. (Haney, M. J., claims) 12763 (vii).

Tobacco, Customs Seizure at Charlottetown, Penalties *re*, &c., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 2982 (ii).

Tobacco Infractions of Inland Rev. Act in P.E.I., on M. for Sup., 9514 (v).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9237 (v).

Tobacco Manufacturers in Mar. Provs., Amounts of Fines and Penalties, &c. (Ques.) 363 (i).

Tracadie Harbour Breakwater, Pet. *re* Construction (Ques.) 5472 (iii).

Trap Bag Nets in Pokemouche River, &c. (Ques.) 9476 (v).

Travelling Expenses of R. A. Wiallard *re* Colonial Conference, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3987 (ii).

Vernon River Bridge, P.E.I., Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 5471 (iii).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6133 (iii).

Whale Fishing Cos. in B.C., Licenses granted, &c. (M.) 10259 (v).

——— Penalties, &c. (Ques.) 5996 (iii).

McLEAN, Mr. P. D., *Centre York.*

Hogg, Mr. W. D., Payments to since 1896, &c. (Ques.) 2981 (ii).

McLENNAN, Mr. A., *Inverness.*

Ancoin *vs.* The King, Cor. *re* Suit in Supreme Court, N.S. (M. for cor.*) 558 (i).

Diseases and Public Health Bureau, on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2589 (ii).

Dog Fish Reduction Works at Canso, Total Expenditure (Ques.) 5790 (iii).

Inverness County and Increased Ry. Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12233 (vii).

Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, on M. (Mr. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7744 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Customs—Inspectors (travelling expenses) 9546 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Inverness) 7173 (iv); (Lake Ainslie) 11228; (Margaree) 11229; (Port Hastings) 11266; (Port Hood) 11268 (vi).

McLENNAN, Mr. A.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Railways—I.C.R. (Moncton, additional line) 12761; (stations) 12233 (vii).

MARCIL, Mr. C., *Bonaventure.*

Interprovincial Ry. Bridge Co. of N. B. (B. 76) 1°*, 1584 (i).

MAJOR, Mr. C. B., *Labelle.*

C.P.R., Papineauville to Little Nation River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13303 (vii).

MARSHALL, Mr. D., *Elgin, E.*

Aylmer, Customs Collector, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 1506 (i).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6206 (iii).

Canned Pease imported from France, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 3847 (ii).

Cold Storage, Assistance *re* East Elgin Establishment (Ques.) 351 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Res., 1242 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3604 (ii).

Fraser, A. W., Emplymt. as Counsel *re* Sussex St. Property Purchase (Ques.) 3478 (ii).

Fruit Inspection, Complaints *re* Apple Packing, &c. (remarks) 2766 (ii).

Fruit and Vegetable Inspectors, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 516 (i).

Govt. Securities *re* Dom. Notes, &c. (Ques.) 6235 (iv).

Immigration Agents in East Elgin, Number employed (Ques.) 692 (i).

Meat and Canned Foods B. 149, in Com., 7227; on M. for 3°, 7215 (iv).

Port Bruce Harbour, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 2389 (ii).

Port Burwell Harbour, Contracts, Payments, &c. (M. for ret.*) 556 (i).

Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3924 (ii).

Salmon Fishing Licenses in Gardner's Inlet, &c. (Ques.) 5652 (iii).

Salvation Army Immigrants, Stmnt. of Genl. Booth (Ques.) 2390 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Meats and Canned Foods Act) 12893 (vii).

Militia (annual drill) 5750 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10894 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 7493; (Leamington) 7815; (St. Mary's) 7828; (Owen Sound) 7824 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (improvements, &c.) 5708 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal, pneumatic postal) 5704 (iii).

MARTIN, Mr. A., *Queens, P.E.I.*

Anglo-American Cable between P.E.I. and Mainland, Breaking of, &c. (remarks) 8439 (v).

Belle River Harbour Improvements, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 685 (i).

Budget, The, 6113 (iii).

Charlottetown Board of Trade, Pets. *re* Sailing Vessels (M. for copy*) 6240 (iv).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5099 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 10723; in Com., 11559 (vi).

Coal Deposits in P.E.I., Boring for, &c. (Ques.) 515 (i).

Coal Shipments from N.S. and Cape Breton, Res. of Board of Trade, P.E.I. (Ques.) 5470 (iii).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13273 (vii).

Express Charges in Mar. Provinces, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 518 (i).

Fisheries Dispute between Dom. and Mar. Provs., Jurisdiction *re* (Ques.) 2395 (ii).

Fruit Marks Act Inspection and Sale B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 10563 (vi).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6250 (v).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolishing of to Agents, on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1342 (i).

I.C.R., Extension to Great Lakes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2450 (ii).

——— Painsec Junction and Pointe du Chene (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10157 (v).

Little Sands Wharf, Repairs, &c., Cor. *re* (M. for copies*) 2397 (ii).

Lobster Fishing and Packing Licenses, Granting in P.E.I. (M. for cor.) 5475 (iii).

Lobster Licenses in Savage Harbour, Pet. *re* (Ques.) 4404 (iii).

McDonald, Archibald, Dismissal from Whim Road P. O. (M. for cor.*) 5087 (iii).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12798 (vii).

Murray Harbour Branch Ry. Improved Service, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 6239 (iv).

——— Inquiry for, 10123 (v).

Peat for Fuel, Deposits in Canada, Industry, &c. (Ques.) 515 (i).

Pinette Harbour, P.E.I., Pets. *re* Dredging (Ques.) 685 (i).

Pisquid Post Office, Removal of, Cor., Tels., Pets., &c. (M. for copies*) 4588 (iii).

Port Vernon Bridge, P.E.I., Completion of Work, &c. (Ques.) 4404 (iii).

MARTIN, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Postal Arrangements between U. S. and Canada, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 3895 (ii).

P.E.I. Fishing Bounties, Stmnt. of Payments (M. for ret.*) 1295 (i).

P.E.I., Post Offices in Queens County, Complaints *re* Mail Service (Ques.) 355 (i).

——— Steam Communication between P.E.I. and C. B. (remarks) in Com. on Sup., 12754, 13353 (vii).

——— Tunnel, Information *re* (Ques.) 562 (i).

P.E.I., Winter Communication, Freight carried, Freight Rates, &c. (M. for ret.*) 936 (i).

——— (Ques.) 843 (i).

P.E.I., Winter Communication, Mail Service, Cor., &c. (M. for copies) 1203 (i).

——— Tunnel Construction, Tels., Reps., &c. (M. for copies) 4589 (iii).

——— Withdrawal of Steamers from Georgetown Route, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 1513 (i).

——— (remarks) 1207 (i).

——— (remarks) *re* Discussion, 1109 (i).

P.E.I. Ry. Branch Lines, Cor., &c., *re* Construction (M. for copies) 3242, 3272 (ii).

P.E.I. Ry., Claims of Mr. James Maher, &c. (Ques.) 3834 (ii).

——— Complaints *re* Excessive Charges, &c. (Ques.) 1123 (i).

——— Freight Rates, Delegates from P.E.I., Reps. *re* (M. for copies*)6240 (iv).

——— Harmony-Elmira Branch B. 202 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 12408; on M. for 2°, 12628; in Com., 12631 (vii).

——— Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2745 (ii).

——— Hillsborough Bridge, Mr. Haney's Claim, Progress *re* (remarks) 7100 (iv).

——— Mail Service, Delay in Distribution (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9094 (v).

——— Murray Harbour Branch, Expenditure and Earnings, &c. (Ques.) 848 (i).

——— Time-Table, Protest *re*, &c. (Ques.) 1123 (i).

——— Train Service between Charlottetown and Murray Harbour (Ques.) 568 (i).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11630 (vi).

Railway Commission (Ass't. Chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3926 (ii); in Com., 4978 (iii).

Representation of the Mar. Provinces in H. of C., on M. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 9811 (v).

Returns, Inquiry for, 5491 (iii), 7722 (iv).

MARTIN, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Returns, Unopposed (remarks) 5914 (iii).

St. Peter's Bay, Mail Contract with H. B. Finlay, Amount, &c. (Ques.) 1686 (i).

St. Peter's Bay Post Office, Charges against Mrs. Finlay, Investigation *re* (Ques.) 1687 (i).

——— (M. for copies*) 2170 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 2786 (ii).

Seed Grain, Distribution *re*, Purchases in P.E.I. (remarks) 3157 (ii).

Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, &c., on M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7738 (iv).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3812 (ii); in Com., 12610 (vii).

Supply B. 96 (seed grain) in Com., 2783 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Indians—B.C. (land sales) 12754 (vii).
Militia (annual drill) 5736 (iii).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 1085 (i); (obstructions) 3213; (winter mail service) 3218 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Generally (experimental farms) 13339 (vii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (New London) 11292; N.S. (Port Hood) 11276; P.E.I. (repairs) 11292; (Rustico) 11293 (vi).
Railways—I.C.R. (salaries) 10157 (v).

Toronto Island Tunnel, Deputation *re* Construction by Govt. (Ques.) 5564 (iii).

Valleyfield, P.E.I., Change of Mail Route (Ques.) 11297 (vi).

Wednesday Evening Sittings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 11232 (vi).

West India Trade, Reciprocity Negotiations (remarks) 1860 (i).

MARTIN, Mr. M., *Montreal (St. Mary's).*

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6728 (iv).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6511 (iv).

Monteal Excise Officers, Increases to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 817 (i).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4911 (iii).

Quebec Bridge, Rep. of Sel. Com., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to conc., 13393 (vii).

Ry. Act Amt. (B. 100) 1° m., 3316 (ii).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Political Interference of Warden (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5539 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Excise (provisional allowances) 817 (i).

MICHAUD, Mr. P., *Victoria, N.B.*

G.T.P., Madawaska Right of Way (remarks) 12661 (vii).

MacIlreith, Mr., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7176 (iv).

MICHAUD, Mr. P.—*Con.*

N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference of Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3068 (ii).

Quebec and New Brunsick Ry. Co.'s (B. 128) 1°*, 5255; in Com., 6181 (iii), 6225 (iv).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8563 (v).

MILLER, Mr. H. H., *Grey, S.*

Address, The, 148 (i).

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3860 (ii).

Anglo-Canadian and Continental Bank incorp. B. 141 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 7724 (iv).

Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5950 (iii).

Budget, The, 5567 (iii).

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11256 (vi).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res (Mr. Blain) 5104 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 11707; in Com., 11844 (vi), 12944 (vii).

Fruit Inspection *re* Apple Packing, Complaints, &c. (remarks) 2764 (ii).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6825 (iv).

Indian Department, Extravagent Management, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11068 (vi).

Occidental Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 131 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 7724 (iv).

Postal Services, Delays, &c., on M. for Sup. (remarks) 7261 (iv).

Presbyterian Widows' and Orphans' Fund B. 23 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 2789 (ii).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3102 (ii).

Senate Reform, on prop. Res. (Mr. G. H McIntyre) 1533 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12620 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Indians—Ont. and Que. (land sales) 12749 (vii); Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4058 (ii); Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Owen Sound) 7817; P.E.I. (Georgetown) 7185 (iv).

Timber Limits, Leasing, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2359 (ii).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10693 (vi); on Sen. Amts., 13045 (vii).

Wheat Transportation from N.W., on M. Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2194 (ii).

MONK, Mr. F. D., *Jacques Cartier.*

Actonvale Public Building, Total Cost of Construction (Ques.) 6232 (iv).

Address, The, 535 (i).

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4732 (iii).

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3875 (ii).

——— All-Red Line, Irish Route, Opposition by Govt. (Ques.) 10253 (v).

——— Letter to Mr. Sifton from Prime Minister (remarks) 948 (i).

——— Negotiations, Canadian Representatives in England, &c. (Ques.) 353 (i).

——— Tenders, Proposals, &c., Cor. *re* (Ques.) 6460 (iv).

Anglo-American Treaty, Submitted to Can. Govt. (remarks) 6926 (iv).

Anglo-French Exhibition, Canadian Representative (Ques.) 8611 (v).

——— Purchase of Goods, &c. (Ques.) 8443 (v).

——— Total Expenditure by Govt. (Ques.) 8443 (v).

Anglo-Japanese Treaty, Cor. Rep., &c. (M. for copies) 594 (i).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4395 (iii).

Becancour, Blanche, &c., Dredging at during 1907, &c. (Ques.) 3040 (ii).

Bonus System, *re* Immigration (notice of motion) 6288 (iv).

Bridge Subsidies to Rys., on Amt. (Mr. Leonard) in Com., 13311 (vii).

B.C. Appeal Court B. 165 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 1°, 8466 (v).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6169, 6174, 6192 (iii), 6409 (iv).

Canada and France SS. Communication, Provision *re* Treaty (Ques.) 12391 (vii).

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12868 (vii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5125 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 10724; in Com., 11573 (vi).

Clarke City, Expenditure *re* Public Works (Ques.) 2394 (ii).

Colonial Conference, Travelling Expenses of Ministers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1001 (i).

Co-operative Societies (B. 5) 1° m., 92; on Order for 2°, 583 (i).; on M. for 2°, 4558; in Com., 4564 (iii).

——— (M.) to transfer to Govt. Orders, 3654 (ii).

Coteau Landing Wharf, Repairs to (Ques.) 9277 (v).

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Criminal Code (libel) Amt. B. 92 (Mr. Gervais) on M. for 1°, 2544 (ii).

Cumberland Railway and Coal Co.'s (B. 46) 1°*, 891; 2°*, 1109 (i).

Debates, Official, 4th Rep. (translators) Notice to ref. back to Debates Com., 9709 (v).

——— M. to ref back to Com., 10225; Neg. (Y. 48; N. 94) 10252 (v).

——— (remarks) 9889, 10119 (v).

Deschambault Wharf, Tenders *re* Construction, Contractor, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5801 (iii).

——— (Ques.) 5464 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8116, 8138 (iv).

Dredging Works at Nicolet River, &c., Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 3896 (ii).

——— (M. for ret.*) 4247 (iii).

Dredging in Quebec Prov., Claims pending, &c. (Ques.) 7200 (iv).

Dredging in Vaudreuil Co., Supt.'s Salary, &c. (Ques.) 4587 (iii).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10763 (vi).

Fisheries Treaties, Boundaries with U. S. (remarks) 6632 (iv).

Franco-Canadian Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 1397 (i); on M. for 2°, 2221 (ii); on M. for 3°, 4317 (iii).

Frano-Canadian Trade Treaty, Consideration of Proposed Convention, (M.) for Sel. Com., 923 (i).

——— Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 12651 (vii).

——— Shipments from Canada, &c. (Ques.) 4763 (iii).

See 'Can. and France,' &c.

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3794 (ii).

Godfroi River Wharf, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 3423 (ii).

Govt. Vessels, Pay of Officers, &c. (Ques.) 10736 (vi).

Govt. Works, Emplymt. of Technical Students (prop. res.) 3288 (ii).

G.T.P. Guarantee Bonds B. 171 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10772 (vi).

G.T.P., Winnipeg to Moncton, Number of Miles completed, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 6643 (iv).

House of Commons, Rules for Hours of Adjournment, on prop. Res. (Mr, Wright) 592 (i).

Hudson, Dredging,, Total Expenditure, 1907 (Ques.) 4587 (iii).

Hull Customs Imports, Amount for 1906-8 (Ques.) 11703 (vi).

Hull Post Office, Total Revenue for 1906-07 (Ques.) 11704 (vi).

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Immigrants landed in Canada to June, 1907, Number deported, &c. (Ques.) 3839 (ii).

Immigrants reported by SS. 'Montreal,' Bonuses paid, &c. (Ques.) 6921 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B.135 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 5658 (iii); in Com., 6436 (iv).

Immigration Agents in France, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9840 (v).

——— (notice of motion) 4769 (iii).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of *re* Agents, &c. (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 6663; Amt. neg. (Y. 42; N. 95) 7092 (iv).

Immigration Frauds at Halifax, Par. in Press (remarks) 4834 (iii).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6491, 6514 (iv).

I.C.R., Amqui Station, Cost of Construction (Ques.) 10012 (v).

——— Vote *re* Construction, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 12774 (vii).

Italy, Commercial Treaty with (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10593 (vi).

Japanese and Oriental Immigration, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for copies of O.Cs., &c., 872 (i).

Japanese Immigration, Recent Entries into B. C. (remarks) 3751 (ii).

——— on Stmt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1605 (i).

——— from U. S., Deportation, &c. (remarks) 3900 (ii).

Lachine Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12097 (vii).

La Compagnie de Publication du Canada, Amount paid by Govt. (Ques.) 5082 (iii).

Lac Saumon Station, I.C.R., Amount expended (Ques.) 12652 (vii).

La Societe Canadienne d'Immigration, &c., Montreal, Pet. *re* Assistance, &c. (Ques.) 4244 (iii).

——— (M. for copies*) 4773 (iii).

Lighthouses in Nicolet River and Fort St. Francois, &c. (Ques.) 3837 (ii).

Loans, Temporary, by Govt., Names of Lenders, Rates of Interest, &c. (M. for ret.*) 554 (i).

——— (Ques.) 314 (i).

Mail Service, Egypte and St. Ephrem d'Upton, Renewal of Contract (Ques.) 5257

Mail Service by Steamers via Coteau Landing, &c. (Ques.) 9277 (v).

Mail Service, Soulanges County, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 9277 (v).

Marine, Deptl. Officials, Suspension of *re* C. S. Report (remarks) 6004 (iii).

——— Deptl. Book-keeping, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3988 (ii).

Montreal Liquor Licenses, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fisher) 4066 (ii).

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Montreal Turnpike Roads, Claim of Govt., &c. (prop. res.) 3465 (ii).

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c. (prop. res.) 3436; on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3452 (ii).

—— Amounts collected and expended, &c. (M. for ret.) 1688 (i).

—— Payment of Interest, &c. (Ques.)1931 (i), 2979 (ii).

—— Rep. of Auditor General (M. for copy*) 2983 (ii).

Nicolet County, Dredging, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 4588 (iii).

Nicolet Post Office, Contract, Tender, Extras, &c. (Ques.) 3838 (ii).

Nicolet River Dredging, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 3840 (ii).

Nicolet River Protection Walls, Repairs, Expenditure *re* (M. for ret.*) 4588 (iii).

Nicolet River Wharf, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 3478 (ii).

Order, Ques. of, *re* answering questions by Govt., 234 (i).

Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, on M. (Mr. Sloan) to Com. of Sup., 3974 (ii).

Pointe Aux Trembles Wharf, Date of Contract, &c. (Ques.) 9267 (v).

—— Number of Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 1734 (i), 2394 (ii).

—— Tender of Messrs. Dusseault & Pageau, &c. (Ques.) 8838 (v).

Quebec Bridge Commission, on M. (Mr. Maclean) to ref. Rep., Evidence, &c., to Special Com., 10401 (vi).

—— Rep. of Sel. Com., on M. (Mr. Maclean) to conc. (amt.) 13363; Amt. neg. (Y. 52; N. 103) 13414 (vii).

Quebec Bridge Commission's Report, Distribution of Printed Copies (remarks) 8608 (v), 10302 (vi).

Quebec Bridge Co., Govt. Grants, Investigation *re* (M.) for Sel. Com., 2547 (ii).

Quebec Bridge Co., ref. to in debate on Address, 535 (i).

Quebec Bridge, Construction Materials, Customs Duties collected (Ques.) 5200, 5793 (iii).

Ques. of Priv., Par. in 'Le Soleil,' 7994 (iv).

Railway Act Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 3°, 10688; (amt) 11603, neg. (Y. 36; N. 89) 11608 (vi).

Ry. Act (working hours) Amt. B. 157 (Mr. R. Smith)—(remarks) 10120 (v).

Railway Commissioners' Board, Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8513 (v).

Raquette River Dredging, Contract *re* (Ques.) 4587 (iii).

—— (remarks) 5658 (iii).

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Rimouski County Public Works, Expenditures *re* (Ques.) 10013 (v).

St. Gabriel de Brandon, Post Office Savings Bank, Opening, Pets., &c. (M. for copies*) 4589 (iii).

—— (Ques.) 4828 (iii).

St. Francois Port Wharf, Construction, Payments, &c. (Ques.) 3423 (ii).

Ste. Hyacinthe, 84th Regiment, Total Amount of Pay unpaid, &c. (Ques.) 844 (i).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Political Interference of Warden (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5541 (iii).

Sacred Heart Post Office, Establishment of six Offices, &c. (Ques.) 5472 (iii).

Sauve, Alfred, Rep. of Investigation *re* Charges, &c. (Ques.) 9278 (v).

Seven Islands, Expenditure *re* Public Works (Ques.) 2394 (ii).

Soulanges Canal, Commissioner Boyer, (Ques.) 12413 (vii).

—— Electric Power, Contract with Govt., &. (Ques.) 10011 (v).

—— Expenditure *re* Investigation by Messrs. Sauve and Boyer (Ques.) 10513 (vi).

—— Investigation, Rep. of Mr. Boyer, Inquiry for, 9890 (v).

—— Investigation, Rep. of Mr. Boyer (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10304 (vi).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3805 (ii).

Suburban Mail Delivery (prop. res.) 3276 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10585 (vi).

Canals—Lachine (Richard, Jos., compensation) 13175 (vii).

Canals — Soulanges (investigation) 10304 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries) 9698 (v).

Immigration (agents, G.B.) 9840 (v).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 3988 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2943 (ii).

Post Office (boots for letter carriers) 8877 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Midland and Tiffin) 12128 (vii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11081 (vi).

Railways—Ry. Commission (legal expenses) 10362 (vi).

Technical Students, Emplymt. on Govt. Works (prop. res.) 3288 (ii).

Temporary Govt. Loans, Rates of Interest, &c. (Ques.) 233 (i).

Tobacco Excise Taxes, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 566 (i).

Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor., &c., *re*

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Amt. to Inland Revenue Act, 904; on Amt. (Mr. Barker) 921 (i).
Toll Gates upon Island of Montreal, Abolition of (prop. res.) 3299 (ii).
Travelling Expenses of Minister of Marine, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1001 (i).
Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6123 (iii).
Wharfage Dues in Soulanges County, Amounts received, &c. (Ques.) 9276 (v).
Wheat, frozen, Shipments from Man., &c., on M. (Mr. Blain) to adjn., 826 (i).
Whisky, Illegal Distribution at Thetford Mines (remarks) 9894 (v).

MORIN, Mr. J. B., *Dorchester.*

Bic Wharf, Material supplied, Quantity, Price, &c. (Ques.) 9713 (v).
Brockville-Ottawa Ry Service (remarks) on M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn., 189 (i).
Butter and Cheese exported from Prov. of Quebec, Quantity, Value, &c. (Ques.) 2162 (ii).
Debates, French Edition, Delay, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10505 (vi).
Fortier, Mr. Eugene, Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 8613 (v).
G.T.P., Contracts, Safeguard Clause, &c. (M. for copies*) 2398 (ii).
——— Medical Officer Parent, Payments to (Ques.) 8618 (v).
House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10493 (vi).
I.C.R., Connection with Quebec Central at Levis (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10179 (v).
——— Harlaka Junction, Ry. Connections (remarks) 189, 434, 1436 (i), 3317 (ii).
——— Riviere du Loup Station Master, &c. (Ques.) 7445 (iv).
Lake Francois Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12138 (vii).
Pulp Wood Export Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 4813 (iii).
Quebec Bridge Disaster, Lifting of Ruins (remarks) 10303 (vi).
Quebec and N. B. Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13290 (vii).
Riviere du Loup Wharf, Total Expenditure *re* Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 6462 (iv).
Royal Canadian Dragoons, St. Johns, Tenders *re* Supplies (Ques.) 5788 (iii).
Saguenay Dredging, Purchase of Coal *re*, &c. (Ques.) 8380 (v).
——— 'Storm King,' Tug, Employment of (Ques.) 8381 (v).
Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5414; on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 5448 (iii).

MORIN, Mr. J. B.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—
Immigration (agents) 9875 (v).
Marine—(ice-breakers) 1913 (i).
Miscellaneous (charwomen) 10508 (vi).
Ocean and River Service (obstructions) 3213; (tidal service) 3216 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings — Ottawa (Museum) 1495 (i).
Public Works—Que. (Montreal post office) 7413; (Quebec, citadel) 7430; (Quebec, drill hall) 7431; (Levis) 7295 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (train service) 10179 (v).
Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2690 (ii).

NORTHRUP, Mr. W. B., *Hastings, E.*

All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12476 (vii).
Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4505 (iii).
Belleville and North Hastings Ry., Cor. with G.T.Ry. Co. (M. for copies) 2796 (ii).
Crown Life Insurance Co.'s (B. 180) 1°*, 9330 (v).
Documents in Dept., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1190 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1658 (i).
——— on M. for Sup., 1830; (amt.) 1839; neg. (Y. 50: N. 95) 1882 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11803 (vi).
Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6753 (iv).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13271 (vii).
Govt. Employees at Ottawa, Number of Permanent and Temporary, &c. (M. for ret.*) 558 (i).
G.T.P., Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 12323 (vii).
Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R. M. C., on M. for Sup., 1030 (i).
Marine and Fisheries, Book-keeping, Payments *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4182 (ii).
Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7371 (iv).
——— Apptmt. of Mr. Perron (remarks) 6926 (iv).
——— Method of Procedure (remarks) 10743 (vi).
Militia and Marine Stationery Supplies, Purchases *re* Book-keeping (Ques.) 6233 (iv).
Niagara Camp, Transportation of Troops, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 2163 (ii).
P.E.I.Ry., Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* M. J. Haney's Claims (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2750 (ii).

NORTHRUP, Mr. W. B.—*Con.*

Ry. Act (Ry. Commission) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°,4659 (iii); in Com., 10647; on M. for 3° (amt.) 10777; on M. for 3°, 11598; Amt. neg. (Y. 36; N. 77) 11600 (vi).

Ross Rifle, Extravagance of Militia Dept., on Amt. (Mr. Worthington) to Com. of Sup., 8994 (v).

Supplies purchased by Govt., Apptmt. of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5854 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (subsidies) 12263 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4182 (ii); (ice-breakers) 1923 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8526; Ont. (Glencoe) 7490 (iv).

Watson, Mr. G. H., Apptmt. as Counsel *re* West Elgin Election Frauds (remarks) 6848 (iv).

OLIVER, Hon. Frank (Minister of the Interior) *Edmonton.*

Adams Lake, Construction of Dam, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 5798 (iii).

Alberta Closed Leases, Number granted, &c. (Ans.) 3037 (ii).

Badgley Island, Trespass by T. H. Jackman (Ans.) 1937 (i).

Belgian Immigrants, Number and Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 176 (i).

Blankets purchased by Militia and Indian Depts., Amounts, Price, &c. (Ans.) 4584 (iii).

Blood Indian Reserve, Lease to McEwan Cattle Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12739 (vii).

Boundary Surveys (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9740 (v).

Boyle Concession, Memorial of Dawson Legislature (Ans.) 509, 562, 681 (i).

Britton, Mr. Justice, Payment *re* Treadgold Commission (Ans.) 5474 (iii).

Buchanan Townsite, Homestead Entry of Mr. Ramsland (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10083 (v).

Buffalo Herd located at Elk Park (Ans.) 5208 (iii).

Buffalo Herd for Moose Mountain Reserve (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10102 (v).

Buffalo Herd for Parks (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5755 (iii).

Buffalo imported for Game Preserve in Alberta, Payments *re* (Ans.) 847.

Buffalo purchased for Parks, Authority for Expenditure (Ans.) 896 (i).

Buffalo purchased for Elk Park, Name of Purchaser (Ans.) 5795 (iii).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

Calgary Town Site (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9776 (v).

Cameron, John, Homestead Inspector, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 4769 (iii).

Canadian repatriated from U.S. (Ans.) 685 (i).

Chambly Common, Area, Rental, &c. (Ans.) 5652 (iii).

Chapel Point Ferry Wharf, Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 513 (i).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. (B. 184) 1°*, 10008 (v); 2° m., and in Com., 10545, 10744, 11020 (vi).

Clearwater Lake, Half Breeds' Location, &c. (Ans.) 175 (i).

——— Squatters' Claims (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9995 (v).

Clement, W. H. P., Legal Adviser in Yukon, &c. (Ans.) 5650 (iii).

Coal Areas, Agents for Applicants, &c. (Ans.) 5469, 5790 (iii).

Coal and Govt. Lands in Possession of Govt., &c. (Ans.) 843 (i).

Coal Lands, Alberta and Sask., Total Area sold, &c. (Ans.) 9278 (v).

——— Royalty Dues, &c., Sale or Lease of (Ans.) 11019 (vi).

Coal Lands, Disposed of by Govt. (Ans.) 3480 (ii).

——— Leases, Applicants *re* (Ans.) 2395 (ii).

——— Leased by Govt., Original Grantees, &c. (Ans.) 3232 (ii).

——— Purchase Price on Sections 16, 20 and 21, &c. (Ans.) 10513 (vi).

——— Purchases on Sections 27, 28, 33 and 34, Payments *re* (Ans.) 10512 (vi).

——— Timber, &c., Dates of Regulations, O.Cs., &c. (Ans.) 12656 (vii).

Coal Mining Cos. in Sask. and Alberta, Returns made to Govt. (Ans.) 10258 (v).

Coal Mine Royalties, Sums received in Alberta (Ans.) 12391 (vii).

Colonization Lands, Alienations, on Inquiry for Ret., 4317 (iii).

Colonization Societies in Quebec, Amounts paid (Ans.) 684 (i).

Congdon, Mr. F. T., Stmnt. *re* Estates administered (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10111 (v).

——— Investigation *re* Trusts and Estates (Ans.) 12050, 12413 (vii).

——— (remarks) 13420, 13518 (vii).

Congdon vs. Mrs. Wiley, Investigation, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 565 (i).

See 'Yukon.'

Crooked Lake Indian Reserve, Sale of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 634 (i).

——— (remarks) 10916 (vi).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

Cypress Hills Reservation, Homestead Lands, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9992 (v).

—— Reserve, Preservation of, &c. (Ans.) 3842 (ii).

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1133 (i).

—— Examination of, by Members (remarks) 3853 (ii).

—— Production of to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1636 (i).

Dodds, Mr. W., Information *re* Immigration Frauds (Ans.) 5655 (iii).

See 'Halifax.'

Dokis Indian Reserve, Consent of Chief *re* Sale of Timber (Ans.) 8175 (iv).

—— Commission to Mr. Ryan (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12732 (vii).

—— Name of Agent (Ans.) 5084 (iii).

—— Negotiations *re* Surrender (Ans.) 3849 (ii).

—— Protest *re* Sale of Timber (remarks) 10918 (vi).

—— Sale, Notice in Newspapers, &c. (Ans.) 7501 (iv).

—— Total Expenditure *re* Surrender (Ans.) 10512 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8659 (v).

Dom. Lands Survey (B. 9) 1° m., 231; 2°, and in Com., 754, 948 (i); on Senate Amts., 3755 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. (B. 181) 1° m., 9333 (v); 2° m., 11125; in Com., 11158, 11165, 11408, 11502, 11940; 3° m., 11970 (vi); on Mr. Lake's Amt., 12394; on Senate Amts., 13522 (vii).

Dom. Lands, Areas disposed of (Ans.) 3431 (ii).

—— Disposed of from 1896 to 1905, on M. (Mr. Lake) for Ret., 3852 (ii).

Dom. Land Grants to Rys. prior to 1896, Total Acreage, &c. (Ans.) 8183 (iv).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10806 (vi).

Doukhobors, Bonuses *re* Immigrants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9952 (v).

—— Condition of, Par. in Montreal 'Gazette' (remarks) 2219 (ii).

—— Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5017 (iii).

—— Manner of Living (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5753 (iii).

—— at Yorkton, Violation of Laws, &c. (remarks) 7630 (iv).

Doyle, Mr. P., Superannuation, &c. (Ans.) 6923 (iv).

Eagle Lake Coal Lands, Surrender of (Ans.) 694 (i).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

Estevan Quarantine Lands, Disposal of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10093 (v).

Fence Post Fees on Permits, &c. (Ans.) 10258 (v).

Fire Guardians, Number employed in Alberta, &c. (Ans.) 3433 (ii).

Foreign Purchases, Customs Collections *re* (Ans.) 5475 (iii).

French Immigration Agents, Names, Facilities, &c. (Ans.) 177 (i).

French Immigrants, Number and Expenditures, &c. (Ans.) 176 (i).

Gaetz Brothers, Payments to (Ans.) 10514 (vi).

Girouard, J. E., Resignation from Yukon Council (Ans.) 11938 (vi).

Grain Inspection Act Amt. (B. 203) 1°*, 12594; in Com., 13048, 13208 (vii).

Grazing Lands leased to Brown, Bedingfield & Co., Number of Acres (Ans.) 13062 (vii).

Grazing Leases, Application of Messrs. Woods, Fleck and Finnie (Ans.) 238 (i).

—— Irrevocable for 21 Years, Applications for, &c. (Ans.) 1512 (i).

Grazing and Irrigation Lands reserved by Govt. (Ans.)* 3479 (ii).

Grazing Lease of H. Riviere, Location, &c. (Ans.) 13060 (vii).

Grazing Ranches, Names of Lessees, &c. (Ans.) 7211 (iv).

Griffith Island, Sale of, &c. (Ans.) 1508 (i).

Halifax Frauds, Rep. of Mr. Robertson (remarks) 9127 (v).

—— Dismissal of Mr. Bernstein (remarks) 8605 (v).

See 'Dodds.'

Hindus Deportation from B.C., Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' (remarks) 5337 (iii).

See 'Immigration,' 'Japanese,' &c.

Hintz, Fred., Homestead Location, &c. (Ans.) 3235 (ii), 6238 (iv).

Holliday, Mr. P., Additional Living Allowance (Ans.) 5475 (iii).

Homestead Application of Mr. John C. Haddock (remarks) in Com. on B. 181, 11200 (vi).

Homestead Cancellations, Unfair Methods (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10090, 10101 (v).

Homestead Entries, Granted for Quarters 10-17-17 W. of 4th Meridian (Ans.) 9773 (v).

Homestead Entry for S.W. Quarter-Section 16-28-1, Issue of Patent, Duties performed, &c. (Ans.) 2167 (ii).

Homestead Entries in Quarter-Section No. 35, History of (Ans.) 4762 (iii).

Homestead Entries on Quarter Section 16, &c., Applications, Inspections, &c. (Ans.) 3432 (ii).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

Homestead Entries, N.E. Quarter-Section 28, Permission *re* Grants (Ans.) 1941 (i).
Homestead Entries in Man., &c., Total Acreage, &c. (Ans.) 6921 (iv).
Homesteaders on Sections 15, 16 and 27, Issue of Patents, &c. (Ans.) 7503 (iv).
Homesteading in Section 18, Extension of Time Allowance, &c. (Ans.) 8382 (v).
Homestead Sale of Township 13 (Ans.) 7206 (iv).
Hough, Campbell and Ferguson, Sales of Lands, &c. (Ans.) 364 (i).
Hough, Mr. J. S., and Hough, Campbell and Ferguson (Ans.) 568 (i).
—— on Inquiry for Ret., 3319 (ii).
Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6394 (iv).
—— Proposition *re* Construction by Govt. (Ans.) 5789 (iii).
Immigration Act Amt. (B. 135) 1° m., 5657 (iii); in Com., 6429 (iv).
Immigration Act Amt., O.C. *re* (Ans.) 7500 (iv).
—— O.C. *re* B.C. (remarks) 8171 (iv).
—— on Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 8608, 9891 (v).
Immigration Agents in East Elgin, Number, &c. (Ans.) 693 (i).
—— G.B., Names, &c. (Ans.) 2169 (ii).
—— Italy, Number, &c. (Ans.) 4584 (iii).
—— Names of those paid Commissions in Europe, &c. (Ans.) 3845 (ii).
—— N.B., Apptmt. (Ans.) 843 (i).
—— Number of Special Agents, Addresses, &c. (Ans.) 180 (i).
—— Special Prizes, &c. (Ans.) 3484 (ii).
Immigration Bonuses, Abolishing of, to Agents, on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1311 (i).
—— on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6697 (iv).
—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 1298 (i).
Immigration, Central Board, London, Moneys paid to, &c. (Ans.) 2545 (ii).
Immigration, Co-operation with Govt. of N. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 621 (i).
Immigration, Expenditure *re* Maintenance of Immigrants (Ans.) 5084 (iii).
Immigration, Expenditure for March, 1907-8 (Ans.) 5081 (iii).
Immigration Forms, Number received by Farmers, Agents, &c. (Ans.) 3847 (ii).
Immigration Frauds at Halifax, Investigation *re* (statement) 4963 (iii).
—— Further Information *re* (remarks) 5567 (iii).
—— Restitution *re* (remarks) 5659 (iii).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

Immigration Frauds at Halifax (remarks) 4835, 5567, 5659 (iii), 6465 (iv).
See 'Halifax.'
Immigration from U. S., Total Expenditure (Ans.) 5082 (iii).
Immigration Hall, East Selkirk, Furniture, &c., Disposal of (Ans.) 6403 (iv).
Immigration Officers, Waugh and Perrin, Payments to (Ans.) 514 (i).
Immigration Premiums, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 1287 (i).
Immigration Regulations *re* British Subjects, Deportations, &c. (Ans.) 9773 (v).
Immigration Regulations, O.C. *re* (remarks) 11019 (vi).
Immigration Relief to Gimli Galicians, Rep. of Mr. Walker (read) in Com. of Sup., 9979 (v).
Immigration Returns, on Inquiry for, 1108 (i).
Immigrant Bonuses, Increase to Agents, &c. (Ans.) 3429 (ii).
Immigrants, Bulgarians, Stranded in Toronto (remarks) 186, 242 (i).
Immigrants cared for in Toulon Sheds, 1906-7 (Ans.) 892 (i).
Immigrants at Chatham, Complaints *re* Deportation (Ans.) 6922 (iv).
Immigrants deported from Chatham, Names and Causes, &c. (Ans.) 5796 (iii).
Immigrants deported, Expenditure *re* Transportation (Ans.) 5080 (iii).
Immigrants deported, Number, &c. (Ans.) 177 (i).
Immigrants stranded at St. Thomas, Deportation of (Ans.) 567 (i).
Immigrant Detention Hospital, Amount expended (Ans.) 5082 (iii).
Immigrants entering Canada, Number, Bonuses paid on, &c. (Ans.) 5256 (iii).
—— Deportations, &c. (Ans.) 240 (i).
Immigrants from Europe, entering U.S., List furnished to Govt. (Ans.) 5082 (iii).
—— Restriction of (remarks) 5491 (iii).
Immigration from France and Belgium, Premiums paid to Agents (Ans.) 6923 (iv).
Immigrant Inspection of Ships, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 1289 (i).
Immigrants reported by SS. 'Montreal,' Bonuses paid, &c. (Ans.) 6921 (iv).
Immigrants landed in Canada to June, 1907, Number deported, &c. (Ans.) 3840 (ii).
Immigrant Passages to Canada, Number rejected by SS. Companies (Ans.) 5468 (iii).
Indian Affairs, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Indian Department, Extravagant Management, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11045 (vi).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

Indian Lands, Acres sold, Total Receipts, &c., since 1896 (Ans.) 4586 (iii).

Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale of, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13122 (vii).

——— Withdrawal from Sale, &c. (Ans.) 2396 (ii).

Indian Lands and Islands owned, sold, &c., by Indians (Ans.) 5079 (iii).

Indian Lands, B.C., and Provincial Rights (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 628 (i).

Indian Lands at New Westminster, B.C., Disposal of, &c. (Ans.) 3037, 3839 (ii).

Indian Lands, Sale of, on Inquiry for Ret., 4495 (iii).

Indians in Man. and Sask., Investigation by Mrs. Paget and Miss Ferguson, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 6919 (iv).

Indian Schools, Rep. of Dr. Bryce (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 623 (i).

Interior, Deptl. Rep., (presented) 7 (i).

Irrigation (B. 10) 1°*, 231; 2° m., 766; in Com., 767, 953 (i); (M.) to withdraw, 2974 (ii).

——— (B. 99) 1° m., 3315 (ii); in Com., 4671 (iii).

Irrigation in Western Provs., Investigations *re* Measurements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9990 (v).

Japanese and Oriental Immigrants in B. C., Number, &c. (Ans.) 692 (i).

Japanese entering B. C., Passports, &c. (Ans.) 4243 (iii).

Japanese Immigrants entering from U.S. into Canada, Deportation, &c. (remarks) 3900 (ii).

Japanese Syndicate purchasing Land in Alberta, &c. (Ans.) 2162 (ii).

Kananaski Falls Water Power, Granting of Rights, &c. (Ans.) 3036 (ii).

——— on Inquiry for, 6464 (iv).

La Compagnie de Publication du Canada, Amount paid by Govt. (Ans.) 5082 (iii).

Lands applied for by Mr. Alwyn under Irrigation Regulations (Ans.) 7209 (iv).

Land Entries of T. J. Oliver and Fred Hintz, Cancellation of, Investigation *re* (Ans.) 3235 (ii).

Land Grants to Rys. in Man. and N. W. Ters., Area reserved on July 1st, 1896 (Ans.) 13512 (vii).

Land Grants to Rys., Selections, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 4766 (iii), 6920 (iv).

Lands leased by Govt. in Section 11, Twp. 8, Original Grantee, &c. (Ans.) 3235 (ii).

Land Patent issued for E. ½ S.E. ¼ Section 2, Name, &c. (Ans.) 2169 (ii).

Land Patents for Section 8, Twp. 53, Present Owner, Occupation, &c. (Ans.) 3430 (ii).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

Land Patents for Sections 10 and 17, Applicants for (Ans.) 9475 (v).

Land Patents, Section 36, &c., Issue of (Ans.) 3481 (ii).

Land Sales in N. W., Purchasers' Names, Prices paid, &c. (Ans.) 3835 (ii).

Lands, Section 2, 10, 14, &c., Disposal of (Ans.) 5083 (iii).

Land Subsidies to Rys., Areas granted from 1892-6 (Ans.) 8614 (v).

Land Titles Act Amt. (B. 113) 1° m., 4221 (iii); in Com., 6517 (iv).

Land Titles Act Assurance Fund (B. 168) prop. Res., 7094 (iv); in Com. on Res., 8480 (v); 2° m., 10525; in Com., 10526 (vi).

Lands withdrawn for Settlement or Colonization Purposes, &c. (Ans.) 2393 (ii).

La Societe Canadienne d'Immigration, &c., Assistance *re* (Ans.) 4244 (iii).

Lennox Island Wharf, Contract *re* (Ans.) 8444 (v).

Livingstone, Wm. G., Sale of Sections 22, 28 and 32, &c. (Ans.) 9475 (v).

Lumber manufactured in N. W., Royalties, &c. (Ans.) 3835 (ii).

McDonald, Albert G., Commission paid *re* Immigrants (Ans.) 8617 (v).

McDougall, Rev. John, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 688 (i).

McInnes, Hon. W. B., Emplymt. in the Yukon, &c. (Ans.) 5794 (iii).

McKenzie, Mr. K. W., Apptmt. as Dom. Lands Agent, Edmonton (Ans.) 6981 (iv).

McLeod, Roderick, Date of Homestead Entry (Ans.) 6401 (iv).

Manchester, Dr., Misappropriation of moneys of Mr. Walter Dick (Ans.) 11937 (vi).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. (B. 188) 1°*, 10717 (iv); in Com., 12559, 13215 (vii).

Man. Lands owned by Govt., Number of Acres (Ans.) 1289 (i).

Menzies, Mr. James, Emplymt. by Govt., &c. (Ans.) 1349 (i).

Metlakatla Indian Reserve, Ret., on Inquiry for, 2381 (ii).

Mining Rights on Sections 20, 28 and 32, Original Grantees, Transfers, &c. (Ans.) 3238 (ii).

Mission Reserve, Conditions of Sale to G.T. P. Ry. Co. (Ans.) 5257 (iii).

Muskoday Indian Reserve, Negotiations *re* Sale (Ans.) 5083 (iii).

Newspapers, Payments to (Ans.) 1512 (i).

Nolan, Wm. Howard, Issue of Patents to (Ans.) 8182 (iv).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Amounts paid, Claims, &c. (Ans.) 167 (i).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

North Atlantic Trading Co., Bonuses paid by Govt., &c., on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 773 (i).
——— Ref. to Mr. Blair's Letter, &c. (Ans.) 2392 (ii).
Northwest Gold Dredging Co., Assignment of, &c. (Ans.) 11703 (vi).
Pasqua Indian Reserve, Sale of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12731 (vii).
Patterson, J. W., Govt. Lands in B. C., Sale to (Ans.) 6002 (iii).
Peace River Col. and Land Development Co., on M. (Mr. Hughes) to Com. of Sup., 10408 (vi).
——— Surveys of Lands (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9996 (v).
Peace River Exploratory Surveys, Rep. (presented) 3834 (ii).
Peace River Timber Limits, Granting of Leases, &c., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Cor., 3851 (ii).
Peace River Land Co., Cancellation of Grant (remarks) 11018 (vi).
——— Terms and Regulations *re* Sale, &c. (Ans.) 1111 (i).
'Phœnix,' Saskatoon, Number ordered, paid, &c. (Ans.) 6920 (iv).
Piegan Reserve, Cattle Shipments, Weighing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 633 (i).
Preston, W. T. R., Employmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 360 (i).
Public Accounts Com., Production of Original Documents, on Inquiry for, 4495 (iii).
Quarantine Lands, Sask., Sale of, &c. (Ans.) 3482 (ii).
Quarter Sections, 35, 31 6, &c., Public and Private Sale, &c. (Ans.) 8176 (iv).
Railway Land Grants in Man., Alberta, Sask., Total Acreage, &c. (Ans.) 6920 (iv).
Rama Indians Fund, Payments *re* (Ans.) 8611 (v).
Ramsland Homestead Entry, Improvements, &c. (Ans.) 5209 (iii).
See 'Buchanan,' &c.
Ranchvale Homestead Entries, Receipts, Number, &c. (Ans.) 5258 (iii).
——— Sub-Land Agency, Closing of (Ans.) 4830 (iii).
Rattenbury & Co., Purchasers of Seed Oats, Assignment, &c. (Ans.) 12392 (vii).
Returns, on Inquiry for, 2309, 2384, 3318 (ii).
——— Questions, &c., ordered by the House, Number, &c. (Ans.) 4243 (iii).
Riding Mountain Reserve, Applications *re* Homesteads (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9994 (v).
Riding Mountain Reserve, Entry for Homesteaders (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7654
——— Squatters' Rights, &c. (Ans.) 175 (i).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

Robbins Irrigation Co., Amount expended to Date (Ans.) 4763 (iii).
Roberts, Mr. J. M., Promotion in Interior Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9693 (v).
Rocky Mountain Park, Revenue, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9991 (v).
St. Peter's Reserve, Extinguishment of Title, Issue of Patents (Ans.) 1933 (i).
——— Instruction to Agents *re* Rights of Purchasers (Ans.) 2217 (ii).
——— Pet. *re* Election of Chief and Councillors (Ans.) 7990 (iv).
Salvation Army Immigrants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9973 (v).
——— Stmnt. of Genl. Booth (Ans.) 2391 (ii).
Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Conditions of Sale &c. (Ans.) 4761 (iii).
——— (stmnt.) 10402 (vi).
——— Information *re* (remarks) 9280 (v).
——— Sale of Homestead Lands, &c. (remarks) 9127 (v).
School Lands Exchange (B. 163) 1° m., 8086 (iv); 2° m., 8467; in Com., 8478 (v).
School Timber and Coal Lands, Average Price, &c. (Ans) 3431 (ii).
Scrip and Money received by Govt. *re* Lands, &c., on M. (Mr. Lake) for Cor., 3852 (ii).
Scrip received on Account of Lands, Mines, &c. (Ans.) 3431 (ii).
Section 32, Report *re* (Ans.) 8383 (v).
Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1377 (i).
——— Apptmt. of Mr. R. A. E. Leech (remarks) 3041 (ii).
——— Duties assigned to Mr. Leech (remarks) 3158 (ii).
——— Distribution of (Ans.) 692 (i).
——— O.C. amending Regulations, &c. (Ans.) 6981 (iv).
——— O.C. *re* Advances (remarks) 6634 (iv)
——— in N. W., Extension of time for Payment, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2901 (ii).
——— Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 10121 (v).
——— Settlers, &c., in Com. of Sup., 277[illegible] (ii).
Seed Grain Distribution, Purchases from P.E.I. (remarks) 3158, 3752 (ii), 12392 (vii).
——— Corrected answer, 13066 (vii).
Seed Grain purchased, Quantity, Price, &c. (Ans.) 8185 (iv).
Selkirk, Lord, Land Register, State Papers and Register 'B,' Custody of, &c. (Ans.) 1685 (i).
Six Nations Indians, Refusal *re* Inspection of Memorials, &c. (Ans.) 6239 (iv).
Smith, O. B., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 4765 (iii).
S. A. Veterans, Land Grants to, &c. (Ans.) 563 (i).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

S. A. Volunteers Land Grant Bounty (B. 109) Res. prop., 3316, 3756 (ii); 11938 (vi); in Com. on Res., 3823 (ii) 12595; in Com., 13047; on Senate Amts., 13524 (vii).

Southern Alberta Land Co., Application *re* Change of Lands (Ans.) 7729 (iv).

Squatters on Turtle Mountain Forest Reserves (remarks) 4741 (iii).

Supply B. 96 (seed grain) in Com., 2784 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries, &c.) 623 (i); Interior (astronomical survey) 9737 (v); (salaries) 616 (i), 9693 (v).

Dom. Lands (agents) 10044; (forest rangers) 10049; (forest reserves) 10060; (homesteads) 10083; (salaries) 10038; (surveys) 9987 (v).

Immigration (agents, G. B.) 9840: (agents in U. S.) 9965; (deportations) 9882 (v); (general expenses) 5753 (iii); (hospitals) 9983; (literature) 9949; (relief to settlers) 9983 (v); (U. S. labourers) 13169 (vii).

Indians—B. C. (land sales) 12752 (vii).

Indians — Generally (destitute) 5762; (printing, &c.) 5762 (iii).

Indians—N. B. (salaries) 12736, 13170; (schools) 13170 (vii).

Indians—N.W.T. (Sioux) 5762 (iii).

Interior—Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5755 (iii).

Miscellaneous (seed grain) 2777 (ii).

N.W. Ter. (Govt. salaries) 10117; (school grants) 10117 (v).

Public Works—Telegraphs (towers) 13178 (vii).

Yukon—(Govt. salaries) 10107 (v).

Surveys of Public Lands: *See* 'Dom. Lands.'

Swamps Lands in Man. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10106 (v).

Swan Lake Indian Reserve, Acquisition of by Govt. (Ans.) 693 (i).

——— Sale (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12729 (vii).

——— Settlement of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 633 (i).

Tanguay, Mr., Homestead Entry (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10090 (v).

Temple, Mr. W. A., Emplymt. by Govt. in Yukon (Ans.) 1126 (i).

Timber Berth, East Saskatchewan, Conditions of Sale, &c. (Ans.) 3839 (ii).

Timber Berths granted in Man. and N.W. T., Retention by Original Grantees (Ans.) 2546 (ii).

Timber Berth, No. 1100, Area, &c. (Ans.) 364 (i).

——— No. 1168, Area, &c. (Ans.) 364 (i).

——— Nos. 1220, &c., on Order for Ret. (remarks) 849 (i).

Timber Cutting by Sawmill Owners, Applications, &. (Ans.) 2168 (ii).

Timber Lands, Sales to Messrs. Rutherford, &c. (Ans.) 1294 (i).

Timber Licenses cancelled from May, 1905, to Nov., 1907, &c. (Ans.) 181 (i).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

Timber Licenses, Conditions and Forms in force at present (Ans.) 359 (i).

Timber Licenses granted under Mackenzie Govt. (Ans.) 3038 (ii).

Timber Licenses issued in Man. and N.W.T. during 1896-7 (Ans.) 2396 (ii).

Timber Licenses and Renewals in N. W., Number of Miles, &c. (Ans.) 182, 691, 1127 (i).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2486 (ii).

——— Grants to Messrs. McLeod, Lundy, &c. (Ans.) 237 (i).

——— on Inquiry for Ret., 3581 (ii).

Timber Permits to Sawmill Owners, O.C. *re* (Ans.) 179 (i), 11496 (vi).

Torrens Land Title Fund, Information *re* (remarks) 10916 (vi).

Turtle Mountain Reserve, &c. (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4741 (iii), 7649 (iv).

Vacant Land Reservations, Instructions to Agents *re* (Ans.) 1935 (i).

Water Power Sales or Leases in Alberta, &c. (Ans.) 8378 (v).

Waugh, James, Immigration Agent, Refund to Govt. (Ans.) 4765 (iii).

Whitehorse Town Site, Portions sold and retained (Ans.) 11496 (vi).

Wood, Mr. David, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 568 (i).

Young, Mr. W. C., Inquiry *re* Charges as Mining Inspector, &c. (Ans.) 1127 (i).

Yukon Act Amt. (B. 169) 1° m., 8604 (v); 2° m., 10528; in Com., 10529; on Senate Amts., 11634 (vi).

Yukon, Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9616 (v).

——— Finnie-Perron Case, Investigation *re* (remarks) 4316 (iii).

——— Gold Co., Holdings by Guggenheims, &c. (Ans.) 7726 (iv).

——— Liquor Permits, Agents, &c., Corrected Answer, 5048 (iii).

——— Lithgow, Girouard and Congdon, Messrs., Apptmt. by Govt., &c. (Ans.) 5999 (iii).

See 'Congdon,' &c.

——— Officials, Re-arrangement, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10108 (v).

——— Placer Claims, Renewals by Gold Commissioner, Fees, &c. (Ans.) 4245 (iii).

——— Placer Mining Act Amt. (B. 150) 1°*, 6221 (iv); 2° m., 8481; in Com., 8483 (v), 10518 (vi).

——— Whiskey Permit Agents, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 1127 (i).

——— Wiley *vs.* Congdon, Amt. *re* Return (remarks) 1691 (i).

OSLER, Mr. E. B., *Toronto W.*

Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on M. for Sup., 1800 (i).
Dry Docks, Construction, B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4687 (iii).
Goodwin Car Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 60) 1°*, 1283 (i).
I.C.R. Audit System (remarks) in Com. on Sup., 10214 (v).
Lead Bounties B. 91 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 11238 (vi).
Montague Moore and T. J. Haskett Patent Relief (B. 61) 1°*, 1283 (i).
Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4908 (iii).
Seed Grain for Northest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1362 (i).

SUPPLY—
Railways—I.C.R. (supplies) 10209 (v).

OWEN, Mr. C. L., *Northumberland, E., Ont.*

Brighton Wharf, Rep. of Mr. Sing (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12138 (vii).
—— Repairs *re* (remarks) 5913 (iii).
Cambellford, Lake Ontario & Western Ry. Co., Exercise of Powers, &c. (Ques.) 236 (i).
Cattle Embargo in G B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12889 (vii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11820 (vi).
Financial Review, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 13469 (vii).
Fruit Inspection, *re* Apple Packing, Complaints *re* (remarks) 2761 (ii).
House of Commons Clerks, Changes, &c. (M. for ret.*) 4247 (iii).
—— Recommendations *re* Apptmts., &c. (Ques.) 3899 (ii).
Japanese Immigration, on Stmt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1611.
Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7248 (iv).
Obstruction *re* Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9894 (v).
Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3930 (ii).
Ry. Act (telephones) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10640 (vi).
Shipping Rings, Combination *re* (remarks) 5915 (iii).

SUPPLY—
Canals—Trent (Buckhorn dam) 12227; (construction) 12226 (vii).
Justice—Supreme Court (registrar's uniform) 5507 (iii).
Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4087 (ii).
Militia (annual drill) 5735 (iii).
Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5533 (iii).

OWEN, Mr. C. L.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Vancouver) 10868; (Vernon) 10879; (Victoria Immigration) 10879 (vi).
Public Works — Buildings — Ont. (Owen Sound) 7823; (St. Mary's) 7827 (iv).
Public Works — Buildings — Yukon (commissioner's house) 10884 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Brighton) 12133 (vii).
Public Works—Slides and Booms (surveys) 11078 (vi).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10697 (vi).
Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2507 (ii).
Trent Bridge Post Office, Re-opening of (remarks) 609 (i).
Woolen Industry, Specific Duty (remarks) 6988 (iv).

PAQUET, Mr. E., *L'Islet.*

Address, The, 505 (i).
Belgian Immigrants, Number and Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 176 (i).
Canadians repatriated from U. S. (Ques.) 684 (i).
Debates, French Edition, Delay in Distribution, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Beland) 3490 (ii).
Experimental Farm in Quebec District, Establishment of (Ques.) 2593 (ii).
Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3545 (ii).
French Immigration Agents, Names, Facilities, &c. (Ques.) 176 (i).
French Immigrants, Number and Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 176 (i).
Immigrants deported, Number, &c. (Ques.) 177 (i).
Immigrants, Number settled in Canada in 1905-6-7, &c. (M. for ret.*) 697 (i).
Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6945 (iv).
I.C.R., Cold Storage Cars for Dairy Produce, Number, &c. (Ques.) 1688 (i).
'Montcalm,' Str., Services as an Ice-breaker, in Com. of Sup., 2941 (ii).
Quebec Colonization Societies, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 684 (i).
Quebec Port Improvements, Expenditure, since Confederation (M. for ret.*) 697 (i).
—— Sums expended for Improvements, &c. (Ques.) 176 (i).

SUPPLY—
Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4038, 4172 (ii); Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2941 (ii).

PARDEE, Mr. F. F., *Lambton W.*
Budget, The, 5364 (iii).
Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12859 (vii).
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 67) 1°*, 1424 (i); on Senate Amts., 5955 (iii).
Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. House, 5910 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11834 (vi).
Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett)—(remarks) 6749 (iv).
Erie, London & Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s (B. 51) 1°*, 1108 (i).
'Golspie,' Str., Payments *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i).
Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3020 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4137 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2955; (masters and mates) 2971 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Midland and Tiffin) 12106 (vii); (Tiffin) 5711 (iii).

PARENT, Mr. G., *Montmorency.*
Quebec Bridge Rep., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to conc., 13411 (vii).

PARMELEE, Mr. C. H., *Shefford.*
Printing of Parliament, 5th Rep. of Com. (peresented) 10915 (vi).

PATERSON, Hon. W. (Minister of Customs) *Brant.*
Absinthe and Brandy imported, Total Amount, &c. (Ans.) 689 (i).
Agricultural Implements, Amount of Rebates, (Ans.) 1112 (i).
American Cereal Co., Customs Refunds, &c. (Ans.) 3485 (ii).
Anthracite Coal, Quantity imported from U. S. and other Countries (Ans.) 1511 (i).
'Arctic,' Str., Payments *re* Supplies (remarks) 4163 (ii).
Aylmer Customs Collector, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 1506 (i).
Bernier, Capt., Customs Ports opened, &c. (Ans.) 5208 (iii).
Brass, Quantity and Quality, Importation into Can. (Ans.) 6232 (iv).
Budget. The, 5296 (iii).
Butter and Cheese exported from Prov. of Quebec, Quantity, Value, &c. (Ans.) 2163 (ii).
Butter Imports, Quantity, and Countries of Origin (Ans.) 1116 (i).
Canned Pease imported from France, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 3847 (ii).

PATERSON, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Cattle, Exports and Imports from Canada to G. B. (Ans.) 6460 (iv).
Cattle exported to U. S. during Years 1900-07, Value &c. (Ans.) 1508 (i).
Cattle Registered, Importations from U. S. (Ans.) 6238 (iv).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10746 (iv).
Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9139 (v).
Coasting Trade *re* Norwegian Ships (Ans.) 6237 (iv).
Coasting Trade, O.Cs. *re* Foreign Vessels, &c. (Ans.) 4586 (iii).
Customs Act Amt. (B. 194) Res. prop., 11233, in Com. on Res., 11312, 1°*, of B., 11315; in Com., 11980 (vi).
Customs Brokers, Fees, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9550 (v).
Customs Defalcations in Huntingdon, B.C., Rep. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9442 (v).
Customs Dept., Criticism by Civil Service Rep., 10448 (vi).
Customs Dept., Criticism, &c., on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10448 (vi).
Customs Duties on Militia Uniforms (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9567 (v).
Customs Estimates, Obstruction in Supply (remarks) 10133 (v).
Customs and Excise Revenue, Amount received from June 1 to 15, 1908 (Ans.) 10791 (vi).
Customs Frauds in Montreal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9563 (v).
Customs Inspectors, and Rep. of Civil Service Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9555 (v).
Customs Officers at Niagara Falls, Fort Erie, &c., Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 6980 (iv).
Customs Officers at Windsor, Age and Salary (Ans.) 12656 (vii).
Customs Outside Service, Ports, &c., 9220 (v).
Cotton, Raw, Imported from U. S. during 1905-7, &c. (Ans.) 1511 (i).
Customs, Receipts and Expenditures for 1907-8 (Ans.) 12655 (vii).
Customs Statistics, Duplicating with Trade and Commerce (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9550 (v).
Detroit River Tunnel, Materials entered free of Duty (Ans.) 10254 (v).
—— Material imported, &c. (Ans.) 4583 (iii).
—— Duties on Construction Materials (Ans.) 1117 (i), 3841 (ii).
—— (statement) 13524 (vii).

PATERSON, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Dillon, Michael, Emplymt. at Windsor Customs (Ans.) 7201 (iv).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12951 (vii).

Dredging Companies, Insinuations *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5929 (iii).

Farm and Garden Produce at Sault Ste. Marie, Customs Duties, &c. (Ans.) 13061 (vii).

Fire Extinguishers File, Cor., &c., quoted by Minister, Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7792 (iv).

Fish Exportations from Man., to March, 1907, Value, &c. (Ans.) 4240 (iii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for Com. on Res., 1257 (i); on M. for 1°, 3507, 3567; in Com. 3588 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Treaty, Canadian Products, &c., on M. for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 852 (i).

Fraser, Donald, Customs Collector, Investigation *re* Defalcations (Ans.) 5200 (iii).

——— Dismissal from Customs Service (Ans.) 5474 (iii).

See 'Customs Defalcations.'

French Books, Reduction of Customs *re* French Treaty (Ans.) 2160 (ii).

German Goods imported under Preferential Tariff, Investigation *re* (Ans.) 689 (i).

Glucose, Quantity imported from G. B. (Ans.) 6980 (iv).

G.T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2249 (ii).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 4226 (iii).

Honey Imports from 1898-1908, Amount, Value. &c. (Ans.) 8177 (iv).

Hoppins, Mr. Wm., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 3842 (ii).

Horses and Cattle imported from U. S. as Thoroughbreds, Prevention of (Ans.) 6001 (iii).

Hull Customs Imports, Amount for 1906-8 (Ans.) 11703 (vi).

Imports and Exports, Sept. 30 and Oct. 30th, 1907 (Ans.) 350 (i).

——— Values from June to Dec., 1907 (Ans). 1113 (i).

Imports from France for last five years, &c. (Ans.) 1124 (i).

Imports for Home Consumption, Value, &c., for 1897-8 (Ans.) 13063 (vii).

Japanese Trade with Canada, Total Amount for 1905-6-7 (Ans.) 898 (i).

Literature distributed through Customs and Mails, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9104 (v).

PATERSON, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7393 (iv).

Massey-Harris Co., Rebate of Duty, &c. (Ans.) 8442 (v).

Mess Pork, Quantity imported from U. S. (Ans.) 5650 (iii).

Montreal Liquor Licenses, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fisher) 4067 (ii).

Obstruction Tactics (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9220 (v).

Opium, Amount of Duty received, Pet. from B. C. *re* Prohibition (Ans.) 8614 (v).

Pacaud, Benj., Apptmt. to Customs at Windsor (Ans.) 5200 (iii).

Pepin, J. E., Emplymt. at Customs Office in Windsor (Ans.) 7202 (iv).

Pork, Fresh, Imported for Home Consumption (Ans.) 5650 (iii).

Port, South Bar, C. B., Number of Vessels entered for Customs, &c. (Ans.) 9271 (v).

Posters, Prohibition *re* Indecent Ones, Tariff *re* (Ans.) 6462 (iv).

Prince Rupert Customs Collector, Transfer of Mr. McDonald (Ans.) 6402 (iv).

Pulp Wood exported to U. S., Quantity, Value, &c. (Ans.) 1511 (i).

Quebec Bridge Material, Total Amount of Customs Duties *re* (Ans.) 5200, 5793 (iii).

Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4977 (iii).

Sand, Cement or Clay Utensils imported from G. B. in 1904-5-6-7 (Ans.) 1506 (i).

Sault Ste. Marie Port, Quantity of Farm Produce entered, &c. (Ans.) 898 (i).

Seed Grain for Settlers in N. W., Extension of Time for Payment, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2932 (ii).

Sugar Imports for 1898, Total Amount (Ans.) 13065 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 637 (i).

Customs—Inspectors (travelling expenses) 9536; Miscellaneous (Guarantee Cos.) 9577; (cruisers) 9578; (legal expenses) 9578; (printing, &c.) 9577; Outside Service (salaries) 9226, 9442 (v).

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2964 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8530 (v); Ont. (Brantford) 7465 (iv).

Trade and Nav. Returns (presented) 7 (i).

Unleavened Bread, Pet. *re* Customs Duties (Ans.) 8616 (v).

Venoit, Mr. P. G., Complaints *re* Interference in Politics (Ans.) 6406, 7730 (iv).

Wallace, Michael J., Employment in Customs at Windsor (Ans.) 7500 (iv).

Wheat Transportation from N.W. and Financial Aid, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2196 (ii).

PATERSON, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Wool, Raw, Quantity imported into Canada (Ans.) 5201 (iii).

PERLEY, Mr. G. H., *Argenteuil.*

Address, The, 449 (i).
Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3873 (ii).
Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12866 (vii).
Chicoutimi Boom, Payments from Pulp Co., &c. (Ques.) 8174 (iv).
Civil Service Commission's Report, Inquiry for, 90 (i).
Coal Lands, Purchases on Sections 27, 28, 33 and 34, &c., Payments *re* (Ques.) 10512 (vi).
Corry Building, Total Rental by Govt., Taxes, &c. (Ques.) 11938 (vi).
Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on M. for Sup., 1818 (i).
Dokis Indian Reserve, Consent from Chief *re* Sale of Timber (Ques.) 8175 (iv).
——— Notice of Sale, Names of Newspapers, &c. (Ques.) 7500 (iv).
——— Sale of Timber, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7801 (iv).
——— Total Expenditure *re* Surrender (Ques.) 10512 (vi).
G. T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2256 (ii); in Com., 12073 (vii).
Mining Rights in Sections 17, 20, 21, &c., Applications, Leases, &c. (M. for copies*) 3851 (ii).
Mining Rights on Sections 20, 28 and 32, Original Grantees, Transfer, &c. (Ques.) 3238 (ii).
Postal Stamps, Special Issue (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9115 (v).
Public Works Dept. Expenditures, on M. for Sup., 4868; (amt.) 4886; Neg. (Y.43; N. 99) 4959 (iii).
Ry. Act (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10637 (vi).
Saguenay Boom and Chicoutimi Pulp Co., Amounts paid Govt. *re* (Ques.) 183 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12262 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4140 (ii).
Post Office (inspection) 9115; (mail service) 9119 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg military) 10971 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—N. W. (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10978 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (heating, &c.) 11010 (vi); (mint) 1453 (i); (rents, &c.) 10999; (telephones) 11012 (vi).

PERLEY, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*

Timber Licenses in Man., Sask. and Alberta, Renewals, &c. (Ques.) 1127 (i).
Timber Limits, Leasing, Alienation, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2310 (ii).
Timber Limits, Disposal of, &c. (explanation) *re* Mr. McDonald's letter, 2679 (ii).

PICKUP, Mr. S. W. W., *Annapolis.*

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12874 (vii).
Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. 187 (Mr. Black) on M. for 2°, 13507 (vii).
Fruit Marks Inspection and Sale B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 10559 (vi).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Annapolis) 11211; (Round Hill) 11283 (vi).

PORTER, Mr. E. G., *Hastings, W.*

Admiralty Court Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 4851 (iii).
Belleville City, Flood Investigation by Govt. (remarks) 3319 (ii).
——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 4744 (iii).
Belleville Drill Hall, Negotiations for Site, &c. (Ques.) 1509 (i).
——— Payments to Mr. J. Hurley (Ques.) 1737 (i).
Belleville Harbour, Issue of Bonds, &c. (Ques.) 6237 (iv).
——— Revenue and Expenditure, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2983 (ii).
——— Delay, &c. (remarks) 4408 (iii).
——— Total Revenue, for 1903-7, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 2592 (ii).
Belleville Hospital Lot, Purchase Price, &c. (Ques.) 4830 (iii).
——— (M. for ret.*) 5211 (iii).
Belleville Post Office, Excessive Postage, &c. (remarks) 7933 (iv).
Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s (B. 20) 1°*, 430 (i); in Com., 7669 (iv), 8552, 8609, 9066 (v).
——— on Order being called for 2°, 681 (i).
Bell Rapids P. O. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8883 (v).
Brockville and Ottawa Ry. Connection (remarks) 1437 (i).
Buell, W. S., Emplymt. *re* Telephone Commission (Ques.) 10011 (v).
Commissions appointed between 1896 and 1908, Costs, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1295 (i).
——— Ret., Inquiry for, 6288, 7447 (iv).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. (amt.) 11892 (vi).
Fruit Marks Act Prosecutions, Violation *re* Apples, &c. (Ques.) 4830 (iii).
Hintz, Fred., Location of Homestead (Ques.) 3235 (ii), 6238 (iv).

PORTER, Mr. E. G.—*Con.*

Homestead Entries, Records of Payments, of Scale by Peter Luenson to F. Heintz, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1294 (i).

Inspection and Sale Act (milk) Amt. (B. 64) 1° m., 1283 (i); on Order for 2°, 5226 (iii).

Irrigation Act Amt. B. 99 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4673 (iii).

Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R. M. C., on M. for Sup., 1031 (i).

Land Entries of T. J. Oliver and Fred. Hintz, Cancellation of, Investigation *re* (Ques.) 3235 (ii).

N.B. Cold Storage Plants, Bonuses by Govt. (Ques.) 9272 (v).

—— Ministerial Connection *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9372, 9390 (v).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4701 (iii).

Quebec Tercentenary, Mobilization of Militia, Abandonment of (remarks) 8862 (v).

Section 32, Rep. *re* (Ques.) 8383 (v).

SUPPLY—

Post Office (clerical assistance) 8883 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8525 (v); (Winnipeg hospital) 10967 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Belleville armoury) 7455 (iv).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11078 (vi).

Public Works—Slides and Booms (surveys) 11072 (vi).

Trent Valley Canal Contracts, Deposits, &c. (Ques.) 1734 (i).

POWER, Mr. W., *Quebec, W.*

Quebec Ry. Light and Power Co.'s (B. 73) 1°*, 1584 (i).

PRINGLE, Mr. R. A., *Stormont.*

Audit and Inspection of Banks, Legislation *re* (remarks) 12658 (vii).

Bank Act Amendment (prop. res.) 4248 (iii).

Banking Systems, Par. in 'Financial Post,' Ques. of Priv., 4770 (iii).

—— Ques. of Privilege *re* Newspaper Reports, 2306 (ii).

See 'Wheat.'

Canadian Bank of Commerce, Letter of Mr. E. B. Walker, Ques. of Priv., 6005 (iii).

Civil Service Bill, Physical Fitness (remarks) 11017 (vi).

Cornwall Canal, Arrangements with Mfg. Cos. *re* Water Power (remarks) 13084 (vii).

—— Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. on Sup., 12201 (vii).

—— Opening (remarks) 12660 (vii).

—— Payment of Dues on Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12095 (vii).

PRINGLE, Mr. R. A.—*Con.*

Deep Waterways Commission, Damming St. Lawrence River at Long Sault (remarks) 13146 (vii).

Dominion Guarantee Co.'s (B. 127) in Com., 6183 (iii), 6231 (iv); on Senate Amts., 12772 (vii).

—— (B. 211) M. to suspend Rule, 12836 (vii).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13270 (vii).

London and Lancashire Guarantee and Accident Co.'s incorp. (B. 129) 1°*, 5255 (iii).

'Montcalm,' Str., Supplies, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1899 (i).

Old Age Pension Scheme (M.) for Sel. Com., 2398 (ii).

—— Progress *re* (remarks) 12660 (vii).

—— (remarks) 7722 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Marine—(ice-breakers) 1899 (i).

Wheat Transportation from West, Financial Aid *re* (Ques.) 173 (i).

—— on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2204 (ii).

PROULX, Mr. E., *Prescott.*

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Chute à Blondeau) 12094 (vii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W. (Minister of Public Works) *St. John City and County.*

Actonvale Public Building, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 6232 (iv).

Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4723 (iii).

Allan, Mr., Interference in Dom. Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 615 (i).

Anglo-Canadian and Continental Bank incorp. B. 141 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 7724 (iv).

Anse. St. Jean Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vii).

Architects on Public Works, Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7122 (iv).

Becancour Harbour Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 2392, 3040 (ii).

Bell Memorial Association (remarks) on M. for Sup., 11207 (vi).

Bell River Harbour Improvements, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 685 (i).

Belleville Drill Hall, Negotiations for Site, &c. (Ans.) 1509 (i).

—— Payments to Mr. J. Hurley (Ans.) 1738 (i).

Belleville Hospital Lot, Purchase Price, &c. (Ans.) 4830 (iii).

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 8557, 9067 (v).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Bic Wharf, Materials supplied, Quantity, Price, &c. (Ans.) 9713 (v).
Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5943 (iii).
Booms in International Streams, Regulation (B. 105) 1° m., 3654 (ii).
Brighton Wharf, Repairs to (remarks) 5913 (iii).
Bronze Coat-of-Arms, Duty *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7151 (iv).
Buildings, Administrative, Erection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10984 (vi).
Buildings, Construction of, Papers laid on Table, 12771 (vii).
Burlington Channel Repairs, Apptmt. of Foreman (Ans.) 4404 (iii).
Campbellton Wharf, Contract *re* Piling (Ans.) 8612 (v).
Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. 187 (Mr. Black) on M. for 2°, 13507 (vii).
C.P.R., Plaster Rock Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13299 (vii).
Canadian Timber used in Public Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11208 (vi).
Caron and Thiberge, Messrs., Employmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 10517 (vi).
Cement Testing Laboratory, Cost. &c. (statement) in Com. of Sup., 11250 (vi).
—— Purposes of Vote (remarks) on M. for Sup., 11206 (vi).
'Challenge,' Dredge, Quantity of Material removed (Ans.) 12651 (vii).
Charlemagne and Terrebonne Dredging, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 686 (i).
Charlotte County Wharf, Pet. *re* Erection (Ans.) 5202 (iii).
Chase's Point, N.B., Pet. *re* Construction (Ans.) 7937 (iv).
Chicoutimi Boom and Pulp Co.'s Payments, &c. (Ans.) 8175 (iv).
Chicoutimi Dredging Contract, Tenders *re*, &c. (Ans.) 7203 (iv).
Chicoutimi Public Expenditure, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Taylor) 13204 (vii).
Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. House, 5895 (iii).
Clarke City, Expenditure *re* Public Works (Ans.) 2394 (ii).
Clerk of Works *re* Public Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7119 (iv).
Clifton Breakwater, N.B., Amount of Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 695 (i).
Clinton Wharf Repairs, Extension of Contract, &c. (Ans.) 4832 (iii).
Cloutier, J. E., Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 8380 (v).
Cobourg Harbour, Amount expended *re* Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 359 (i).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Colchester Point, Pier, Essex County, Amt. expended (Ans.) 12652 (vii).
Corry Building, Total Annual Rental, Taxes, &c. (Ans.) 11938 (vi).
Coteau Landing Wharf, Repairs to (Ans.) 9277 (v).
Côté, Boivin & Co., Amounts paid to by Govt. (Ans.) 12650 (vii).
Dauphin Public Building, Valuation of Site (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10866 (vi).
Deep Waterways Commission, on Inquiry (Mr. Foster) *re* Progress (remarks) on M. for Sup., 11205 (vi).
Deputy Ministers, Payments for Special Services, &c. (Ans.) 1736 (i).
Deschambault Wharf, Tenders, Amount expended, &c. (Ans.) 5465 (iii).
Documents, Production of Originals, Announcement *re* (remarks) 1426 (i).
—— Production in Committees, 1428 (i).
—— Taken from Public Accounts Com. (remarks) 2308 (ii).
Dorval, Dredging at St. Lawrence Yacht Club (Ans.) 13060 (vii).
Dredges, registered in Canada (Ans.) 11497 (vi).
Dredging at Becancour, Blanche, &c., during 1907 (Ans.) 2392, 3040 (ii).
Dredging at Fort William, Amount paid to Great Lakes Dredging Co. (Ans.) 8839 (v).
Dredging at Port Arthur and Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 8618 (v).
Dredging Contract, O.C. *re*, on Inquiry for, 6927 (iv).
Dredging Contracts at Midland, &c., Advertisements for Tenders (remarks) 7195 (iv).
Dredging Contracts, Basis of Payments (Ans) 9711 (v).
—— O.C. *re* (remarks) 6853 (iv).
—— O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6745-6816 (iv).
Dredging Contracts, Payments to Great Lakes Dredging Co. (Ans.) 1737 (i).
Dredging Contracts (remarks) 7105 (iv).
—— Renewals without Tenders (remarks) 6633 (iv).
—— Tenders *re* (remarks) 9773 (v).
Dredging in Ont. and Que., for 1907-8, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 10008 (v).
Dredging in Quebec Prov., Claims Pending, &c. (Ans.) 7200 (iv).
Dredging Instructions to Inspectors, Circular (read) in Com. of Sup., 12043 (vi).
Dredging Tenders, on Inquiry for Ret., 8696 (v).
Dredging Work at Nicolet River, &c. (Ans.) 3897 (ii).
Drill Halls, Number constructed since 1896, Location, &c. (Ans.) 178 (i).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Drill Halls, Ret., on Inquiry for, 4834, 5659 (iii), 6222 (iv).

Eclipse Co. of Ottawa, Payments to (Ans.) 6461 (iv).

—— Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7468 (iv).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13279

Fair Wages Schedule on Dredging Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 7200 (iv).

Farnham Post Office, Vote *re* Improvements (Ans.) 6399 (iv).

'Fielding,' Dredge, Number of Days working (Ans.) 7199 (iv).

Fire Extinguishers, Purchase by Govt., Number, &c. (Ans.) 1510 (i).

—— Explanation *re* Purchases, 5658 (iii).

—— Ret., on Inquiry for, 4833 (iii).

—— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7643 (iv).

Floods at Chatham and Belleville (remarks) on M. for Sup., 4745 (iii).

Fortier, Mr. Eugene, Payments to, &c. (Ans.) 8613 (v).

Foster, Frederick, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 12652 (vii).

Garthby, Govt. Wharf, Inspection by Midraud, &c. (Ans.) 3844 (ii).

Gatineau Point Bridge, Amount contributed by Govt. (Ans.) 355 (i).

Gelinas, Mr., Repayment of Travelling Expenses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 654 (i).

Geological Museum, Progress *re* Construction (remarks) on Conc., 13568 (vii).

Georgian Bay Canal, Report *re* Estimated Cost (remarks) 12053 (vii).

—— Rep. *re* (remarks) 12836 (vii).

Georgian Bay Canal Survey, Final Report, &c. (Ans.) 240 (i), 5465 (iii).

—— on Inquiry for, 1740 (i).

—— Papers laid on Table, 8378 (v).

—— Rep. of Surveys, on Inquiry for (Mr. White) 11827 (vi).

Godfroi River Wharf, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 3423 (ii).

Govt. Employees, and Provincial Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10989 (vi).

Grand Bend Pier, Final Estimate *re* (Ans.) 8891 (v).

—— Ret., Delays, &c. (remarks) 4408 (iii).

Grand Manan Telegraph System, Application *re* Leasing (Ans.) 6463 (iv).

Grand River Wharf, Tenders, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 8382 (v).

Grandes Piles Dam, Amount voted, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 13059 (vii).

G. T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale (B. 89) M. for Com. on Res., 2221; 1°*, 2260 (ii); in Com., 12060 (vii).

See 'Major's Hill Park.'

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 8130, 8745, 9462 (iv).

—— Ques. of Order *re* 'Imputing Motives,' 8134 (iv).

G.T.P., Montreal Branch, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13301 (vii).

Gravenhurst Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vii).

Hackett Dock, Purchase of (Ans.) 7730 (iv).

Halifax Customs House, Name of Contractor (Ans.) 7212 (iv).

Higgin's Shore Wharf, Pet. *re* Extension (Ans.) 695 (i).

Hillsborough Bridge Return, on Inquiry for, 6160 (iii).

Hillsborough Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7188 (iv).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10498 (vi).

—— Allotment of Rooms in New Wing (remarks) 5729 (iii).

—— Ventilation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10978 (vi), 13340 (vii).

See 'Postal,' 'Restaurent.'

Howard's Cape, Wharf, Pet. *re* Investigation (Ans.) 11702 (vi).

Hudson, Dredging, 1907, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 4587 (iii).

Hunter, Mr. J. B., Apptmt. as Dep. Min. of Public Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1459 (i), 5698 (iii).

Indian Lands, B.C., Provincial Rights, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 631 (i).

Inspectors of Public Works, Apptmts. by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5678 (iii).

Inverness Harbour, Purchase of McIsaac's Pond (Ans.) 5792 (iii).

Inverness Public Building, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 5998 (iii).

I.C.R., Branch Lines (remarks) in Com. on B. 215, 13489 (vii).

—— Hard Pine Tenders, Number, &c. (Ans.) 3233 (ii).

—— Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4451 (iii).

Interprovincial Ry. Bridge Co., N.B., Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13308 (vii).

Jesus River, Dredging, Payments to Mr. Morgan (Ans.) 6980 (iv).

Juvenile Delinquents, B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12406 (vii).

'King Edward,' Dredge, Emplymt. in Lunenburg Harbour (Ans.) 13063 (vii).

Lacas, Mr., Payments to by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1038 (i).

Lachine Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12098 (vii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Ladysmith Wharf, B.C., Cost of (Ans.) 8176 (iv).

Lafferty, Thos., Payment for Removal of Snags in St. John River (Ans.) 8379 (v).

Lake Francois Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12139 (vii).

Lake Megantic, Public Works, Total Cost to date, &c. (Ans.) 11299 (vi).

Leonardville Wharf, Rep. *re* Estimated Cost (Ans.) 6463 (iv).

Loggieville, Dredging, Payments *re* (Ans.) 9472 (v).

'Lord Kitchener,' Tug Boat, Payments *re* Services (Ans.) 7198 (iv).

Major's Hill Park and G.T.Ry. Co.'s Hotel, Sale (B. 89) prop. Res., 1584 (i).
See 'G.T.R.'

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12799 (vii).

Matchedash Bay, Dredging done at Fesserton, &c. (Ans.) 566 (i).

Medicine Hat, Building, Contract *re* Heating System (Ans.) 10791 (vi).

Midland and Tiffin Dredging, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 3428 (ii).

—— Expenditure *re* Dredging, 1907 (Ans.) 8181 (iv).

Midland Harbour, Tenders for Dredging (Ans.) 8893 (v).

Milford Haven Wharf, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 13060 (vii).

'Montague,' Dredge, Amounts paid for Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 182 (i), 8172 (iv).

Montmagny and Cap St. Ignace Wharfs, Construction of, &c. (Ans.) 1288 (i).

Montmorency Falls, Walls, Length, &c. (Ans.) 12410 (vii).

Montreal 'Gazette,' Building, Amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 3900 (ii).

Montreal Harbour and St. Lawrence River, Dredging and Elevator Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 1683 (i).

Montreal Post Office Addition, Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 6922 (iv).

Monuments to McGee and Brown (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13352 (vii).

N. B. Cold Storage Co., &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9376 (v).

N. B. Inland Water Wharfs, Construction Policy (Ans.) 5465 (iii).

N. B. Provincial Elections, Interference by Dom. Govt., on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 3663 (ii).

—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7134 (iv).

Nicolet County, Govt. Expenditures from 1896-1908 (Ans.) 12775 (vii).

—— Dredging, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 4588 (iii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Nicolet Post Office, Contracts, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 3838 (ii).

Nicolet River Dredging, Emplymt. of Narcisse Jutras (Ans.) 11936 (vi).

—— Total Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 3840 (ii).

Nicolet River Wharf, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 3479 (ii).

North East Harbour Wharf, Total Length (Ans.) 11019 (vi).

Notre Dame du Portage Wharf, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 6400 (iv).

Occidental Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 131 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 7725 (iv).

Office Specialty Co., Quantity of Goods supplied Govt. (Ans.) 3039 (ii).

Ont. and Quebec Dredging, Tenders, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 9276 (v).

Order, Ques. of, Withdrawal of word 'grafter,' 10994 (vi).

Oromocto Shoals, Contract *re* Dredging (Ans.) 11496 (vi).

O'Shaughnessy, Mr. John, Emplymt. at Nicolet Post Office (Ans.) 11702 (vi).

Ottawa Post Office, Completion of Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 3842 (ii).

Owen Sound Public Building, Contract *re* Extension (Ans.) 3039 (ii).

—— Inspector, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 3039 (ii).

—— Sub-letting of Contract by Leslie (Ans.) 3039 (ii).

Owen Sound Dredging Co., Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 2792 (ii).

Pacific Coast Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 40 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6231 (iv).

Pelican Lake Channel, Opening of (Ans.) 1940 (i).

Petawawa Dock, Tenders *re* Improvements (Ans.) 685 (i).

Petit Rocher Breakwater, Return (remarks) 7108 (iv).

—— Incomplete Return (remarks) 5725 (iii).

—— on Inquiry for, 6464 (iv).

—— Papers laid on Table, 10402 (vi).

—— Statement as to Missing Letters (remarks) 9716 (v).

Pictou Post Office, Concrete Sidewalk, Total Cost (Ans.) 10518 (vi).

Pinette Harbour, Pets. *re* Dredging (Ans.) 685 (i).

Point Prim Wharf, P.E.I., Construction, &c. (Ans.) 3898 (ii).

Pointe-aux-Trembles Wharf, Contract of Messrs. Dusseault & Pageau (Ans.) 8839 (v).

—— Date of Contract (Ans.) 9268 (v).

—— Tenders, Contract, &c. (Ans.) 1734 (i)

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Pointe-aux-Trembles Wharf, Number of Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 2394 (ii).
Port Arthur Dredging, Contracts, Securities, &c. (Ans.) 697 (i).
Port Bruce Harbour, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 2389 (ii).
Port Colborne, Total Expenditure *re* Improvements (Ans.) 4403 (iii).
Port Credit Harbour, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 10513 (vi).
Port Dufferin Dredging, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 4828 (iii).
Port Hood Harbours, Closing of Northern Entrance (Ans.) 10255 (v).
Port St. Francois Wharf, Construction, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 3424 (ii).
Port Stanley Breakwater, Contractors, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 240 (i).
Port Vernon Bridge, Completion of Works, Pet. *re* (Ans.) 4404 (iii).
Postal Service in House of Com. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7481 (iv).
Presbyterian College, Halifax, B. 154 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 7669 (iv).
P.E.I., Public Works, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 1686 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Ret., 2172 (ii).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 8696, 9893 (v).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11679 (vi).
P.E.I., Souris Breakwater, Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 1685 (i).
Public Buildings, Erection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7192 (iv).
Public Works, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Public Works Dept., New Apptmts. (Ans.) 13061 (vii).
——— Employees at Hamilton, Delay in Pay (remarks) 10016, 10119 (v).
——— Estimates, Discussions *re* (remarks) 5661 (iii).
——— Ret., on Inquiry for, 6223 (iv).
Quebec County, Govt. Expenditures, on M. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4896 (iii).
Quebec County, Govt. Expenditures, on M. (Mr. Robitaille) for Ret., 3853 (ii).
Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s B. 128 (Mr. Michaud) in Com., 6226 (iv).
Quebec and N. B. Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13291 (vii).
Quebec Port, Sums expended for Improvements, &c. (Ans.) 176 (i).
Ry. Act (telephones) Amt. B. 118 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 10649 (vi).
Raquette River Dredging, Contract *re* (Ans.) 4588 (iii).
——— correcting answer, 5658 (iii).
Red Head Wharf, N.S., Total Expenditure (Ans.) 11019 (vi).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Reinhardt, Paul, Emplymt. in Provincial Elections, Hull (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10988 (vi).
Representation from the Mar. Provs., Ques. of Priv., 9892 (v).
Restaurant of House of Com. and Senate, Joint Com. (M.) 13224 (vii).
Returns, Inquiry for, 2385, 3581 (ii).
Rhindress, Dr. Horace, Salary as Port Physician (Ans.) 6000 (iii), 6232 (iv).
Richibucto Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12000 (vi).
Rideau Hall Improvements, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 5467 (iii).
Rimouski Dredging, &c., *re* Landing of 'Lady Evelyn' (Ans.) 7727 (iv).
Rimouski Public Works, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 10013 (v).
Rivard, Mr. S., Apptmt. as Supt. of Nicolet Post Office (Ans.) 11702 (vi).
Rivière à la Graisse, Dredging, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 686 (i).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 3689 (ii).
Rivière du Loup Post Office, Improvement to Grounds (Ans.) 6399 (iv).
——— Wharf, Total Amount of Dredging (Ans.) 6462 (iv).
Ruscomb River Works, Estimate of Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1122 (i).
St. Andrews Rapids Improvement Co., Land Grant to Great Falls Power Co. (Ans.) 238 (i).
St. Anicet Wharf, Expenditure by Public Works Dept. (Ans.) 3479 (ii).
St. Boniface Public Building, Purchase of Land, &c. (Ans.) 5999 (iii).
St. Francis River, Melbourne Pier, Removal of Rock, &c. (Ans.) 6918 (iv).
——— Richmond Pier, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 6641, 6919 (iv).
St. Fulgence Pier, Signatures on Pay List, &c. (Ans.) 1116 (i).
St. John, N.B., Contracts with Dom. Dredging Co. (Ans.) 11700 (vi).
St. John Port, Dredging Contracts, Payments, &c. (Ans.) 11497 (vi).
St. John River, Snags, Removal of, Tender *re* (Ans.) 3478 (ii).
St. Joseph's Wharf, Payments to *re* Construction, &c. (Ans.) 8890 (v).
St. Laurent Wharf, Expenditure *re* Construction, &c. (Ans.) 896, 1121 (i).
St. Laurent Wharf, Lake Manitoba (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12142 (vii).
St. Mary's Post Office, Total Cost (Ans.) 11019 (vi).
——— Items *re* Expenditure of $658.03 (Ans.) 11937 (vi).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Saguenay and Chicoutimi Pulp Co., Amounts paid for Use of Boom, &c. (Ans.) 183 (i).
Saguenay Dredging, Purchase of Coal, &c. (Ans.) 8380 (v).
——'Storm King,' Tug, Emplymt. of (Ans.) 8381 (v).
See 'Chicoutimi.'
Sandwich Post Office Site, Price, &c. (Ans.) 7201 (iv).
Saskatchewan Power Co.'s B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 7675, 7722 (iv), 8563, 9068 (v).
Scotch Town Wharf, Application (Ans.) 7202 (iv).
Seal Cove Dredging, Rep. *re* Estimated Cost (Ans.) 6463 (iv).
Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5425, 5520 (iii).
'Sir Wilfrid Laurier,' Dredge, Completion, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 5207 (iii).
Skinner's Cove, Boat Channel, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 10012 (v).
Snag Boat, Red River, Construction of, &c. (Ans.) 567, 891 (i).
Souris Harbour Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 1939 (i).
S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12599 (vii).
Spanish River Dredging, Amount expended (Ans.) 4764 (iii).
'Speedy,' Str., Purchase, Commission, &c. (Ans.) 565 (i), 3844 (ii).
Spry Bay Wharf, Expenditure *re* Repairs, (Ans.) 2392 (ii).
Stoney Lake Dock, Construction by Govt. (Ans.) 5564, 5787 (iii).

SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Public Works (salaries) 638 (i), 12917 (vii).
Indians—N. B. (salaries) 12737; (schools) 13172 (vii).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 5766 (iii).
Post Office (inspectors) 13153 (vii).
Public Works—(Ass't. Dep. Minister) 5698 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Chilliwack) 13338 (vii); (Cranbrook) 10864 (vi), 13338 (vii); (Cumberland) 10864 (vi); (Fernie) 5706 (iii), 10866 (vi); (Grand Forks) 13338; (Greenwood) 13338 (vii); (Ladysmith) 10866 (vi), 13338 (vii); (Quesnel) 10867 (vi); (Revelstoke) 13339 (vii); (Vancouver) 10868 (v), 13339 (vii); (Vernon) 10870 (vi), 13339 (vii); (Victoria) 10883; (Victoria, immigration) 10874; (William's Head) 10883 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10886; (cattle quarantine stations) 11008; (experimental farms, repairs) 10904 (vi), 13339 (vii); (furniture) 11007; (immigration, repairs) 11008; (post office fittings) 11007; (quarantine stations)

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*
11008; (rents, &c.) 10981; List read, 10998; (repairs) 10886 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon drill hall) 8517 (v), 10953, 10974; (Dauphin) 8519 (v); (Elmwood) 13335 (vii); Emerson) 8534 (v), 13335 (vii); (Neepawa) 8536 (v), 13336; (Portage la Prairie) 13336 (vii); (St. Boniface) 8566; (Selkirk) 8547 (v); (Souris) 13336; (Winnipeg) 13336 (vii); (Winnipeg hospital) 10955 (vi); (Winnipeg immigration) 8573 (v); (Winnipeg military) 10969 (vi); (Winnipeg P. O.) 8575; (Winnipeg warehouse) 8566 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Fairville) 13328; (Fredericton) 13328; (Grand Falls) 13328; (Hillsborough) 13328; (Moncton) 13328 (vii); (quarantine, steam sterilizer) 7187; (quarantine, water service) 7186; (St. John) 7186 (iv), 13329 (vii); (St. John, military) 7186 (iv); (St. John, quarantine station) 5703 (iii); (Tracadie Lazaretto) 7187 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—N.W.T. (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10975 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Antigonish) 7110; (Bridgewater) 7135; (Glace Bay) 7139; (Halifax) 7140; (Halifax, customs) 7144; (Halifax, immigration) 7143; (Halifax, military) 7143; (Halifax, quarantine) 7171; (Inverness) 7172 (iv); (Lunenburg) 13326; (Parrsboro) 13327 (vii); (Shelburne) 7173; (Westville) 7179 (iv); (Wolfville) 13327 (vii); (Yarmouth) 7180 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Arnprior) 7454; (Belleville) 7678; (Belleville armoury) 7455; (Brantford) 7455; (Dom. renewals) 7467; (Glencoe) 7473 (iv), 13331; (Guelph) 13331 (vii); (Guelph, armoury) 7678; (Hamilton, drill hall) 7692; (Hamilton, post office) 7696 (iv); (Harriston) 13331 (vii); (Kincardine) 7698; (Kingston) 7814; (Kingston, artillery park) 7701; (Kingston, gun shed) 7700; (Kingston, hospital) 7702 (iv); (Kingston, magazine) 10907; (Kingston, militia stores) 10907 (vi); (Kingston, R.M.C.) 7702 (iv), 10907 (vi); (Leamington) 7705, 7815 (iv), 13331; (Listowel) 13331 (vii); (London, magazine) 7705; (London, military) 7706; (Markham) 7709 (iv), 13331; (Mitchell) 13332; (Mount Forest) 13331; (Niagara) 13332 (vii); (North Bay) 7712, 7810 (iv), 13332 (vii); (Owen Sound) 7817 (iv); (Park Hill) 13332 (vii); (Peterborough) 13332 (vii); (Port Arthur) 7825 (iv), 13332 (vii); (Renfrew) 7825 (iv); (St. Mary's) 7826 (iv); (Sarnia) 7829 (iv), 13333; (Seaforth) 13332 (vii); (Simcoe) 7830 (iv), 13333; (Sudbury) 13333 (vii); (Tilsonburg) 13333 (vii); (Uxbridge) 13333 (vii); (Walkerville) 13333 (vii); (Waterloo) 13333 (vii); (Welland) 7830 (iv); (Whitby) 7833 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (archives) 5700 (iii); (deptl. buildings) 1505 (i), (eastern block) 1504 (i); (elevator attendants) 11011 (vi); (grounds) 11012 (vi); (heating, &c.) 11009 (vi), 13340 (vii); (House of Commons, addition) 1486 (i); (improvements, &c.) 5707 (iii); (lighting) 11011 (vi); (Major's Hill park) 11015 (vi); (maint) 1451, 1474 (i);

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

(museum) 1489 (i), 13477 (vii); (new deptl. building) 5701 (iii); (observatory) 1450, 1485 (i); (post office) 5705 (iii); (printing bureau, motors) 7817 (iv); (rents, &c.) 5706 (iii); (repairs, furniture, &c.) 10981 (vi); (Rideau Hall) 11005 (vi); (skylights) 7816 (iv); (telephones) 11012 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—P.E.I. (Georgetown) 7183 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Arthabaskaville) 13329 (vii); (Chicoutimi) 7279 (iv); (Cookshire) 7281 (iv); (Dominion, renewals) 7286 (iv); (Dundee) 7286 (iv); (Farnham) 7287 (iv); (Grand Mere) 13329 (vii); (Grosse Isle) 7289, 7290 (iv); (Joliette) 13329 (vii); (Knowlton) 7290 (iv), 13329 (vii); (Lachute) 7293 (iv), 13329 (vii); (Lake Megantic) 7294 (iv); (Levis) 7294 (iv), 13329 (vii); (Longueuil) 7304 (iv); (Magog) 7306 (iv); 13329 (vii); (Marieville) 7306 (iv); (Megantic) 13330 (vii); (Montreal, barracks) 7407 (iv); (Montreal, examining warehouse) 7423 (iv); (Montreal, military) 7418 (iv); (Montreal, pneumatic postal) 5703 (iii); (Montreal, postal station) 7418 (iv); (Montreal, post office) 7410 (iv); (Montreal, station C) 7419 (iv); (Nicolet) 7428 (iv); (Plessisville) 7430 (iv), 13330 (vii); (Point St. Charles) 7419 (iv), 13330 (vii); (Quebec Citadel) 7430 (iv); (Que. Dominion arsenal) 7435 (iv); (Quebec, drill hall) 7431 (iv); (Quebec, hospital) 7433 (iv); (Quebec, immigrants) 7432 (iv); (Quebec, warehouse) 7432 (iv); (Roberval) 13330 (vii); (St. Henri) 7439 (iv); (St. Hyacinthe) 7440 (iv); (St. John's, military) 7440 (iv); (St. John's, post office) 7444 (iv); (St. Rochs) 7438 (iv); (St. Therese) 13330 (vii); (Shawenegan) 13330 (vii); (Sherbrooke) 13330 (vii); (Sherbrooke, drill hall) 7439 (iv); (Three Rivers) 13330 (vii); (Westmount) 13331 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Battleford) 8576 (v); (Calgary) 8578 (v); (Edmonton) 5706 (iii), 8579 (v), 13336 (vii); (Estevan) 8581 (v), 13336 (vii); (Humboldt) 8582 (v); (Lethbridge) 13336 (vii); (Maple Creek) 8600 (v), 13337 (vii); (Medicine Hat) 8601 (v); (Moose Jaw) 13336 (vii); (Prince Albert) 13337 (vii); (Prince Albert, penitentiary) 8601 (v); (Regina) 8602 (v); (Saskatoon) 8602 (v), 13337 (i); (Strathcona) 13338 (vii); (Wetaskiwin) 13338 (vii); (Yorkton) 8603)v).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (commissioner's residence) 10883 (vi); (Dawson) 13339 (vii); (maintenance) 11005 (vi).

Public Works—Dredging—B.C. (North Thompson river) 13352 (vii); Mar. Provs. (new plant) 12143 (vii); Ont. and Que. (generally) 13351 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Spillumcheen) 13351 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Generally (repairs, &c.) 11694, 12032 (vi); (graving docks) 5731 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Grand Marais) 12140 (vii); (Lake Dauphin) 12141 (vii); (St. Andrew's rapids) 5701 (iii), 12145 (v); Winnipegosis Lake) 12141 (vii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (creosoted timber) 12028 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Beaver) 13344 (vii); (Buctouche) 11679 (vi); (Campbellton) 13344 (vii); (Campbellton wharf) 11685 (vi); (Caraquet) 11685 (vi); (Dorchester) 13344 (vii); (Dover wharf) 11692 (vi); (Harvey) 13344 (vii); (Leonardsville) 13344 (vii); (Lorneville) 13344 (vii); (Lower Newcastle) 11696 (vi); (Madawaska) 11696 (vi), 13344; (Miscou) 13344 (vii); (Moncton) 11696 (vi); (New Mills) 13345 (vii); (Richibucto) 11698 (vi); (St. Andrews) 12011 (vi); (St. John) 11698 (vi); (St. John, harbour) 12011 (vi); (St. John, improvements) 5708 (iii); (St. John, surveys) 13346 (vii); (St. John, tidal waters) 12000 (vi); (St. John, wharfs) 13345 (vii); (Shippegan) 12027 (vi); (Tracadie) 13349 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis) 11207 (vi); (Baddeck) 11219 (vi); (Barachois) 11224 (vi); (Bay St. Lawrence) 11224 (vi); (Big Lorraine) 11224 (vi); (Breton Cove) 11224 (vi); (Cape St. Mary) 11224 (vi); (Caribou Island causeway) 11224 (vi); (Charlos cove) 11225 (vi); (Church Point) 11225 (vi); (Cow Bay) 11225 (vi); (Digby) 11226 (vi); (dredging) 13340 (vii); (Glace Bay) 11228 (vi); (Hall's Harbour) 11228 (vi); (McPherson's cove) 11229 (vi); (Margaree) 11229 (vi); (Middle River) 11230 (vi); (New Glasgow) 11257 (vi); (Oyster Pond) 11258 (vi); (Parker's Cove) 11258 (vi); (Parrsborough) 11259 (vi); (Poirierville pier) 11260 (v); (Porter's Lake) 11260 (vi); (Port Hastings) 11265 (vi); (Port Hilford) 11267 (vi); (Port Hood) 11268 (vi); (Port Joli West) 11279 (vi); (Port Royal) 11278 (vi); (Portuguese cove) 11279 (vi); (Pugwash wharf) 11280 (vi); (Round Hill) 11282 (vi); (Skinner's cove) 11290 (vi); (Sydney wharf) 11230 (vi); (Tancook island) 11230 (vi); (Tatamagouche) 11291 (vi); (Yarmouth) 11291 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Beaverton) 12090 (vii); (Belle River) 12090 (vii); (Blanche River) 12090 (vii); (Blind River) 12091 (vii); (Bronte) 12092 (vii); (Bronte, dredging) 5708 (iii); (Burlington) 12092 (vii); (Chute a Blondeau) 12092 (vii); (Cobourg) 12095 (vii); (Colborne) 12095 (vii); (Collingwood) 12096 (vii); (Georgian Bay surveys) 13326 (vii); (Goderich) 12101 (vii); (Goderich, breakwater) 13350 (vii); (Gore's Landing) 12101 (vii); (Juniper Island) 13350 (vii); (Lakefield) 13350 (vii); (Little Current) 13350 (vii); (McGregor's Creek) 12103 (vii); (Magnetawan) 13350 (vii); (Meaford) 12103 (vii); (Michipicoten) 13350 (vii); (Midland and Tiffin) 12105 (vii); (Petawawa) 12133 (vii); (Peterborough) 12133 (vii); (Point Edward) 5713 (iii); (Port Arthur, &c.) 12144 (vii); (Port Burwell) 12135 (vii); (Port Colborne) 12146 (vii); (Port Credit) 12102 (vii); (Port Hope) 12135 (vii); (Port Stanley) 12136 (vii); (Rainy River) 12136 (vii); (Roche's Point) 12136 (vii); (Ron-

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

deau) 12137 (vii); (Rossport) 12137 (vii); (Sault Ste. Marie) 12137 (vii); (Severn) 12137 (vii); (Smeeth and McGillicuddy) 13350 (vii); (Southampton) 12137 (vii); (Stanley Island pier) 5720 (iii); (Temiskaming Lake) 13350 (vii); (Tiffin) 13351 (vii); (Tiffin, dredging) 5709 (iii); (Tobermory) 13351 (vii); (Toronto) 12137 (vii); (Victoria) 12137 (vii); (Winnipeg River) 12138 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (McPherson's cove) 11292 (vi); (New London) 11292 (vi); (repairs) 11292 (vi); (Rustico) 11293 (vi); (Souris) 13341 (vii); (Summerside) 13343 (vii).

Public Works Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse a la Barbe) 12028 (vi); (Anse a l'Ilot) 12029 (vi); (Baie St. Paul) 12029 (vi); (Barachois de Malbaie) 12029 (vi); (Batiscan) 12029 (vi); (Batiscan, river) 12036 (vi); (Berthier) 12029 (vi); (Bic wharf) 12030 (vi); (Bonaventure) 12036 (vi); (Cap St. Ignace) 12030 (vi); (Chateauguay) 12030 (vi); (Chicoutimi) 12030 (vi); (Clarke City) 12031 (vi); (East Templeton) 12031 (vi); (Escoumains) 12031 (vi); (Father Point) 12031 (vi); (Grand Mechins) 12031 (vi); (Grande Riviere) 12031 (vi); (Lake Aylmer) 12032 (vi); (Lake Megantic) 12032 (vi); (Lake St. Francis) 12033 (vi); (Lake St. John) 12033 (vi); (Lavaltrie) 12033 (vi); (Les Eboulements) 12033 (vi); (Lotbiniere) 12033 (vi); (Magdalen Islands) 12034 (vi); (Malbay) 12034 (vi); (Matane) 12034 (vi); (Montmagny) 12034 (vi); (Nicolet) 12034 (vi); (Notre Dame de Portage) 12034 (vi); (Peribonka) 12035 (vi); (Petite Decharge) 12034 (vi); (Piche Point) 12035 (vi); (Pointe aux Trembles) 12035 (vi); (Quebec, harbour) 12144 (vii); (Richelieu) 12037 (vi); (Rimouski) 12035 (vi); (Riviere du Lievre) 12037 (vi); (Riviere du Loup) 12036 (vi); (Riviere Maskinonge) 12037 (vi); (Riviere Ouelle) 12037 (vi); (St. Alphonse) 12041 (vi); (Ste. Anne des Monts) 12042 (vi); (St. Francis) 12041 (vi); (St. Francois) 12042 (vi); (St. Ignace de Loyola) 12042 (vi); (St. Jacques) 12041 (vi); (St. Jean des Chaillons) 12042 (vi); (St. Jean Orleans) 12042 (vi); (St. Laurent) 12042 (vi); (St. Louis) 12040 (vi); (St. Maurice River) 12041 (vi); (St. Omer) 12042 (vi); (St. Pierre les Becquets) 12042 (vi); (St. Simeon) 12042 (vi); (Saguenay) 12040 (vi); (Sorel) 12042 (vi); (Three Rivers, deep water wharf) 13349 (vii); (Varennes) 12042 (vi); (Yamaska, dredging) 12043 (vi); (Yamaska, lock) 12041 (vi); (Yamaska, river) 5708 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Sask. (Lesser Slave Lake) 5719 (iii); (Lesser Slave) 13351 (vii); (Old Man's River) 12142 (vii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (architects' branch) 11096 (vi); (cement testing) 11078 (vi); (clerical assistance) 11099 (vi); (Deep Waterways Commission) 11101 (vi); (engineering branch) 11093 (vi); (gratuities) 5730 (iii); (International Commission *re* Red River) 11118 (vi); (monuments) 11118 (vi); (technical books) 11100 (vi); (telegraph branch) 11097 (vi); (unprovided items) 11119 (vi).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges (Shellmouth) 12143 (vii).

Public Works—Slides and Booms (surveys, &c.) 11071 (vi).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines (Ashcroft-Dawson) 5731 (iii); (B. C. Cape Beale Lines) 5732 (iii); (cable service) 5731 (iii); (Chicoutimi) 13179 (vii); (Marconi) 12143 (vii); (operating) 13178 (vii); (Yukon) 13179 (vii).

Public Works—Transportation Facilities (Georgian Bay surveys) 12146 (vii).

Railways—I.C.R. (St. John accommodation) 12257 (vii).

Sussex St. Property Purchase, Payments to Jos. Riopelle (Ans.) 3844 (ii).

Tache, J. C., Emplymt. in Public Works Dept. (Ans.) 8180 (iv).

Tatamagouche Dredging, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 11701 (vi).

Tenders, Lists of Papers *re* Advertisements (read) in Com. of Sup., 7476 (iv).

Tiffin, Tenders *re* Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 8893 (v).

Tignish Breakwater, Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 3229 (ii).

Tignish Harbour, Pet. *re* Extension (Ans.) 682 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11679 (vi).

Tilbury, Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vii).

Toney River Boat Harbour, Contract Price, Extras, &c. (Ans.) 9712 (v).

Toronto Harbour (eastern gap), Amount of Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 354 (i).

——— Construction of Entrance (Ans.) 355 (i).

——— Murray & Cleveland's Contract, Date, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1507 (i).

Toronto Harbour (western entrance) Contract Price, &c. (Ans.) 518 (i), 4587 (iii), 10014 (v).

——— Entrance, Delay in Contract (remarks) 5915 (iii).

Toronto Island Tunnel, Construction by Govt. (Ans.) 5564 (iii).

Town Site Property, Section 32, Public Works *re* (Ans.) 1125 (i).

Tracadie Harbour Breakwater, Pets. *re* Construction (Ans.) 5472 (iii).

Transportation: *See* 'I.C.R.,' &c.

Trueman, Mr., and N. B. Cold Storage Co., Ques. of Priv., 9343 (v).

Truro Armoury, Estimate for Heating and Electric Wiring (Ans.) 3429 (ii).

Uniforms and Customs Duties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9571 (v).

Vaudreuil County, Dredging, Supt.'s Salary, &c. (Ans.) 4587 (iii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Vautelet, Mr., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 642 (i).

Ventilation of H. of C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13340 (vii).

See 'House of Commons,' &c.

Vernon River Bridge, P.E.I., Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 5471 (iii).

Victoria Beach Pier, Amounts expended, &c. (Ans.) 237 (i).

Victoria Harbour, Tenders *re* Dredging (Ans.) 8893 (v).

Welchpool Wharf, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ans.) 7935 (iv).

Western Block Extension, Total Expenditure, Area, &c. (Ans.) 512 (i).

Westville Public Building, Total Cost (Ans.) 9475 (v).

Wharfs, Piers and Harbours, Expenditure *re*, on M. (Mr. Blain) for Cor., 5476 (iii).

——— on Inquiry for Ret., 4867 (iii).

Winfield Basin Dredging, Tenders, Inspection, &c. (Ans.) 6461 (iv).

White Head Wharf, Report *re* Cost (Ans.) 6463 (iv).

Wiarton Dredging, 1907, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 6236 (iv).

——— Payments to Mr. Bowman, &c. (Ans.) 6407 (iv).

Yarmouth, Dredging Contracts, Tenders, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 11500 (vi).

Yukon Telegraphs, Receipts and Expenses (Ans.) 512 (i).

——— Service to Prince Rupert, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 1934 (i).

REID, Mr. J. D., *Grenville.*

Acetylene Gas Works at Prescott, Emplymt. of Political Officers (remarks) in deb. on Technical Education, 3292 (ii).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4504 (iii).

Beauharnois Canal, Lease of Water Power (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13176 (vii).

Belleville—Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 8553 (v).

Blue Books, Distribution of (remarks) 432 (i).

Bobcaygeon Dam, Flooding of Highways, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2993 (ii).

Boneless Meat, Frozen, Imported into G.B., Par. in English Newspapers, &c. (Ques.) 3230 (ii).

Brockville and Ottawa Ry. Service (remarks) on M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn., 188 (i).

Canada Shipping Act Amt., B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12853, 13052 (vii).

Canned Foods Inspection Act, Enforcement of (Ques.) 3846 (ii).

REID, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6871 (iv).

Catharine C., Incomplete Return (remarks) 5727 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11566 (vi).

Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. Hse., 5891 (iii).

——— (remarks) 5627 (iii).

Colonial Conference, Travelling Expenses of Ministers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i).

Cornwall Canal, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12198 (vii).

Cypress Hills, Timber Reserve, Preservation of, &c. (Ques.) 3841 (ii).

Deep Waterways Commission, St. Lawrence River Dam (remarks) on M. for Sup., 11205 (vi).

——— Damming of St. Lawrence at Long Sault (remarks) 13151 (vii).

Documents, Original, Production of to Members, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1638 (i).

——— on M. for Sup., 1875 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12941 (vii).

Doukhobors, Religious Fanatics, Par. in Newspapers (remarks) 12161 (vii).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13270 (vii).

Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13297 (vii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3798 (ii).

Gilmore, Edith May Relief (B. 164) 1°*, 8377; 2°*, 8610 (v).

Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6269 (iv).

Govt. Works, Emplymt. of Technical Students, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3292 (ii).

G.T.Ry., Connections at Prescott (remarks) 433 (i).

Halliday Bros., Supplies to Lighthouses, Rates, &c. (Ques.) 6236 (iv).

Hillsborough Bridge, P.E.I., Claims of M. J. Haney, Arbitration *re* (remarks) 1739 (i).

Indian Lands at New Westminster, Sale of (Ques.) 3037, 3839 (ii).

I.C.R., Delays to Maritime Express, &c. (Ques.) 8614 (v).

——— Number of Tons of Steel Rails, &c. (M. for ret.*) 6240 (iv).

——— Rolling Stock in Service on Sundays, &c. (M. for ret.*) 6240 (iv).

——— Rolling Stock, Purchase of, &c. (M. for ret.*) 6240 (iv).

REID, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Trains breaking down, &c. (M. for ret.*) 6240 (iv).
——— Train Service, Explanations *re* Delays, &c. (M. for ret.) 6242 (iv).
——— Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4469 (iii).
Kananaski Falls Water Power, Granting of Rights, &c. (Ques.) 3036 (ii).
——— (M. for ret.*) 3850 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 5491 (iii), 6464 (iv).
Lake Francois Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12139 (vii).
Lighting Buoys on Rideau Canal, Contract *re* (Ques.) 9476 (v).
Marine and Fisheries, Deptl., Book-keeping, &c., ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4004 (ii).
Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel (remarks) 7327 (iv).
——— Officers under Suspension (remarks) 6847 (iv).
Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3018 (ii).
Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6894, 7247 (iv).
Medicine Hat Building, Contract *re* Heating System (Ques.) 10791 (vi).
'Montcalm,' Collision with C.P.R. Steamer, Par. in 'Montreal Gazette' (remarks) 8086 (iv).
Montreal Harbour Commission, Contract *re* Cement, &c. (Ques.) 7199, 7499 (iv).
North Grove Post Office, Letters, Pets. *re* Establishment of (M. for copies*) 4773 (iii).
——— Return Inquiry for, 5490 (iii).
Order, Ques. of, Discussions *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4107 (ii).
Pacific Coast Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 40 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6227 (iv).
Parliamentary Documents, Distribution of (remarks) 609 (i).
Patterson, J. W., Govt. Lands in B.C., Sale to (Ques.) 6002 (iii).
——— (M. for ret.*) 6241 (iv).
Petition. (M.) to introduce, 1682 (i).
Plains of Abraham, Lease to Ross Rifle Co., &c. (Ques.) 1348 (i).
Postal Arrangements between U. S. and Canada, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 3894 (ii).
P.E.I., Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* Claims of M. J. Haney (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1739 (i), 2740 (ii).
Public Accounts Committee, Meetings, &c., Adjournments, &c. (remarks) 1439 (i).
——— Production of Original Documents (remarks) 4495 (iii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 3084 (ii).

REID, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

Public Works Dept., Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4890 (iii).
Quebec and N.B. Ry. Co.'s B. 128 (Mr. Michaud) in Com., 6225 (iv).
Quebec and N. B. Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13291 (vii).
Quebec Troops, Food supplied (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13176 (vii).
Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3929 (ii).
Ry. Passenger Ticket Act Amt. (B. 90) 1° m., 2466 (ii); 2° m., 5244 (iii).
——— (remarks) 3404 (ii).
Rideau Canal, Buoys between Merrickville and Edmond Rapids, Contract *re* Lighting (Ques.) 8613 (v).
Returns, Retention by Members, Ques. of Priv., 4666 (iii).
See 'Documents.'
Returns unopposed, *re* I. C. R. (remarks) 5914 (iii).
Returns, Inquiry for, 8516 (v).
St. Lawrence Power and Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. Gervais) for Cor., &c., 3009 (ii).
See 'Deep Waterways.'
Salmon Licenses, Leases &c., in B.C. (Ques.) 5652 (iii).
——— (M. for ret.*) 5801 (iii).
Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8560, 8610 (v).
Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5458 (iii).
S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12598 (vii).
South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 16 (Mr. Calvert) on M. for 3°, 1929 (i).
Spain, Commander, Travelling Expenses, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1012 (i).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture (seed grain) 5500 (iii).
Canals—Galops (Upper entrance) 5671 (iii).
Canals—Lachine (slope walls) 5664 (iii).
Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 12223 (vii).
Canals—Soulanges (Manning & Macdonald's claims) 5669 (iii).
Canals—Welland (dredging slide) 5673 (iii); (electric lighting) 12197; (Port Colborne) 12216 (vii); (Port Maitland piers) 5681 (iii); (widening) 12211 (vii).
Civil Govt.—Agriculture (Dep. Minister) 12878 (vii); Interior (salaries, &c.) 616 (i); Marine and Fisheries (ass't. dep. min.) 12915; Sec. of State (C. S. examiners) 12917 (vii).
Marine (ice-breakers) 1909 (i).
Militia (annual drill) 5735 (iii); (customs dues) 12155; (Dom. arsenal) 12154; (properties) 12148; (provisions) 12150;

REID, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

(R. M. College) 12153; (warlike stores) 12149 (vii).

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2942, 2950; (life-saving awards) 2972; (masters and mates) 2969 (ii).

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5522 (iii).

Post Office (inspectors) 13253 (vii).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon drill hall) 8517 (v), 10953 (vi); (Neepawa) 8544; (St. Boniface) 8566; (Selkirk) 8547 (v); (Winnipeg, hospital) 10955 (vi); (Winnipeg, warehouse) 8567 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Antigonish) 7111 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Brantford) 7463; (Dom. renewals) 7479; (Glencoe) 7497 (iv); (Kingston) 10913 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 1450; (deptl. buildings) 1505; (House of Com., additions) 1486; (mint) 1451, 1474; (museum) 1490; (observatory) 1485 (i); (skylights) 7816 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Farnham) 7288; (Grosse Isle) 7289; (Knowlton) 7292; (Levis) 7294 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 8582 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Lake Dauphin) 12141; (St. Andrew's Rapids) 12145 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Digby) 11226; (Porter's Lake) 11260 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Brighton) 12134; (Chute à Blondeau) 12092; (Colborne) 12095; (Midland and Tiffin) 12125; (Petewawa) 12133 (vii); (Point Edward) 5713 (iii); (Port Colborne) 12146; (Roche's Point) 12136 (vii); (Stanley Island wharf) 5720 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. Quebec harbour) 12144 (vii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11090; (Deep Waterways Commission) 11116; (engineering branch) 11094 (vi); (gratuities) 5730 (iii).

Public Works—Transportation Facilities (Georgian Bay survey) 12146 (vii).

Railways—I. C. R. (Campbellton) 12258; (Moncton car shops) 12250 (vii); (Pictou) 5561; (rolling stock) 5549 (iii); (St. John, increased accommodation) 12257 (vii); (train service) 10223; (Windsor Branch) 10146 (v).

Railways—Miscellaneous (litigation) 10357; (Ry. Commission) 10361 (vi).

Tenders, Advertising, *re* Govt. Works, Supplies, &c. (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 4702, neg. (Y. 50; N. 95) 4735 (iii).

Timber Lands, Sale of to Messrs. Rutherford, &c. (Ques.) 1293 (i).

Travelling Expenses of Ministers, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i).

'Victor,' Tug, Repairs by Govt., Ques. of Priv., 9774 (v).

RIVET, Mr. L. A. A., *Hochelaga.*

Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., &c., on M. to adjn. House, 5905 (iii).

RIVET, Mr. L. A. A.—*Con.*

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3463 (ii).

ROBITAILLE, Mr. L., *Quebec County.*

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3866 (ii).

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4514 (iii).

Corby Distillery, Deficits in Spirit Production (Ques.) 12410 (vii).

Experimental Farm, Pet. from Quebec Board of Trade *re* Establishment, &c. (Ques.) 8182 (iv).

French Language, Par. in 'Le Soleil,' on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1212 (i).

Gooderham & Worts Distillery, Deficit in Spirit Production (Ques.) 12411 (vii).

Grandes Piles Dam, Amount voted, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 13059 (vii).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6976, 6989 (iv).

——— Par. in 'Canadian Gazette' (remarks) 7453 (iv).

Meat and Canned Food Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7237 (iv).

Militia Dept., Quebec, Hours for Masons, &c. (Ques.) 10790 (vi).

Montmorency Falls Retaining Walls, Width, &c. (Ques.) 12410 (vii).

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3450 (ii).

Montreal and Quebec Ports, Expenditures for the last fifty years (Ques.) 3482 (ii).

Printing Supt., Apptmnt. of a Frenchman (Ques.) 12411 (vii).

Provincial Elections, and Federal Ministers' Speeches (remarks) 8850 (v).

Public Works Dept., New Apptmts., &c. (Ques.) 13061 (vii).

Quebec Bridge Disaster, Apptmt. of Engineer Hoare (Ques.) 8173 (iv).

——— Names of Jurymen, &c. (Ques.) 7991 (iv).

Quebec Bridge, Rep. of Sel. Com., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to conc., 13389 (vii).

Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s B. 217 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 13491 (vii).

Quebec County Expenditures by Govt. (Ques.) 3847 (ii).

——— (M. for ret.) 3853 (ii).

Ques. of Priv., Deputy Minister of Public Works *re* French Canadians, 8465 (v).

Revised Statutes, Completion of French Edition (Ques.) 6983 (iv).

ROBITAILLE, Mr. L.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10606 (vi).
Excise (methylated spirits) 821 (i).
Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor., 909 (i).

ROCHE, Mr. W., *Halifax.*

Address, The, 267 (i).
All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12453 (vii).
Bank Act Amendments, on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 4285 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8691 (iv); on M. for 3°, 13257 (vii).
Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1719 (i).
G.T.P., Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 12323 (vii).
I.C.R., &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4486 (iii).
Marine and Fisheries Accounts, Payments to Mr. Falconer (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4120 (ii).
Prisons and Reformatories Act (Halifax) Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10693 (vi).
Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, &c., on M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 7742 (iv).
Supplies purchased by Govt., Apptmt. of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5847 (iii).

SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Interior (astronomical survey) 9737 (v).
Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4046 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 1068 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Porter's Lake) 11264 (vi).

ROCHE, Mr. W. J., *Marquette.*

Address, The, 485 (i).
Buffalo purchased for Elk Park, Name of Purchaser, &c. (Ques.) 5795 (iii).
Canadian Associated Press, Govt. Subvention, &c. (Ques.) 5080 (iii).
Clearwater Lake, Half-breeds' Rights, &c. (Ques.) 175 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9995 (v).
Customs Collectors in Man., Additional Fees charged, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9551 (v).
Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1183 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8012 (iv), 11762 (vi); in Com., 13005 (vii).

ROCHE, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*

Dom. Lands (surveys) B. 9 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 759 (i).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11168, 11422 (vi).
Doukhobors bonused as Immigrants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9953 (v).
Doukhobors at Yorkton, Violation of Laws, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7633 (iv).
Fish Exportations from Man., five years to March, 1907, Value, &c. (Ques.) 4240 (iii).
Garthby Wharf, Inspection by Midraud, &c. (Ques.) 3844 (ii).
Grain Inspection and Sale Act, Amt. B. 203 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 13211 (vii).
G.T.P., Engineers and Assistant Engineers, Names, &c., Date of Apptmt., Salaries, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5802 (iii).
——— Medical Attendance, O.C. regulating Deductions (Ques.) 1937 (i).
Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6347 (iv).
——— Proposition *re* Construction by Govt. (Ques.) 5789 (iii).
Immigration, Salvation Army Immigrants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9973 (v).
Indian Schools, Prosecutions *re* Riots (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 626 (i).
Internal Economy Board, H. of C., Minutes, &c. (M. for copies*) 2795 (ii).
Land Sales in N. W., Purchasers' Names, Price paid, &c. (Ques.) 3835 (ii).
Leech, Mr. R. A. E., Apptmt. of (notice of motion) 3477 (ii).
See 'Seed Grain.'
Mail Matter delayed in Transmission by C. P. R. Accident (remarks) 9724 (v).
Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12803 (vii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension (remarks) 6222 (iv).
——— Legislation *re* (remarks) 7506 (iv).
Manitoba Election Frauds, Investigation Com., ref. to in debate on Address, 495 (i).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 13222 (vii).
Man. Voters Lists, Polling Divisions, made by Judges (remarks) 13141 (vii).
Massey-Harris Co., Rebate of Duty from 1905-8 (Ques.) 8441 (v).
Military Stores of Rural Battalions, Care of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5737 (iii).
Minnedosa Armoury (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10889 (vi).
'Montague,' Dredge, Expenditure *re* Repairs (Ques.) 8172 (iv).
Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9488 (v).

ROCHE, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 11991 (vi).

Ranchvale Homestead Entries, Number, Total Receipts, Applications, &c. (Ques.) 5258 (iii).

—— Sub-Land Agency, Closing of (Ques.) 4829 (iii).

Riding Mountain Reserve, Applications for Homesteads, Letter from Mr. Seaman (read) in Com. of Sup., 9992 (v).

—— Entry by Homesteaders (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7653 (iv).

—— Timber Reserves, Squatters' Claims, &c. (Ques.) 175 (i).

St. Boniface Public Building, Contract Price, &c. (Ques.) 4246 (iii).

—— Purchase of Land, &c. (Ques.) 5999 (iii).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Instruction to Agents *re* Rights of Purchasers (Ques.) 2217 (ii).

—— Pet. *re* Election of Chief and Councillors (Ques.) 7990 (iv).

—— Title, Extinguish of, Issue of Patents, &c. (Ques.) 1932 (i).

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s incorp. B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 9167 (v).

Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Land Grants, Patents, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5801 (iii).

Sawmill Owners, Applications refused *re* Timber Cutting (M. for ret.*) 557 (i).

Seed Grain in N. W., Distribution of, Apptmt. of Mr. R. E. A. Leeh (remarks) 3040 (ii).

—— Duties assigned to Mr. Leech (remarks) 3158 (ii).

Seed Grain for N.W., Charges by Mr. Macdonell, M.P. (remarks) 1442 (i).

Seed Grain for Settlers in N.W., on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2909 (ii).

—— on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1373 (i).

—— in Com. of Sup., 2775 (ii).

Selkirk, Lord, Land Registers and State Papers, Register 'B' *re* Hudson Bay Co., Custody of, &c. (Ques.) 1684 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3815 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Interior (astronomical surveys) 9769 (v).

Customs—Miscellaneous (guarantees) 9577; Inspectors (salaries) 9550 (v).

Dom. Lands (agents) 10046; (forest rangers) 10049; (surveys) 9989 (v).

Immigration (agents) 9860; (deportations) 9883 (v); (general expenses) 5754 (iii); (hospitals) 9982; (literature, &c.) 9952 (v).

Legislation (provincial voters' lists) 10508 (vi).

Militia (annual drill) 5737 (iii); (rifle and artillery grants) 12152 (vii).

ROCHE, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Miscellaneous (seed grain) 2775 (ii).

N.W. Ters. (school grants) 10118 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10889 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon, drill hall) 8518; (Dauphin) 8519; (Neepawa) 8536; (Selkirk) 8547 (v); (Winnipeg, hospital) 10962 (vi); (Winnipeg, immigration) 8574; (Winnipeg, P.O.) 8575 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (North Bay) 7713 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 8582; (Saskatoon) 8603; (Yorkton) 8603 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (commissioner's house) 10884 (vi).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges (Shellmouth) 12143 (vii).

Timber Berths granted in Man. and N.W.T., Retention by Original Grantees (Ques.) 2546 (ii).

Timber Cutting by Saw-mill Owners, Applications *re* (Ques.) 2168 (ii).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2614 (ii).

Timber Permits to Saw-mill Owners, O.C. *re*, &c. (Ques.) 179 (i).

Town Site, Section 32, Man., Erection of Public Buildings, &c. (Ques.) 1125, 1348 (i).

Turtle Mountain Timber Reserve (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7653 (iv).

Western Rifle Association, Pet. *re* Grant (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5743 (iii).

ROSS, Mr. A. C., *Cape Breton, N., and Victoria.*

Cement, Sydney, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11227 (vi).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Baddeck) 11219; (Digby) 11226 (vi).

ROSS, Mr. D., *Yale-Cariboo.*

Ashcroft, Barkerville and Fort George Ry. Co.'s (B. 58) 1°*, 1283 (i).

Bank Act Amt., on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) M. to adjn. debate, 4312 (iii).

Boundary, Kamloops and Cariboo Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 36) 1°*, 606 (i).

B.C. Revenue contributed from 1872-3 to 1905 (M. for ret.) 3435 (ii).

Canadian Naturalization, on M. (Mr. Hughes) to Com. of Sup., Ques. of Order 12089 (vii).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10747 (vi).

Criminal Code Amendments, Ques. of Order, 9282 (v).

Customs Estimates, Obstruction in Sup. (remarks) 10138 (v).

ROSS, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Customs Outside Service, in Com. of Sup., Members remarks checked, 9451 (v).
Dillon, Gerald P., Apptmt. to N. W. M. Police Force (Ques.) 6001 (iii).
Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1172 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1632, 1653 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8185 (iv); in Com., 11877, 11932 (vi); on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 3°, 13252 (vii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11176 (vi).
Edmonton, Dunvegan and B. C. Ry. Co.'s (B. 38) 1°*, 754 (i).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4578 (iii).
G.T.P. Ry. Co., Application for Portion of Metlakatla Indian Reserve, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 1512 (i).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 768 (i).
Immigration Bonuses, Ques. of Order, *re* Discussion of former Speech. 1298 (i).
Indian Lands, B.C., Provincial Rights, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 630 (i).
Indian Schools, Dr. Bryce's Report (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 625 (i).
I.C.R. Employees Provident Fund Amt. B. 117 (Mr Graham) in Com., 4995 (iii).
Japanese Immigration Restriction, B.C. Legislation, on M. for Sup., 1744 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2066 (ii).
——— on Stmt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1602 (i).
Japanese and Oriental Immigration, O.Cs., &c., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Copies, 855, 877 (i).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. R. Smith) 732 (i).*
Kamloops and Yellowhead Pass Ry. Co.'s (B. 39) 1°*, 754 (i).
Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 11244 (vi).
Obstruction *re* Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9916 (v).
——— Ques. of Order, 10023, 'Bourinot' quoted, 10030 (v).
Obstruction Tactics, &c., Ques. of Order, 9222 (v).
Occidental Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 131) 1°*, 5337 (iii); in Com., 7724 (iv).
Order, Points of, 'Bourinot' *re* Discussions on, 4103 (ii).
Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4955 (iii).
Quebec Bridge Rep., Ques. of Order, 13401 (vii).

ROSS, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4986 (iii).
——— (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 118, Ques. of Order, 10663 (vi).
Railway Subsidies B. 215 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13286 (vii).
Resignation as Member *re* Chinese Question (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11106 (vi).
Shuswap and Thompson Rivers Boom Co.'s (B. 49) 1°*, 891 (i); in Com., 5409, 5519 (iii).
S.A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3773 (ii).

SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries) 625 (i).
Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9244; Ques. of Order, 9222 (v).
Legislation (voters' lists) 10508 (vi).
Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4099 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Midland and Tiffin) 12126 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Knowlton) 7293 (iv).

Timber Berths, Leasing of, &c., Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2287 (ii).
Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor. *re* Amts., 908 (i).

SCHAFFNER, Mr. F. L., *Souris.*

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4520 (iii).
Berins Fish Hatchery, Failure *re* Spawn Supply (Ques.) 3240 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8200 (iv).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11132; in Com., 11170, 11458, 11521; (amt.) 11943; (amt.) on M. for 3°, 11970; Neg. (Y. 28; N. 58) 11974 (vi).
Fisheries in Lake Winnipeg, Legislation *re* Closing (Ques.) 2389 (ii).
Fish Hatchery, Lake Winnipeg, Failure *re* Spawn, &c. (Ques.) 1683 (i).
Grain Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 203 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 13210 (vii).
Homestead Entries granted for Quarters 10-17-17 W. of 4th Meridian, &c. (Ques.) 9773 (v).
House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10492 (vi).
Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction of, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6306 (iv).
Immigrants, Amounts paid for Maintenance, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5476 (iii).
——— (Ques.) 5084 (iii).
Immigrants from Europe, entering U.S., List furnished to Govt. (Ques.) 5082 (iii).

SCHAFFNER, Mr. F. L.—*Con.*

Immigration from U. S., Total Amount expended (Ques.) 5082 (iii).

'Lady of the Lake,' Str., Purchase by Govt., Staff, &c. (Ques.) 3434 (ii).

Land Patents for Sections 10, and 17, Applicants *re* (Ques.) 9475 (v).

Lumber Combine Investigation, Rep. *re* (Ques.) 2977 (ii).

Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Papers, Memorials, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 852 (i).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12565, 13220 (vii).

Man. Lands owned by Govt., Number of Acres, &c. (Ques.) 1288 (i).

Montreal Harbour, Expenditure *re* Docks and Elevators (M. for ret.*) 2170 (ii).

——— (Ques.) 1683 (i).

'Neptune,' Cruise in Hudson Bay, on order for Copy of Rep. (wthdn.) 850 (i).

Nolan, Wm. Howard, Issue of Patents to (Ques.) 8182 (iv).

Pelican Lake Channel, Opening of (Ques.) 1940 (i).

Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4976 (iii).

——— (demurrage) B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3366 (ii).

Railway Building to Fort Churchill, &c., Cor., Documents, &c. (M. for copies*) 1689 (i).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1367 (i).

Selkirk Fish Hatchery, Failure *re* Spawn Supply (Ques.) 3240 (ii).

Squatters on Forest Reserves in Turtle Mountain (remarks) 4739 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Dom. Lands (coal lands) 10074; (surveys) 10007 (v).

Immigration (agents) 9866; (deportations) 9882 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8519; (Emerson) 8534; (Neepawa) 8540; (St. Boniface) 8566; (Selkirk) 8547 (v); (Winnipeg, hospital) 10964 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Glencoe) 7490 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 8582 (v).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2655 (ii).

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10696 (vi).

Turtle Mountain Timber Reserve (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7647 (iv).

SCHELL, Mr. J. T., *Glengarry.*

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11389 (vi).

Cornwall Canal, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12198 (vii).

SCHELL, Mr. J. T.—*Con.*

Dredging Contracts, Supplies, &c. (remarks) 7106 (iv).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13264 (vii).

Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13298 (vii).

G.T.P., Construction Tenders, Total Amounts, &c. (M. for ret.) 600 (i).

——— Cost of Construction, on M. for Sup., 12677 (vii).

——— Hodgins, Major, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 12364 (vii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 4997 (iii).

Quebec and Lake St. John (branch lines) Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13300 (vii).

Quebec and N. B. Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com on Res., 13291 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Canals—Welland (electric lighting) 12198; (Port Colborne) 12221 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Midland and Tiffin) 12126 (vii).

Railways—I.C.R. (piping) 10195 (v).

Transportation Facilities (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12221 (vii).

Wheat Transportation from N.W., Financial Aid by Govt., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2188 (ii).

SCHELL, Mr. M. S., *Oxford S.*

Budget, The, 5616, 5957 (iii).

Canada Weather Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 37) 1°*, 753 (i); in Com., 5174 (iii).

Co-Operative Societies B. 5 (Mr. Monk) on M. for 2°, 4563; in Com., 4564 (iii).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10835 (vi).

Fruit Marks Act Inspection Sale B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 10560 (vi).

Senate Reform, on prop. Res. (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 1550 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 12598 (vii).

SIFTON, Hon. C., *Brandon.*

All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12439 (vii).

Brockville and Ottawa Ry. Connections, Charges against Ry. Commission (remarks) 1435 (i).

Budget, The, 5338 (iii).

Imperial Pulp Co., Denial re Managing Directorship, Par. in Montreal 'Star,' Ques. of Priv., 3578 (ii).

SIFTON, Hon. C.—*Con.*

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, Govt. Aid (M.) to adjn., 1349 (i).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2595 (ii).

SINCLAIR, Mr. J. H., *Guysborough.*

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7670 (iv).

Budget, The, 6615 (iv).

Can. Ensign: *See* 'Red,' &c.

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 183 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 12854 (vii).

Coasting Privileges, prop. Res. (Mr. Black) withdrawn, 2795 (ii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Paterson) in Com., 11986 (vi).

Debates of the House, Average Cost per Column (Ques.) 3479 (ii).

Fisheries Act (trials) Amt. Bill, on M. to introduce, 508 (i).

Fisheries Act Amt. (B. 31) 1°*, 562 (i); in Com., 5248 (iii).

Fisheries Com., Sel. Standing, Apptmt. of (prop. res.) 1691 (i).

Fisheries in Mar. Provs., Violation of Act (M. for ret.*) 1513 (i).

Fishery Officers Jurisdiction, Convictions, Fines, &c. (M. for ret.*) 4247 (iii).

Fisheries Regulations, Violations of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5781 (iii).

I.C.R., Hanlon's Crossing Accident, Investigation *re* (M. for papers*) 5800 (iii).

Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3027 (ii).

N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference by Dom. Govt., on M. (Mr. Foster) 3680 (ii).

Northwest and Gold Dredging Co., Leases, assigned, &c. (Ques.) 11702 (vi).

Postal Revenue, One Cent Rate (Ques.) 8381 (v).

Presbyterian College, Halifax (B. 154) in Com., 7667 (iv).

Red Ensign, Flying on Merchant Vessels, Authority *re* (uQes.) 12775 (vii).

Shipping, Statistics *re* Tons Registered, &c. (Ques.) 2790 (ii).

SUPPLY—

House of Commons (contingencies) 10503 (vi).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 4758 (iii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4016, 4169 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 10298 (v).

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 2957; (masters and mates) 2971 (ii).

Railways—I.C.R. (Moncton, additional line) 12761 (vii).

SLOAN, Mr. W., *Comox-Atlin.*

British Columbia Bank incorp. (B. 59) 2° m., 1469 (i).

SLOAN, Mr. W.—*Con.*

'Carlotta G. Cox,' Schr., Seizure, &c.: *See* 'Pelagic Sealing.'

Deep Sea Fisheries on Pacific Coast, Cruiser, &c. (Ques.) 1934 (i).

Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s (B. 15) 1°*, 350 (i).

Japanese Immigration, on Stmt. (Mr. Lemieux) *re* Mission to Japan (remarks) 1611 (i).

Japanese and Oriental Immigration into B.C., Restriction of, on prop. Res. (Mr. R. Smith) 726 (i).

Lighthouse Keepers on Pacific Coast, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 1934 (i).

Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, Seizure of Schr. 'Carlotta G. Cox,' on M. for Sup., 3934 (ii).

——— (notice of motion) *re* Discussion, 3156 (ii).

Vancouver Island and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 87) 1°*, 2160 (ii); in Com., 4545; on Senate Amts., 6189 (iii).

Western Rivers Improvement Co.'s incorp. (B. 55) 1°*, 1108 (i).

Yukon Concession Cases, Appeal from Supreme Court (Ques.) 10301 (vi).

Yukon Telegraph Service to Prince Rupert, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 1934 (i).

SMITH, Mr. E. D., *Wentworth.*

Adulteration of Food, Number of Firms penalized, &c. (Ques.) 4402 (iii).

Budget, The, 5375, 5388 (iii).

Burlington Channel Lighthouse, Damages to, &c. (Ques.) 5467 (iii).

Burlington Channel Repairs, Apptmt. of Foreman, &c. (Ques.) 4403 (iii).

Canada and France SS Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6203 (iii).

Cold Storage Plants, Construction of, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 236 (i).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3523; in Com., 3595, 3645 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Treaty, Maximum and Minimum Rate, &c. (Ques.) 178 (i).

Fruit Inspection, in Closed Packages, &c. (Ques.) 2981 (ii).

Militia Food Supply, Inquiry for Ret., 3042 (ii).

Railway Act (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3346 (ii).

Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 4979 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Excise (travelling expenses) 815 (i).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5774 (iii).

Militia (stores, &c.) 5739 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (mint) 1477; (museum) 1498 (i).

SMITH, Mr. G., *Oxford, N.*
Address, The, 407 (i).
Senate Reform, on prop. Res. (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 1555 (i).
Technical Education, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 2866 (ii).

SMITH, Mr. R., *Nanaimo.*
Brantford Stove Works Strike, Arrest *re* Picketing (remarks) 9027 (v).
Canada-Australia SS. Service, Yearly Subsidies, &c. (Ques.) 1289 (i).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10548, 10745 (vi).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11373 (vi).
Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9192 (v).
Coal Land Leases, Applicants *re* (Ques.) 2395 (ii).
Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4685 (iii).
Dunsmuir, Hon. Mr., Lt. Gov. of B.C., Assent to Natal Act, Dom. Interference (remarks) 1738 (i).
Esquimalt and Halifax Garrison, Equipment, &c. (Ques.) 1293 (i).
——— Transfer to Canada (Ques.) 1293 (i).
Fisheries, B.C., Negotiations *re* with Mr. Bastedo, Reports *re* (remarks) 6849 (iv).
G.T.P. Workmen Accidents, &c. (remarks) 10624 (vi).
Immigrant Inspection on Ships, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 1289 (i).
Immigrants stranded at St. Thomas, Deportation of (Ques.) 567 (i).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6449 (iv).
Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6729, 7097 (iv).
Indian Dept., Extravagant Management, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11029 (vi).
Japanese Colony in the West, C.P.R. Application *re* (Ques.) 7196 (iv).
Japanese Immigration Act, Disallowance of *re* B.C. (Ques.) 6642 (iv).
——— Natal Act, Cor., &c., with Lt. Gov., B.C. (M. for copies*) 2170 (ii).
Japanese and Oriental Immigration into B.C., Restriction of (prop. Res.) 699 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2081 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for O.Cs., &c., 874 (i).
Labour Disputes Bill, Applications, &c., *re* Settlement (M. for ret.*) 605 (i).
Mail Service in B.C., Better Arrangements *re* (remarks) 3754 (ii).

SMITH, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4691 (iii); on M. for 3° (M.) to ref. back to Com., 12053 (vii).
Old Age Pension Scheme, on M. (Mr. Pringle) for Sel. Com., 2419 (ii).
Railway Act (working hours) Amt. (B. 157) 1° m., 6843 (iv).
Shipping Companies on Pacific Coast, Amounts of Subsidies, &c. (Ques.) 6919 (iv).
Spratte, Hattie, Relief (B. 182) 1°*, 9889 (v).
SUPPLY—
Dom. Lands (coal lands) 10066 (v).
Militia (annual drill) 5740 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Ladysmith) 10867; (Quesnel) 10868 (vi).

SPEAKER, Mr. (Hon. R. F. Sutherland), *Essex, N.*
Address, The, on Amt. (Mr. Barker) Remarks, 530 (i).
Adjournment of the House, on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4495 (iii).
Advertisements for Tenders for Govt. Works, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) Irrelevancy of Debate, 4730 (iii).
Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) Members addressing Hse. from their Seats without rising (remarks) 10922 (vi).
Banking System, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pringle) Members remarks checked, 2307 (ii).
Battlefields of Canada B. 111, on M. for 3°, 4530 (iii).
Belleville City Floods, Investigation *re*, Members remarks checked, 3319 (ii).
Belleville and North Hastings Ry., &c., on Qes. of Order (Mr. German) 2809; (ruling) 2810 (ii).
Bills, Royal Assent, Mess. from His Ex., 2974, 2995 (ii), 5135, 6157 (iii), 6526 (iv), 10656 (vi).
——— Mess. from Senate, 13587 (vii).
Brantford Stove Works Strike (remarks) 9027 (v).
Cigarette Restraint B. (Mr. Aylesworth) on Senate Amts., 13045 (vii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11363, 11535, 11645 (vi).
Civil Service Commission Report, Discussion *re*, Ques. of Order (ruling) 5627-8 (iii).
Colchester Electoral District, Certificate (notification) 680 (i).
Criminal Code Amendments, on Ques. of Order (ruling) 9282 (v).
Cyr, Mr., Letter from, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) (ruling) 8461 (v).
Debates, Official, Rep. of Com., Conc. without Notice (remarks) 8896 (v).

SPEAKER, Mr.—*Con.*

Documents in Depts., Access to Originals, Members remarks checked, 1195 (i), 2305 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 115) on Senate Amts., 13579 (vii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster)—(ruling) 11717 (vi).

——— on M. for 3°, Ques. of Order, 13247 (vii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to M. for 3° (ruling) 11977 (vi), 12394 (vii).

Dredging Contracts, O.C., Rule *re* Producing, 6927 (iv).

——— Ref. to Matters before Committee (ruling) 6749 (iv).

Easter Adjournment (remarks) 6843 (iv).

Eclipse Mfg. Co., Irrelevancy of Debate (ruling) 7470 (iv).

Electoral Districts, Certificates of Election (notification) 890 (i).

Electoral District of Nicolet, Certificate of Election (notification) 1283 (i).

Electoral District, Vacancies, Issue of Writs (notifications) 2 (i).

Election, New Members, Certificates of Election (notification) 2 (i).

Election Petitions, Supreme Court Judgments (presented) 1 (i).

Fire Extinguishers Ret., Members remarks checked, 4833 (iii).

——— Irrelevancy of debate, 7776 (iv).

French Language, Pet. *re*, Ques of Order, 8886 (v).

Govt. Grounds, Conditions *re*, Members remarks checked, 1741 (i).

G.T. Ry. Co.'s B. 89, Members remarks checked, 2254 (ii).

G.T.P. Branch Lines B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) on Ques. of Order (Mr. Pugsley)—(ruling) 8136 (iv).

G.T.P. Supplies via American Routes, Member's remarks checked, 9026 (v).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25, in Com., on Ruling to ref. back to Com., 3362 (ii).

——— on M. for 3°, 4542 (iii).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10491 (vi).

Huron, South Riding, Certificate of Election (notification) 2541 (ii).

——— Vacancy, &c. (notification) 890 (i).

Immigration Bonuses, on Ques. of Order (ruling) 1299 (i).

Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale of, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) Member's remarks checked, 13137 (vii).

SPEAKER, Mr.—*Con.*

Indian Lands in Algoma, *re* Mr. Sifton's Telegram (remarks) 13532 (vii).

Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 8 (i).

Japanese Immigration, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) *re* Attacks on Prov. Govt. (ruling) 1763 (i).

Library of Parlt., Joint Rep. (presented) 6 (i).

Man. Voters' Lists, Affidavits quoted by Member (ruling) *re* Laying on Table, 7948 (iv).

Marine and Fisheries Dept., Misconduct of Officials, Member's remarks checked, 6633

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr .Fisher) on M. for 3°, Member's remarks checked, 7217 (iv).

——— on M. (Mr. Blain) to ref. back to Com., 7227 (iv).

Members introduced, 3 (i).

Mess. from His Ex. (read) 5134 (iii).

——— Suppl. Estimates (read) 12503 (vii).

Moir, Private, Shooting, &c., Member's remarks checked, 7322 (iv).

Montmagny, Electoral District (Notification) Vacancy, 9263 (v).

Montreal Liquor Licenses, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fisher), Appeal to the Speaker, 4070; (ruling) 4071; Agreed to (Y. 59; N. 23) 4071 (ii).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on Amts. (ruling) 9503 (v).

Motions, Unopposed, and Business of the Hse. (remarks) 8896 (v).

Obstruction *re* Supply, &c., on Ques. of Order (ruling) 9925 (v).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Johnston) 10024 (v).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) to Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross)—(ruling) 10025, 10031 (v).

Opening of Parliament, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 1 (i).

Order Paper, French and English Editions (remarks) 6741 (iv).

Order, Ques. of, re answering Questions by Govt. (ruling) 234 (i).

Peace Interparliamentary Union, Meeting in Ottawa, Com. from Senate (read) 13581 (vii).

Petit Rocher Wharf, Discussion *re* (ruling) 9717 (v).

Petition, on M. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to introduce, 1682 (i).

Postal Arrangements between Can. and U. S., Member's remarks checked, 3164 (ii).

P.E.I. Ry. Harmony-Elmira Branch B. 202 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 2°, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Hughes) 12629 (vii).

SPEAKER, Mr.—*Con.*

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Removal of Steamers from Georgetown Route, Discussion of (remarks) 1109 (i).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Member's remarks checked, 4496 (iii).

Priv., Ques. of (Mr. A. Lavergne) Member's remarks checked, 7993 (iv).

Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (read) 13580 (vii).

——— Mess. from Senate, 13587 (vii).

Public Accounts Com., Investigations, on Ques. of Order (ruling) 3085 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. Johnston) to conc. in 3rd Rep., 9890 (v).

Public Works, Dep. Minister and French Canadians, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Robitaille) 8465 (v).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) Member's remarks checked, 4910 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Talbot) 4958 (iii).

Quebec Bridge Rep., on Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 13401 (vii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Talbot) 13402 (vii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 13403 (vii).

Quebec County Expenditures (remarks) *re* Question, 3847 (ii).

Quebec Tercentenary, Joint Meeting of Members and Senators (remarks) 6061 (iii).

Ques. of Order, *re* Accepting Minister's Stmnt. (ruling) 9352 (v).

Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bennett) Member's remarks checked, 2382 (ii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Johnston) (ruling) 2383 (ii).

Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Reid)—(remarks) 9774 (v).

Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Daniel) *re* Representation of Mar. Provs. (remarks) 9892 (v).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 118, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden)—(ruling) 11618 (vi).

——— on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 11602 (vi).

Ry. Act (level crossings) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) ref. to deb. in Senate (ruling) 577 (i).

Railway Commissioners' Board Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8511 (v).

Ry. Connections at Brockville, on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Taylor) Remarks checked, 9 (i).

Returns, Retention of by Members, on Ques. of Priv., Member's remarks checked, 4667 (iii).

Seed Grain Distribution, Member's remarks checked, 6635 (iv).

SPEAKER, Mr.—*Con.*

Seed Grain Distribution, Apptmt. of Mr. R. A. E. Leech, Discussion ruled out of Order, 3041 (ii).

Speech from the Throne (read) 3 (i).

Supplies purchased for Govt., on Ques. of Order (Mr. Johnston) 5830, (ruling) 5831 (iii).

——— Member's remarks checked, 5837 (iii).

SUPPLY—

House of Commons (Clerk of Crown in Chancery) 10508; (contingencies) 10502; (salaries) 10491, 10501 (vi); (salary, increases) 13562 (vii); (Sergeant-at-Arms) 10503 (vi).

Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) Member's remarks checked, 1064 (i).

Senate (salaries, &c.) 10489 (vi).

Timber Berths, on M. for Original Documents (remarks) 2984 (ii).

——— on Ques. of Order, *re* Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Turrig)—(ruling) 11304 (vi).

Tobacco Prohibition, Resolution *re* Moral Reform Associations, Member's remarks checked, 11302 (vi).

Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on Ques. of Order *re* Amt. (Mr. Barker) (ruling) 923 (i).

Vacancies in Electoral District (notification) 2 (i).

Vacancy in Stanstead, Issue of Writ (notification) 569 (i).

York, Centre, Electoral District, Certificate of Election (notification) 1018 (i).

SPEAKER, DEP. (Mr. C. Marcil) *Bonaventure.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11828 (vi).

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, Member's remarks checked, 5025 (iii).

G.T.P. Branch Lines B. 151, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Pugsley) ref. to Speaker, 8135 (iv).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3717 (ii).

Harbours and Rivers, N.S., Member's remarks checked, 11290 (vi).

Lord's Day Act, Violations *re* Horse Racing, Member's remarks checked, 3753 (ii).

Montreal Liquor Licenses, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fisher) 4066 (ii).

N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference by Dom. Govt., Discussion *re* M. to adjn., 3656 (ii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 5076 (iii).

Ocean and River Service, Irrelevancy of debate, 2943 (ii).

Order, Ques. of, Irrelevancy of Debate (ruling) 10993 (vi).

SPEAKER, DEP.—*Con.*

P.E.I. Ry., Harmony-Elmira Branch Ry. B. 202, Member's remarks checked, 12632 (vii).

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Talbot) *re* Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen,' Member's remarks checked, 4222 (iii).

Restaurant Com., Joint, 1st Rep. (presented) 13510 (vii).

Royal Mint, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fielding) in Com. of Sup. (ruling) 1461 (i).

School Statutes, Saskatchewan Prov. (remarks) 6854 (iv).

Tobacco, Violation of Act, in Com. of Sup. (ruling) on Ques. of Order (Mr. Talbot) 9250 (v).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S., *Grey, E.*

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3855, 3880 (ii).

Anglo-American Treaties, Inquiry for Cor., 10120 (v).

Architects Institute of Canada incorp. B. 88 (Mr. Walsh) in Com., 5379 (iii).

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 134 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 2°. 5763 (iii).

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s Bridge Construction, in Com. on Res., 13307 (vii).

Bait Freezer at North Sydney, Govt. Assistance *re* Construction (Ques.) 3848 (ii).

Banking Act Amts., on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 4272 (iii).

Bank Act Amt. B. 160 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 10923; in Com., 10933 (vi).

Banking Systems, Criticisms of Newspaper Report, Ques. of Privilege, 2308 (ii).

Battlefields of Quebec, Tercentenary at Quebec B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 3902 (ii); on M. for 2°, 4388; in Com., 4415, 4511; on M. for 3°, 4532 (iii).

Belleville and North Hastings Ry. and G.T. Ry. Co., on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Cor., 2810 (ii).

Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 7670 (iv), 8552 (v).

Bills of Exchange Act Amt. B. 142 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 6521 (iv).

Bobcaygeon Dam, Flooding of Highways, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2994 (ii).

Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5950 (iii).

Bonusing System, on Notice of Motion (remarks) 6290 (iv).

Boundary Surveys (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9740 (v).

Budget, The, 6595 (iv).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6171, 6173 (iii); in Com., 6408 (iv).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4231 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 67 (Mr. Pardee) on Senate Amts., 5955 (iii).

C.P.R., Papineauville Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13304 (vii).

C.P.R., Saskatchewan Bridge Construction, in Com. on Res., 13305 (vii).

Canned Goods Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6872 (iv).

Catholics and Public Offices, Ref. to Speech in the Senate, Ques. of Priv., 5047 (iii).
See 'Employees.'

Cement Testing Laboratory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11251 (vi).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10749, 11021 (vi).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5114 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 10721; in Com., 11366, 11536, 11635 (vi), 12184 (vii).

Civil Service Commission Report, Number distributed (remarks) 6060 (iii).

—— Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. Hse., 5901 (iii).

—— Report (remarks) 5628, 5633 (iii).

Civil Service System, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9162 (v).

Colonization Lands, Alienation of, Inquiry for Ret., 3752 (ii), 4317 (iii).

Co-Operative Societies B. 5 (Mr. Monk) on M. for 2°, 4556 (iii).

Criminal Code (ry. mortgages) Amt. B. 212 (Mr. Aylesworth) on Senate Amts., 13317

Criminal Code (trade restraint) Amt. B. 96 (Mr. Gervais) on M. for 1°, 2976 (ii).

Customs and Trade Returns, Duplicate Printing, &c., on M. for Sup. (remarks) 9736 (v).

Cyr, Mr., Letter from *re* Statement of Members, Ruling *re*, 8462 (v).

Detroit River Tunnel, &c., on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10487 (vi).

Documents in Depts., Access to Original Papers, on M. (Mr. Ames) 1147, 1194 (i).

—— Production of to Members, on M. for Sup., 1782 (i).

Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 50 (Mr. Copp) in Com., 4231 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 3°, 13244; (amt.) to M. for 3°. 13255 (vii).

Dom. Lands (surveys) B. 9 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 755 (i).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11466 (vi).

Dom. Notes (grain advances) Issue B. 159 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10815, 10820 (vi).

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5027 (iii).

Doukhobors at Yorkton, Violation of Laws (remarks) 7639 (iv).

Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6755 (iv).

——— (remarks) 6633 (iv).

Dry Docks Construction B. 119 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6912 (iv).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13266; in Com. on Res., 13278 (vii).

Employees of Parliament and Printing Bureau, Names, Salaries, Religions, &c. (Ques.) 5206 (iii).

——— (M. for ret.) 5479 (iii).

Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13297 (vii).

Financial Review, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 13470 (vii).

Fire Extinguishers, Purchase by Govt., on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) 7664 (iv).

——— Cor. quoted by Minister, Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7774 (iv).

Fisheries Treaty, Boundaries with U. S., Information *re* (remarks) 6632, 6739 (iv).

Fishing Rights in Matane River, &c. (Ques.) 7446 (iv).

Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, Apptmt. to Hague Tribunal (remarks) 8294 (v).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3618, 3636 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty, on Preparation of Stmnt. *re* Duty Units (remarks) 945 (i).

Fruit Marks Inspection and Sale B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 10554 (vi).

Fruit Inspection (apples) Complaints *re* (remarks) 2754 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3623, 3794 (ii), 4230 (iii).

Gold and Silver Marking B. 197 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12556 (vii).

Govt. Business, Precedence on Mondays (remarks) 6287 (iv).

——— Precedence *re* Motion for Want of Confidence (remarks) 6917 (iv).

Govt. Officials and Municipal Elections, Interference *re*, on M. for Sup., 2890 (ii).

G.T.P. Branch Lines B. 151 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 8552, 8744, 9461 (v).

G.T.P. Guarantee Bonds B. 171 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 8836 (v).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

G.T.P., Investigation *re* Charges of Major Hodgins, on 1st Rep. of Com., 8515 (v).

——— Montreal Branch, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13301 (vii).

——— Policy *re* Police Patrol (remarks) 7997 (iv).

G. T. Ry. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2241 (ii).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 4224; on M. for 3°, 4536 (iii).

'Hansard,' Extra Copies, Distribution of (remarks) 9131 (v).

Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Neglect of Duty as Inspector at Halifax (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6647 (iv).

Hindus in B. C., Protests *re* Treatment (remarks) 5490 (iii).

Hogs saughtered, Compensations paid, &c. (remarks) 13094 (vii).

Horses and Cattle, Imports to U. S. as Thoroughbreds, Prevention of (Ques.) 6000 (iii).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10492 (vi).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Knowles) 6302 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6434 (iv).

Immigration Bonuses, on Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 1299 (i).

Immigration from England, Statements of Mr. Walker and Mr. Smith (remarks) 5491 (iii).

Immigants stranded in Toronto (remarks) 429 (i).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. B. 143 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 6475, 6482 (iv).

Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6901 (iv).

Insurance Act Amt. B. 42 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 1743 (i).

I.C.R., Employees, Circular from Genl. Manager *re* Municipal Politics (read) 2304 (ii).

——— Employees and Municipal Councils (remarks) 2309 (ii).

——— Employees and Municipal Elections, Circular *re* (remarks) 2884 (ii).

——— Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4484 (iii).

Irrigation Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 768, 953 (i).

Japanese Immigration, Restriction of, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2133 (ii).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Japanese Immigration, B. C. Legislation, on M. for Sup., 1759 (i).
Lands set apart for Settlement since 1896, (M. for ret.*) 2796 (ii).
Lands Titles Act Assurance Fund B. 168 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res. 8481 (v).
Lands Titles Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6518 (iv).
Lands withdrawn for Settlement or Colonization Purposes, &c. (Ques.) 2393 (ii).
Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 10953 (vi).
MacIlreith, Mr., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7177 (iv).
Mackenzie, Mr. Wm., Par. in 'Globe' *re* Apptmt. (remarks) 6985 (iv).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12571 (vii).
Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13290 (vii).
Marine and Fisheries Book-keeping, &c., ref. to Com. of Sup., 4007 (ii).
Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 7403 (iv).
——— Delays, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn. House, 8454 (v).
Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 3020; in Com., 3035 (ii).
Meaford Harbour B. 158 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8510 (v).
Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 6895, 7238; on M. for 3°, 7218 (iv).
Meat and Food Inspection Act, Names and Number of Establishments, &c. (Ques.) 1505 (i).
——— (M. for ret.*) 1690 (i).
Militia Dept., and Civil Service Commissioners' Rep. (remarks) 12546 (vii).
Montreal Liquor Licenses, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fisher) 4065 (ii).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3451 (ii).
Morning Sittings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9477 (v).
Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9495 (v)
Niagara, St Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 5067 (iii); on Senate Amts., 10511 (vi).
Nipigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13289 (vii).
Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4031 (iii); in Com., 12054 (vii).
Orangemen and Quebec Provincial Elections, Ministerial Speeches (remarks) 10126 (v).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Orange Order and Quebec Prov. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10355 (vi).
Order Paper, Differences in English and French Editions (remarks) 6740, 6850 (iv).
Pacific and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 138 (Mr. Dyment) in Com., 9070 (v).
Pardoning Power *re* Criminals, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 2837 (ii).
Patent and Proprietary Medicines, B. 146 (Mr. Templeman) on M. for 2°, 10552 (vi).
Peace River Col. and Land Development Co., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to Com. of Sup., 10412 (vi).
Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, on M. (Mr. Sloan) to Com. of Sup., 3979 (ii).
Petit Rocher Wharf, Inquiry for missing Papers (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9722 (v).
Pork, Fresh, Quantity imported for Home Consumption (Ques.) 5650 (iii).
Port Credit Harbour, Expenditure *re* (remarks) 10513 (vi).
Presbyterian Ministers', Widows' and Orphans' Funds, B. 23 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 2788 (ii).
Prescott Lighthouse Station, Presentation to Dr. W. C. Brown (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 985 (i).
Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigations, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3097 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 3084 (ii).
Public Buildings, Erection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7191 (iv).
Quebec Bridge, Dom. Govt. Guarantee, Amount, &c. (Ques.) 2394 (ii).
Quebec Bridge Rep., on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 13403 (vii).
Quebec, Montreal and Southern Ry. Co., Bridge Construction Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13306 (vii).
Quebec Tercentenary, Attendance of Militia (remarks) 8696 (v).
Railway Act (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3376 (ii).
Railway Commission (asst. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3903 (ii); in Com., 8512 (v).
——— on M. to introduce, 3751 (ii).
——— B. 118 (Mr. Graham) on Amt. (Mr R. L. Borden) to M. for 3°, 11630 (vi)
Railway Subsidies B. 215 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13285 (vii).
Ry. Subsidies, Bridge Subsidies (remarks) in Com., 13309 (vii).
Rhindress, Dr. Horace, Salary, &c. (Ques) 6000 (iii), 6232 (iv).
Rules of the House, Amendments to, on prop. Res. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 2988 (ii).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Saskatchewan Power Co.'s B. 153 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 7677 (iv), 8562, 9068 (v).
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. McIntyre) in Com., 4232 (iii).
School Lands Exchange B 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 8470; in Com., 8478 (v).
Seed Grain Bill, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2781 (ii).
Seed Grain for Settlers in Man., &c., in Com. of Sup., 2773 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2922 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adn., 1361 (i).
Seed Grain Distribution, Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 10122 (v).
——— (remarks) *re* Purchases, 3158 (ii).
Seed Wheat, Delegation *re* (remarks) 1740 (i).
Sharbot Lake and Bathurst Station, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13288 (vii).
Shipping Rings, Combination *re*, Cor., &c. (read) 5916 (iii).
Shortt, Prof., Amounts paid *re* Industrial Disputes (Ques.) 4765 (iii).
Shuswap and Thompson River Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5416 (iii).
Smith, Mr. W. Maxwell, Dom. Fruit Inspector Salary, &c. (Ques.) 2393 (ii), 5085 (iii).
——— (M. for copies) 2398 (ii).
S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3761, 3832 (ii), 12595 (vii).
Stanstead Election Papers, Disappearance of, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 8849 (v).
Supplies purchased by Govt., Apptmt. of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5865 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Agriculture (exhibitions) 10569, 10597 (vi); (seed branch) 5502 (iii).
Canals—Lachine (repairs) 5673; (slope walls) 5664 (iii).
Canals—Welland (Port Colborne) 12217; (surveys) 12210 (vii).
Civil Govt.—Interior (astronomical survey) 9740 (v).
Excise (methylated spirits) 820; (travelling expenses) 815 (i).
Experimental Farms (salaries) 12549 (vii).
House of Commons (Library of Parlt.) 10503 (vi); (salary increases) 13562 (vii).
Immigration (agents) 13169 (vii).
Indians—N.B. (schools) 13171 (vii).
Interior—Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5757 (iii).
Justice (Exchequer Court) 5505 (iii).
Legislation (provincial voters' lists) 10508
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5773; (Thunder Bay ice-breaker) 5043 (iii).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 3986 (ii).
Militia (annual drill) 5741 (iii), 10290 (v); (pay and allowance) 12546 (vii).
Miscellaneous (seed grain) 2773 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 3220 (ii); (Govt. steamers) 5765 (iii); (ice-breakers) 2948, 2949; (naval schools) 3222; (obstructions) 3214; (tidal service) 3215; (wrecks) 3184, 3195; (wrecking plant subsidies) 3221 (ii).
Penitentiaries (maintenance) 5510 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings — Dom. (rents, &c.) 10981 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8519; (Emerson) 8535; (Neepawa) 8541; (Selkirk) 8550; (Winnipeg, immigration) 8574; (Winnipeg, warehouse) 8567 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Halifax customs) 7168; (Shelburne) 7177; (Yarmouth) 7180 (iv).
Public Works—Ont. (Belleville armoury) 7455; (Guelph armoury) 7678; (Hamilton drill hall) 7692; (Kincardine) 7698; (Kingston, artillery park) 7702; (Kingston, gun shed) 7700; (Kingston, R.M.C.) 7704; (Leamington) 7705; (London, military) 7707; (Markham) 7709; (North Bay) 7715 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Major's Hill Park) 11015; (rents, &c.) 10983; (repairs, furniture, &c.) 10981 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings — Que. (Cookshire) 7281; (dominion arsenal) 7435; (Farnham) 7288; (Montreal barracks) 7407; (Montreal, examining warehouse) 7423; (Montreal, post office) 7410; (Montreal, station C) 7422; (Quebec, drill hall) 7431; (St. John's military) 7440; (St. Rochs) 7439 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Sask. and Alta. (Humbolt) 8586; (Maple Creek) 8601; (Medicine Hat) 8601; (Prince Albert penitentiary) 8601, 8602; (Regina) 8602 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (maintenance) 11005 (vi).
Public Works—Dredging—Mar. Provs. (new plant) 12142 (vii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Midland and Tiffin) 12114 (vii).
Public Works—Marine Dept. (gratuities) 13322 (vii).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11079 (vi).
Public Works—Slides and Booms (surveys) 11076 (vi).
Public Works—Telegraph Lines (Marconi) 12143 (vii).
Quarantine (Public health) 5505 (iii).
Railways—Generally (extra clerks) 10342 (vi).
Railways—I.C.R. (supplies) 10188; (Windsor branch) 10145 (v).
Railways—Miscellaneous (litigation) 10358 (vi).
Railways—Ry. Commission (legal expenses) 10362; (maintenance, &c.) 10385 (vi).
Senate—(salaries, &c.) 10489 (vi).

Supply, Conc., 5499 (iii).
Technical Education, Commission of Inquiry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Guthrie) 2864 (ii).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10701 (vi).

Trans-Canada Ry. Co.'s B. 107 (Mr. Girard) in Com., 5387 (iii).

Travelling Expenses of Minister of Marine, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1001 (i).

Torrens Land Title Fund, (remarks) 10917 (vi).

Trent Canal, Newmarket (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10315 (vi).

Vancouver Island and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 87 (Mr. Sloan) in Com., 4545 (iii).

Ways and Means (tobacco) 6122 (iii).

Wheat Transportation from N. W., Financial Aid by Govt., Cor., &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) for copies, 2177 (ii).

Yukon Act Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10536 (vi).

Yukon Administration, Charges of Dr. John Pringle, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9655 (v).

——— Clements, W. H. P., Apptmt. as Legal Adviser, O.Cs., Reps., &c. (M. for copies*) 5801 (iii).

——— (Ques.) 5650 (iii).

Yukon—Moral Reform, Letter of Rev. Dr. Shearer, Inquiry for, 10623, 10689, 11016 (vi).

Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8483 (v).

STANFIELD, Mr. J., *Colchester.*

Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 12647 (vii).

Canso Medical Officer, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 6646 (iv).

——— Successor to Dr. Brine, &c. (Ques.) 1735 (i).

Coasting Trade *re* Norwegian Ships (Ques.) 6237 (iv).

——— O.Cs. *re* Foreign Vessels, &c. (Ques.) 4586 (iii).

'D. H. Thomas,' Tug, Dom. Subsidy Grant (Ques.) 8184 (iv).

Doyle, P., Immigration Agents, Superannuation of (Ques.) 6923 (iv).

Govt. Steamers, Captains' Residences, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3241 (ii).

Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Political Interference, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6649 (iv).

Hunter, Henry C., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1292 (i), 3236 (ii).

I.C.R., Compensation *re* Horses Killed at Truro (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13174 (vii).

I.C.R., Employees, Increased Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 2981 (ii).

——— Ice Contract (Ques.) 5259 (iii).

——— Ice supplied by J. A. McDonald, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 7446 (iv).

STANFIELD, Mr. J.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Oxford and Pictou Branch, Total Expenditure *re* Construction (Ques.) 10733 (vi).

——— Pictou Branch, Transfer from Halifax to Sydney Division, &c. (Ques.) 12773 (vii).

——— Pictou Branch, Answer to Question (remarks) 12661 (vii).

——— Pictou to Copper Crown Co., Total Expenditure *re*, &c. (Ques.) 10733 (vi).

——— Pictou Station, Concrete Sidewalk, Total Cost of Construction (Ques.) 10789 (vi).

——— Revenue from Terminals, &c. (Ques.) 5471 (iii).

——— Stellarton to Pictou, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 10734 (vi).

——— Tatamagouche, Delay of Trains, &c. (Ques.) 1292 (i).

——— Ties delivered, Change *re* Inspection (Ques.) 12052 (vii).

——— Truro Buildings, Name of Tenderers, &c. (Ques.) 6233 (iv).

——— Truro Engine House, Contract to Rhodes & Co. (Ques.) 1936 (i).

——— Truro Ry. Station, Sanitary Condition, &c. (Ques.) 7211 (iv).

Legal Agents in Mar. Provs., Names, &c. (Ques.) 4768 (iii).

Londonderry and Bass River Mail Service, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 2980 (ii).

Louisburg Bait Freezer, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 4406 (iii).

Mail from Canada to Europe, Quantity arrived, &c. (Ques.) 12653 (vii).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12813 (vii).

'Midland Times,' Truro, Amounts paid for Advertisements, &c. (Ques.) 3235 (ii).

Militia, Apptmts. of Generals, Names and Qualifications (Ques.) 5036 (iii).

Newspaper Mail Regulations, Complaints *re* Delivery, &c. (Ques.) 11298 (vi).

Pictou P. O. Building, Concrete Sidewalk, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 10518 (vi).

Port Mulgrave, N.S., Wharfs, Preventing Boats landing Cargoes (Ques.) 9274 (v).

Port au Pique Mail Contracts, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 3232 (ii).

Port South Bar, C.B., Vessels entered for Customs, &c. (Ques.) 9271 (v).

Ry. Surveys, Colchester County, Subsidies, &c. (Ques.) 2980 (ii).

Skinner's Cove Boat Channel, Expenditures *re* (Ques.) 10012 (v).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12599 (vii).

Southvale, N.S., Removal of Post Office, Pets. *re* (Ques.) 4829 (iii).

STANFIELD, Mr. J.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Canals—Lachine (Richard, Jos., compensation) 13174 (vii).

Customs—Inspectors (salaries) 9577 (v).

Dom. Lands (Rocky Mountain Park) 9991 (v).

Marine (ice-breakers) 1908 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 7117; (Halifax, customs) 7161; (Shelburne) 7173 (iv); (Tatamagouche) 11291 (vi); (Westville) 7179 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (St. Henri) 7439; (Sherbrooke, drill hall) 7439 (iv).

Railways—I.C.R. (Pictou) 5559; (rolling stock) 5551 (iii); (salaries) 10180 (v); (Truro) 12231 (vii).

Sydney to Sydney Mines Branch Ry., Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 7201 (iv).

Tatamagouche, Dredging, Pets. *re* (Ques.) 11701 (vi).

Tenders, Advertisements for (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7477 (iv).

Toney River Boat Harbour, Amount of Contract, Extras, &c. (Ques.) 9711 (v).

Trap-Net Licenses issued to John A. Webster, Payments *re* (Ques.) 7204 (iv).

Truro Armoury, Estimate for Heating and Electric Wiring (Ques.) 3429 (ii).

Truro, N.S., Tax Bill, &c. (Ques.) 3480 (ii).

Westport, N.S., Installation of Marine Alarms, &c. (Ques.) 9274 (v).

Westville, N.S., Public Buildings, Total Amount of Contract, &c. (Ques.) 9474 (v).

Wool, Raw, Quantity imported into Canada (Ques.) 5201 (iii).

STAPLES, Mr. W. D., *Macdonald.*

Address, The, 383 (i).

Bank Act Amendments, on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 4297 (iii).

Brass, Quantity and Quality of Imports into Can. (Ques.) 6232 (iv).

Buffalo Herd, Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10104 (v).

Cattle Embargo in G. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12881 (vii).

Cattle exported to U. S., Fees *re* Thoroughbreds (remarks) 2769 (ii).

Cypress Hills Homestead Lands, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9991 (v).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8387 (v).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 11143; in Com., 11183, 11489, 11531 (vi).

Doukohobors Homestead Lands, Sale of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9958 (v).

Fence Post Fees, Memorial from Union of Man. Municipalities, &c. (Ques.) 10258 (v).

Grain Commission, Emplymt. of Members, Distribution of Evidence, &c. (Ques.) 3486 (ii).

——— Report (Ques.) 180 (i).

STAPLES, Mr. W. D.—*Con.*

Grain Commission Report, Inqiury for, 609 (i).

Grain Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 203 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 13048, 13209 (vii).

G.T.P. Ry., Medical Fees, Deductions *re* (Ques.) 9473 (v).

Heath Point, Purchase of Cement from A. E. Walberg, &c., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 4773 (iii).

Homestead Entries in Section 27, Cor., Tels., &c. (M. for copies*) 4773 (iii).

House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10495 (vi).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt Construction, on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6379 (iv).

Immigration Hall, East Selkirk, Furniture, &c., Disposal of (Ques.) 6402 (iv).

Judges in Man. and Ont., Salaries B. 206 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 13050 (vii).

'Lady of the Lake,' Str., Crew during Winter, &c. (Ques.) 6403 (iv).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12811 (vii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12559, 13215 (vii).

Obstructions *re* Supply, &c., on M. for Sup. (remarks) 9932 (v).

Playgreen Lake, Conditions *re* Lease, &c. (Ques.) 6403 (iv).

St. Francois Xavier Post Office, Apptmt. of Postmistress, Pet. *re* (Ques.) 5797 (iii).

St. Laurent Harbour, Lake Manitoba (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12141 (vii).

Seed Grain for Man. Settlers, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2771 (ii).

Seed Grain for Northwest Settlers, on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1357 (i).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2930 (ii).

Smith, O. B., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 4765 (iii).

Snag Boat, Red River, Construction of, &c (Ques.) 567, 891 (i).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 12597 (vii)

Supply (seed grain) B. 96, in Com., 2783 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10575 (vi), 12890; (fumigating stations) 12881; (seeds) 12891 (vii); (seed branch) 5503 (iii).

Customs — Miscellaneous (printing, &c.) 9577; (salaries) 9571 (v).

Dom. Lands (forest rangers) 10051 (v).

Immigration (agents) 9880; (agents in U. S.) 9964; (deportations) 9882; (hospitals, Winnipeg) 9982; (literature, &c.) 9950 (v).

Indians—Ont. and Que. (administration) 12729 (vii).

Interior — Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5760 (iii).

STAPLES, Mr. W. D.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4212 (ii).
Miscellaneous (seed grain) 2771 (ii).
Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5529 (iii).
Post Office (inspectors) 13153 (vii).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dauphin) 8521; (Emerson) 8534; (Neepawa) 8539; (Selkirk) 8547 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (heating, &c.) 11011; (rents, &c.) 10983 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Grand Marais) 12140; (Lake Dauphin) 12141; (Winnipegosis Lake) 12141 (vii).
Public Works—Slides and Booms (surveys, &c.) 11071 (vi).
Railways—I.C.R. (supplies) 10199 (v).

Swamp Lands in Manitoba, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10105 (v).
Swan Lake, Indian Reserve, Acquisition of by Govt. (Ques.) 693 (i).
——— Sale of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12729 (vii).
——— Settlement, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 633 (i).
Teulon Immigration Sheds, Number cared for, 1906-7 (Ques.) 892 (i).
Timber Berths, Opening of Tenders, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Turriff) 11307 (vi).
———on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2691 (ii).
Wallberg, Mr. E. A., Contract *re* Cement, Patent, &c. (Ques.) 3230 (ii).
——— Contracts with Marine Dept. (Ques.) 3843 (ii).
Wood, Mr. David, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 568 (i).

STEWART, Mr. R., *Ottawa.*

Alexander, Mrs. Mary, Relief (B. 177) 1°*, 9126 (v).
Bell, Dr., Additional Remuneration *re* Acting Director of Geological Survey (remarks) on Conc., 13572 (vii).
Boiler Inspection Co., Payments to, *re* Govt. Inspections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5944 (iii).
British-Yukon Ry. Co.'s (B. 21) 1°*, 430 (i); in Com., 3621 (ii).
Cannon, Mrs. Catherine Ann, Relief (B. 175) 1°*, 9126 (v).
Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5125 (iii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 10728; on M. for 2°, 11350; in Com., 11354, 11567 (vi), 12189 (vii).
Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Stewart) 6813 (iv).
General Chemical Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 174) 1°*, 9126 (v).

STEWART, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Geologial Museum, Progress *re* Construction (remarks) on Conc., 13568 (vii).
Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s (B. 47) 1°*, 891; 2° m., 1059 (i); in Com., 3622, 3794 (ii), 4230 (iii).
G.T.R. Hotel, Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 12070 (vii).
Paulding, Mrs. Ada Katurah Stewart, Relief (B. 176) 1°*, 9126 (v).

TALBOT, Mr. O. E., *Bellechasse.*

Alberta Northwestern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 44) 1°*, 891 (i).
All-Red Line, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12481 (vii).
Campaign Literature (French) sent by Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10353 (vi).
Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6191 (iii).
Civil Service Commission Report, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) Ques. of Order, 7598 (iv).
Civil Service System, Ques. of Order, Member reading speech, 9175 (v).
Documents quoted by Ministers, Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7763 (iv).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 1°, 4575 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 3°, 13255 (vii).
Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5023 (iii).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13266 (vii).
Employees of Parliament, Religion, &c., on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Ret., 5480 (iii).
Franco-Canadian Treaty, Delay *re* Approval, and Imp. Treaty (Ques.) 12655 (vii).
French Language Pet. *re*, Ques. of Order, 8887 (v).
German Development Co., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10580 (vi).
Govt. Grounds, Condition of (remarks) 1741 (i).
G.T.P. Construction, Accidents *re* (remarks) 6850 (iv).
Harlaka Junction, Ry. Connections (remarks) 1437 (i).
I.C.R., Transportation, &c., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4459 (iii).
Juvenile Delinquents B. 190 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 12401 (vii).
Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R.M.C., on M. for Sup., 1022 (i).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolishing of Tolls, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3446 (ii).

TALBOT, Mr. O. E.—*Con.*

Obstruction Tactics, Ques. of Order, 9223 (v).
Orange Order and Quebec Prov. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10355 (vi).
Privilege, Ques. of, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen,' *re* Attack on French Canadian Ministers, 4221 (iii).
Public Buildings, Erection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7190 (iv).
Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., Ques. of Order, 4958 (iii).
Quebec Bridge, Rep. of Sel. Com., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to conc. in Rep., 13366 (vii).
——— Rep., Ques. of Order, 13402 (vii).
Quebec Tercentenary, Rural Corps, &c. (remarks) 8385 (v).

SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 10579 (vi).
Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4042 (ii); (ice-breakers) 1902 (i).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 1090 (i).
Public Works—Generally (armouries) 10899; Ont. (Kingston) 10912 (vi); Ottawa (museum) 1502 (i); Que. (Knowlton) 7293; (Levis) 7296; (Montreal, post office) 7413 (iv).
Timber Limits, Applications, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' (ques. of priv.) 3578 (ii).
Tobacco, Violation of Act, in Com. of Sup., Ques. of Order, 9250 (v).

TAYLOR, Mr. G., *Leeds.*

Accounts, Sums, &c., remaining unpaid by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 352 (i).
'Arctic,' Str., History of Northern Cruise, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 4009 (ii).
Bate & Co. and W. C. Edwards & Co., Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 3234 (ii).
——— (M. for ret.*) 3435 (ii).
Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4390; in Com., 4519 (iii).
Beauchemin, A., Emplymt. at Sorel (Ques.) 5467 (iii).
Boiler Inspections, Violation of Independence of Parlt. Act by Mr. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5941 (iii).
Brockville and Ottawa, Ry. Service, Connections, &c. (M.) to adjn. Hse., 186 (i).
——— (remarks) 432 (i).
——— Charges against Ry. Commission, 1429 (i).
See 'G.T.R.'
Campaign Literature franked by Depts. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10351 (vi).
Canadian Associated Press B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 12644 (vii).
Caron and Thiberge, Messrs, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 10517 (vi).

TAYLOR, Mr. G.—*Con.*

Cattle Embargo in G. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12887 (vii).
Chicoutimi Public Expenditures, Ques. of Order, 13203 (vii).
Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5127 (iii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 11367, 11558 (vi), 12184 (vii).
Civil Service Commission Report, Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. Hse., 5909 (iii).
——— (remarks) 5626 (iii).
Cornwall Canal, Accident *re* Ry. Bridge (remarks) 11120 (vi).
Cowie, F. W., Salary, Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 5649 (iii).
See 'Govt. Steamers,' &c.
Customs and Excise Revenue, Amount received from June 1, 1908 (Ques.) 10791 (vii).
Debates, Official, Rep. of Com., Conc. without Notice (remarks) 8900 (v).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 11882 (vi).
Doukhobors, Letter *re* Manner of Living at Yorkton (read) 5751 (iii).
Dredging Contracts, O.Cs. *re* Renewals, on M. (Mr. Bennett) 6794 (iv).
——— Quebec Harbour (remarks) 7100, 7104 (iv).
Drysdale, Hon. Mr. Justice, Date of accepting Apptmt. (Ques.) 4768 (iii).
——— Date of Communication of Apptmt. (Ques.) 5084 (iii).
——— (M. for papers*) 5086 (iii).
Falconer, Mr. K., Payments to *re* Bookkeeping, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3999 (iii).
Financial Review, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 13468 (vii).
Fire Extinguishers, Purchase by Govt., Number, Price, &c. (Ques.) 1510 (i).
——— (M. for ret.*) 1690 (i).
——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7639 (iv).
——— File, Cor., &c., quoted by Minister, Custody of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7782 (iv).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 4832 (iii).
——— (remarks) 5659 (iii).
Forbes, Mr. Justice, Personal Status, &c., Cor., &c. (M. for copies) 899 (i).
——— (Ques.) 2390, 3840 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 1860 (i).
Gananoque Lights and Buoys, Apptmt. of Keeper, &c. (Ques.) 8383 (v).
Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3630 (ii).
Govt. Business (remarks) 13207 (vii).
Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6266 (iv).
Govt. Steamers, Maintenance and Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1049 (i).

TAYLOR, Mr. G.—*Con.*

Govt. Steamers, Trips of Mr. Cowie, &c. (Ques.) 5467 (iii).
See 'Cowie.'

G. T. Ry., Connections at Brockville (Ques. of Privilege) 9 (i).
See 'Brockville.'

G.T.R. Co. and Major's Hill Park, Sale B. 89 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for Com. on Res., 2222 (ii).

G.T.P. Ry., Eastern Division, Recent Estimates *re* Cost (Ques.) 5259 (iii).

——— Ties purchased in U. S. (remarks) 1448 (i).

——— Town and Development Co., Location of Lands, &c. (M. for ret.*) 5087 (iii).

——— Winnipeg and Moncton Branch, Tenders *re* Contracts, Signatures, &c. (M. for ret.*) 935 (i).

Halifax Garrison, Retraction of Remarks by Fin. Min., 5784 (iii).

House of Commons, Ventilation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10978 (vi).

——— Rules for Adjournment, on prop. Res. (Mr. Wright) 594 (i).
See 'Postal.'

'Huronа'-'Mongolian' Collision, Investigation *re* (Ques.) 358 (i).

Kingston Military Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12148 (vii).

Lacas, E., Payments to by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 979, 1039 (i).

Langevin Block Basement, Number of Employees, &c. (Ques.) 3483 (ii).

Magee, Hon. Mr. Justice, Judgments undelivered, Action of Govt., &c. (Ques.) 2594 (ii).

Medicine Hat Building, Contract *re* Heating System (remarks) 10791 (vi).

Menzies, Mr. James, Emplymt. by Govt. in Geodetic Survey (Ques.) 1349 (i).

Merwin, Geo. T., Payments to by Marine Dept. (Ques.) 11701 (vi).

Midland Dredging Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5716 (iii).

'Montcalm' Ice-breaker, Supplies, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1897 (i).

——— Purchase Price, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 8441 (v).
See 'Govt. Steamers.'

Montreal 'Gazette' Building, Amount paid for, &c. (Ques.) 3900 (ii).

Montreal Liquor Licenses, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Fisher) 4066 (ii).

Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9499 (v).

Obstructions to Supply, Charges by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9919 (v).

Official Cars, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10333 (vi).

TAYLOR, Mr. G.—*Con.*

Orangemen and Quebec Provincial Elections, Speech of Hon. Mr. Brodeur at Montreal (remarks) 10123 (v).

Orangeville Post Office Repairs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7482 (iv).

Order, Ques. of, Appeal to the Chair *re* Chairman's Ruling, Agreed to (Y. 84; N. 1) 4188 (ii).

Petit Rocher Breakwater, Contracts, &c., O.Cs., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 1294 (i).

——— Incomplete Return (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5723 (iii), 9716 (v).

——— Inquiry for, 6464, 7107 (iv).

Postal Service, H. of C., Delays, &c. (Ques.) 570 (i).

Prescott Light Station, Presentation to Dr W. C. Brown (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 983 (i).

P.E.I. Ry., Harmony and Elmira Branch Line (B. 202) in Com. on Res., 12409 (vii).

Public Accounts Com., Freedom of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3122 (ii).

Public Buildings, Erection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7190 (iv).

Railway Act (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3387 (ii).

Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3905 (ii).

Ry. Connections: *See* 'Brockville,' &c.

Reinhardt, Mr. Paul, Emplymt. by Public Works Dept. (Ques.) 10301 (vi).

——— Emplymt. in Quebec Provincial Elections, Cor., &c. (read) in Com. of Sup., 10986 (vi).

Returns, Inqiury for, 2738 (ii).

Riviere du Loup Wharf Dredging, &c. (remarks) 6462 (iv).

Ross Rifles, Number in Use in Canada, Total &c. (Ques.) 5786 (iii).

——— Provisions *re* Bayonets, &c. (Ques.) 3483 (ii).

St. Lawrence Power Co. and Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. Gervais) for Cor., &c., 3010 (ii)

St. Louis, Mr., Payments to by Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 979 (i).

Seed Grain for Settlers, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2780 (ii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2904, 2920 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. Sifton) to adjn., 1366 (i).

Senate, Cost of, Outside of Indemnities (M. for ret.*) 5087 (iii).

Sorel Irregularities, Final Rep. (remarks) 10795 (vi).

S. A. School Teachers, Recognition of Services (Ques.) 2791 (ii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3782 (ii).

TAYLOR, Mr. G.—*Con.*

Spain, Commander, Travelling Expenses, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1010 (i).

—— Expenditure *re* Wreck Investigations (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3150 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Agriculture, &c. (dairying, &c.) 10397; (exhibitions) 10570; (Imperial Institute) 10623 (vi).

Canals—Chambly (tow paths) 12226 (vii).

Canals—Murray (houses) 12226 (vii).

Canals—Quebec (steam road roller) 12225 (vii).

Canals—Rideau (improvements) 12227 (vii).

Canals—Soulanges (improvements) 12225 (vii).

Canals (statistical branch) 10320 (vi).

Canals—Trent (construction) 12225; (improvements) 12227 (vii).

Canals—Welland (Port Maitland piers) 5674 (iii).

Changes in Procedure (remarks) 1885 (i).

Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries) 621 (i); Marine and Fisheries (ass't. dep. min.) 12915 (vii); (salaries) 978; Printing and Stationery (salaries, &c.) 613 (i).

Customs—Outside Service (salaries) 9223, 9253; Inspectors (travelling expenses) 9540 (v).

Fisheries (inspectors, &c.) 12261 (vii).

Immigration (general expenses) 5751 (iii).

Justice (Penitentiaries) 12265 (vii).

Labour Dept. ('Gazette') 12261 (vii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5773, 5780 (iii); (pensions) 13324 (vii); (salaries) 4755 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (subsidies) 12263 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries (dredging plant) 4754 (iii); (Hudson Bay patrol) 4131 (ii); (ice-breakers) 1894 (i); (Lake St. Peter piers) 4752 (iii); (observatories) 12262 (vii); (patrol boats) 4750 (iii).

Militia (pay and allowance) 12147; (properties) 12148; (Quebec cliffs) 12148; (salaries and wages) 12147; (warlike stores) 12148 (vii).

Miscellaneous (Civil Service Commission) 13168 (vii); (Japanese riots, B.C.) 5783 (iii); (seed grain) 2780 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 1049 (i), 5764 (iii); (ice-breakers) 2968; (wrecks) 3150 (ii).

Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5530; (maintenance) 5512 (iii).

Public Works (ass't. dep. min.) 5698 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10891; (experimental farms, repairs, &c.) 10904 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 7116; (Glace Bay) 7139; (Halifax, customs) 7166; (Shelburne) 7174; (Yarmouth) 7182 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Brantford) 7465; (Dom. renewals) 7482; (Glencoe) 7487 (iv); (Kingston, militia stores) 10907 (vi); (Renfrew) 7826 (iv); (R.M.C. Barracks) 10907 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (archives) 5700 (iii); (heating, &c.) 11009 (vi); (mint) 1451; (observatory) 1450 (i); (rents, &c.) 10986 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Cookshire) 7282; (Farnham) 7288; (Knowlton) 7291; (Lachute) 7293; (Lake Megantic) 7294; (Longueuil) 7304 (iv); (Montreal, pneumatic postal) 5704 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Caraquet wharf) 11689 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Breton Cove) 11224; (Cape St. Mary) 11224; (Caribou Island) 11225; (Digby) 11227; (Glace Bay) 11228; (Hall's breakwater) 11228; (Oyster Pond) 11258; (Port Hood) 11278; (Port Joli West) 11279; (Tancock island) 11230 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Stanley Island wharf) 5720; (Tiffin) 5711 (iii); (Toronto) 12137 (vii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P. E.I. (Rustico) 11293 (vi).

Public Works—Marine Dept. (gratuities) 13322 (vii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (monuments) 11118 (vi).

Railways—G.T.P. (inspection) 10391 (vi).

Railways—I.C.R. (double tracking) 12238 (vii); (private car of N.T.R.) 10186; (supplies) 10195 (v); (Truro) 12232 (vii).

Railways—Ry. Commission (legal expenses) 10389 (vi).

Steamboat Inspection (fog alarms) 12262 (vii).

Timber Limits, Application of Mr. Gentles, &c. (remarks) 7100 (iv).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2664 (ii).

Travelling Expenses, Marine Dept., Minister's, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 985 (i).

—— *re* Col. Conference, ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3996 (ii).

U.S. Training Ships through St. Lawrence Canals, Number, &c. (Ques.) 5788 (iii).

—— (M. for copies) 5800 (iii).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6135 (iii).

Wednesday Evening Sittings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 11232 (vi).

Wheat Transportation from N. W., Financial Aid, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 2191 (ii).

Willson, T. L., Payments *re* Ottawa Carbide Co. (Ques.) 11498 (vi).

TELFORD, Mr. W. P., *Grey, N.*

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5102 (iii).

I.C.R. Extension to Great Lakes, on prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2459 (ii).

Owen Sound and Meaford Ry. Co.'s (B. 83) 1*, 1732 (i).

Privilege, Ques. of, *re* Registrar of Grey County, 11302 (vi).

Returning Officers in Elections, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10992 (vi).

TELFORD, Mr. W. P.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Midland and Tiffin) 12109 (vii).

Tobacco Prohibition, Resolutions from Moral Reform Associations (remarks) 11302 (vi).

TEMPLEMAN, Hon. W. (Minister of Inland Revenue) *Victoria City, B.C.*

Adulteration of Food, Number of Firms penalized (Ans.) 4402 (iii).

Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3868 (ii).

Assay Office, Vancouver, Results, &c. (remarks) on Conc., 13574 (vii).

Barlow, Dr. A. E., Emplymt. in Geological Survey (Ans.) 5205 (iii).

——— Survey *re* Temagami District (Ans.) 5473 (iii).

——— Payments *re* Temagami District (Ans.) 5787 (iii).

Bell, Dr., Additional Remuneration *re* Acting Director of Geological Survey (remarks) on Conc., 13569 (vii).

Brock, Mr., Emplymt. in Geological Survey (Ans.) 5205 (iii).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6213 (iii).

Chilvers, Francis W., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 10515 (vi).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 10750 (vi).

Cigar Stamps, Use of Black Ones (Ans.) 12390 (vii).

Cirkel, Franz., Remuneration *re* Report of Geological Survey *re* Graphites (Ans.) 7935 (iv).

——— Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 7202 (iv).
See 'Graphite,' &c.

Coal Deposits in P.E.I., Boring for, &c. (Ans.) 515 (i).

Corby Distillery, Deficits in Spirit Production (Ans.) 12410 (vii).

Cosgrove, Mr. J. J., Total Cost of Investigation (Ans.) 5797 (iii).

Daley, Mr. R., Emplymt. in Geological Survey (Ans.) 5204, 5473 (iii).

Dowling, Dr., Leave of Absence from Geological Survey (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10581 (vi).

——— Emplymt. by German Development Co. (Ans.) 5564 (iii).

——— Emplymt. in Geological Survey (Ans.) 5206 (iii).

Electric and Gas Power Licenses, granted under Statute, c. 16, &c. (Ans.) 360 (i).

Excise Revenue, Amount received from June 1 to 15, 1908 (Ans.) 10792 (vi).

TEMPLEMAN, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Geological Survey Dept., Total Expenditure from 1896 to 1908 (Ans.) 6402 (iv).

——— Technical Officers (remarks) on Conc., 13574 (vii).

Geological Survey Yacht, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 11232 (vi).

Gooderham & Worts, Distiller, Deficit in Spirit Production (Ans.) 12411 (vii).

'Graphite,' Cost of Publication, Total Value, &c. (Ans.) 5081 (iii).
See 'Cirkel,' &c.

Harbottle, N. F., Emplymt. by Excise Dept (Ans.) 7731 (iv).

Inland Revenue Act (tobacco) Amt. (B. 143) 1°*, 6142 (iii); in Com., 6466; 3°*, 6517 (iv).

Inland Revenue, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 6 (i).

———Seizures in Cornwall, Toronto, &c. (Ans.) 3847 (ii).

——— Violations, on Inquiry for Ret., 4964 (iii).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°. 11238 (vi).

Maple Syrup and Sugar Adulteration, Penalties *re* (Ans.) 6639 (iv).

Marcoun, Mr. Frank, Commission *re* Settlement of Claims (Ans.) 1122 (i).

Marine and Fisheries Accountants, Payments *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4109 (ii).

Medicine Patent Bill, *re* Apptmts. to Com. (remarks) 10689 (vi).

Niagara Falls, Rep. of Dr. Spencer, Criticism of, in Press (Ans.) 6056 (iii).

Patent Medicines Inspection (B. 146) Res. prop., 4963 (iii); in Com. on Res., 6215; 1°*, 6218 (iii); 2° m., 10551; (M.) to ref. to Special Com., 10553 (vi); in Com., 12622 (vii).

Patent Medicines Bill, Govtl Legislation *re* (Ans.) 356, 608 (i), 2594 (ii).

——— Committee of Inquiry *re* (Ans.) 3900 (ii).

Peat Deposits in Canada, Development of (Ans.) 515 (i).

——— Emplymt. of Mr. Erik Nystrom, &c. (Ans.) 1122 (i).

Port Hope Inland Rev. Collectorship, Apptmnt. of (Ans.) 895 (i).

Sugar Manufacture, Saccharine Standards, &c. (Ans.) 351 (i).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Excise (inspectors' salaries) 813; Inland Revenue (salaries) 645, 646; Mines (salaries) 646 (i).

Excise (customs duty) 817; (distilleries) 814; (methylated spirits) 820; (provisional allowances) 818; (tobacco stamps) 816; (travelling expenses, rent, &c.) 814 (i).

TEMPLEMAN, Hon. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Geological Survey (maps, &c.) 12260; (oil borings) 13162; (specimens) 12261; (technical officers) on Conc., 13574 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4109 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (wrecks) 3189 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vernon) 10874; (Victoria, immigration) 10874 (vi).

Technical Students, Emplymt. on Govt. Works, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3298 (ii)

Tobacco Duties, Total Amount for 1908 (Ans.) 13064 (vii).

Tobacco Excise Taxes, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 566 (i).

Tobacco, Foreign, Total Amount of Refund, &c. (Ans.) 4402 (iii).

Tobacco Industry, Amts. to Inland Revenue Act (Ans.) 179 (i).

—— Infractions of Inland Revenue Act, on M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) to Com. of Sup., 9523 (v).

—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9240 (v).

Tobacco Manufactures, Total Amount of Fines and Penalties, &c. (Ans.) 363 (i).

Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, on M. (Mr. Dubeau) for Cor., &c., 920 (i).

Ways and Means (tobacco) in Com., 6120 (iii).

Whale Fishing Cos. in B. C., Licenses granted, &c., on M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10277 (v).

Windsor Ferry, Expiration of Franchise (Ans.) 1940 (i).

THOMPSON, Mr. A., *Yukon Territory.*

Bank Act Amendments, on prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 4281 (iii).

Budget, The, 5405 (iii).

Dom. Lands (surveys) B. 9 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 757 (i).

Imperial Treaties, Status of Canada *re* Negotiations, &c. (Ques.) 1939 (i).

Mint, Gold Coins, &c. (Ques.) 2593 (ii).

Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, on M. (Mr. Sloan) to Com. of Sup., 3954 (ii).

Railway Commission (ass't. chief, &c.) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 3919 (ii).

Treaty-Making Power, Status of Canada, Notice of Discussion, 3172 (ii).

Yukon—Finnie-Perron Case, Information *re* (remarks) 4316 (iii).

—— (M. for copies*) 1513 (i).

Yukon, Freight Rates, Rep. of Ry. Commission *re* (Ques.) 894 (i).

—— Mail Service, Complaints *re*, 2022 (ii).

—— Mail Service, Nontransmissable, &c. (remarks) 5136 (iii).

—— Money Transmission, Rates *re* (Ques.) 2979 (ii).

THOMPSON, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Yukon, Morality, Correspondence, &c. (M. for copies*) 1513 (i).

TISDALE, Hon. D., *Norfolk.*

Crown Life Insurance Co.'s (B. 180) in Com., 9962 (v).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4577 (iii).

G.T.P., Accidents on Construction (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6658 (iv).

I.C.R., on Annual Statement (Mr. Graham) 4444 (iii).

Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R.M.C., on M. for Sup., 1027 (i).

Manitoba Boundaries, on prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12792 (vii).

Presbyterian Widows' and Orphans' Funds, B. 23 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 2789 (ii).

St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.'s B. 98 (Mr. Blain) in Com., 4580 (iii).

Vancouver Bank incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 4581 (iii).

TOBIN, Mr. E. W., *Richmond and Wolfe.*

Pulp Wood, Export Duty, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 4821 (iii).

TURCOTTE, Mr. G. A., *Nicolet.*

Nicolet, Govt. Expenditure, for 1878-1896; 1896-1908 (Ques.) 12775 (vii).

TURGEON, Mr. O., *Gloucester.*

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 134) 1*, 5649 (iii).

Blackhall, Mrs. Claims *re* Caraquet Wharf Property (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 11686 (vi).

Fisheries Committee, Apptmt. of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1730 (i).

Petit Rocher Breakwater (remarks) 7110 (iv).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4920 (iii).

Representation of the Mar. Provinces in H. of C., on M. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 9795 (v).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Tracadie Lazaretto) 7187 (iv); Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Caraquet wharf) 11686 (vi); (Tracadie) 13349 (vii).

Railways—I.C.R. (Petit Rocher spur) 12759 (vii).

TURRIFF, Mr. J. G., *Assiniboia, E.*

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 11357 (vi).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 11170, 11418, 11533, 11947 (vi).

TURRIFF, Mr. J. G.—*Con.*

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 68) 1°*, 1424 (i); in Com., 4239, 4545, 4577 (iii).

Fog Signal Co., Payments to (Ques.) 11497 (vi).

Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6373 (iv).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 7046 (iv).

Indian Lands in Algoma, Sale of, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13135 (vii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12571 (vii).

Personal Explanation *re* Land Deals, 1927 (i).

Ry. Act (construction) Amt. (B. 4) 1° m., 91 (i); Discussion *re*, 3404; 2° m., 3405 (ii).

——— (demurrage) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3359 (ii).

Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Timber Leases, Denial of Stmnt. of Mr. Ames, 8697 (v).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4233 (iii).

Seed Grain for N. W. Settlers, Extension of Time for Payment, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2922 (ii).

S. A. Volunteers Land Bounty B. 109 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 3765, 3831 (ii); in Com., 12605 (vii).

South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 16 (Mr. Calvert) on M. for 3°, 1930 (i).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—N. W. (Strathcona Horse barracks) 10977 (vi); Sask. (Humboldt) 8595 (v).

Timber Limits, Leasing, &c., Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) 2290 (ii).

——— Opening of Tenders, Ques. of Priv. *re* Speech of Mr. Foster, 11303 (vi).

——— Papers used in Debate, on Inquiry for, 2386 (ii).

——— Par. in 'Toronto News,' Ques of Priv., 5077 (iii).

VERVILLE, Mr. A., *Maisonneuve.*

Convict Labour, Control of, Sale of Articles, &c. (Ques.) 238 (i).

Co-operative Societies B. 5 (Mr. Monk) on M. for 2°, 4562 (iii).

Debates, French Edition, Delay in Distribution, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Beland) 3491 (ii).

Fair Wages Schedule on Dredging Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 7200 (iv).

Immigration Agents in Italy, Number, &c. (Ques.) 4584 (iii).

VERVILLE, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6816 (iv).

Immigration Central Board, London, Moneys paid to, &c. (Ques.) 2545 (ii).

Montreal P. O. Building, Settlement of Strike (remarks) 8608 (v).

North Atlantic Trading Co., and Bonuses, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 803 (i).

Post Office Buildings built since 1904, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 4761 (iii).

Public Works, Hours of Labour (B. 97) 1° m., 3157 (ii).

WALSH, Mr. J. C., *Montreal, St. Anne's.*

Architects Institute of Canada incorp. (B. 88) 1°*, 2214 (ii); in Com., 5379, 5408, 5785, 5953 (iii).

Debates, French Edition, Delay in Distribution, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Beland) 3490 (ii).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 3537 (ii).

WALSH, Mr. R. N., *Huntingdon.*

Beauharnois Canal, Lease to Robert Co., Emplymt. of Mr. Deschene, &c. (Ques.) 8443 (v).

Brockville Cold Storage Plant, Disposal of (Ques.) 3234 (ii).

Currie, W. D., Payments to by Govt. (Ques.) 7731 (iv).

Desaulniers, Mr. Gonsalve, Emplymt. as Translator, &c. (Ques.) 1121, 1290 (i).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13272 (vii).

Gaudette, Mr. Victor, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1120 (i).

International Boundary Line, Representations *re* Buildings on (Ques.) 356 (i).

Public Works Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4933 (iii).

Quebec Bridge, Rep. of Sel. Com., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to conc., 13381 (vii).

St. Anicet and Ste. Barbe, Waterway from Lake St. Francis, Letters, Plans, Surveys, &c. (M. for copies*) 1690 (i).

——— Damages *re* Floods (remarks) 6987 (iv).

——— Rep. of Engineer (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7808 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (live stock) 12898 (vii); Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Dundee) 7286 (iv).

Tuberculin Tests, Results of (Ques.) 9270 (v).

WARD, Mr. H. A., *Durham.*

Blunden, Frederick, Trial and Conviction, &c., Cor., &c. (M. for copy) 3466 (ii).

WARD, Mr. H. A.—*Con.*

Blunden, Frederick (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12902 (vii).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 5211 (iii).
Cobourg Harbour, Amount expended *re* Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 359 (i).
Gillis, Release from Penitentiary (Ques.) 510 (i).
Irrigation Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 960 (i).
Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* Conduct at R.M.C., on M. for Sup., 1028 (i).
Marine and Fisheries Investigation, Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission (remarks) 7387 (iv).
Official Cars, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10330 (vi).
Port Hope Inland Revenue Office, Apptmt. of Collector, &c. (Ques.) 895 (i).
Quebec Tercentenary, Mobilization of Militia, Abandonment of (remarks) 8860 (v).
S. A. Volunteers Land Grants, in Com. on Res., 3832 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Trent (damages) 10308 (vi).
Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries) 9704 (v).
Militia (customs dues) 12156; (pay and allowance) 12147; (provisions) 12151; (R. M. College) 12153 (vii).
Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5524 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon, drill hall) 8518; (Dauphin) 8529 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Hope) 12135 (vii).
Railways — Miscellaneous (arbitrations) 10339 (vi).
Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2520, 2652 (ii).

WATSON, Mr. R. J., *Parry Sound.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. (amt.) 11890 (vi).
Georgian Bay Canal, Plans, Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. McCool) for copies, 1982 (i).

WHITE, Mr. G. V., *Renfrew, N.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. (amt.) 11890 (vi).
Georgian Bay Canal Survey, Final Report *re* (Ques.) 240 (i), 5465 (iii).
—— on M. (Mr. McCool) for copies, 1970 (i).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10314 (vi).
—— Rep. *re* Surveys (remarks) 11827 (vi).
G.T.P., Supplies, Contract *re* District No. 3, &c. (Ques.) 1120 (i).
McInnes, W. B., Inquiry for Ret., 6061 (iii).
Mattawa Postmaster, Place of Residence (Ques.) 7199 (iv).
Petawawa Camp, Arrangements *re* Training of Troops (Ques.) 5791 (iii).
—— Payment *re* Painting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12147 (vii).

WHITE, Mr. G. V.—*Con.*

Petawawa Dock, Improvements, &c. (Ques.) 685 (i).
Post Office Act (postage) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10716 (vi).
Stevenson, Mr. A. W., Chartered Accountant, Amounts paid to by Marine Dept., &c. (Ques.) 3233 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4205 (ii).
Militia (annual drill) 5742 (iii); (salaries and wages) 12147 (vii).
Ocean and River Service (masters and mates) 2969 (ii).
Post Office (inspectors) 13154 (vii).
Public Works — Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10901 (vi); Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Petawawa) 12134 (vii).
Timber Berths, Nos. 1031, &c., on Order for Ret. (amt.) 850 (i).
——Tenders, Original Documents (M for ret.) 2983 (ii).

WILMOT, Mr. R. D., *Sunbury and Queen's.*

Brass, Mr. Albert, Postmaster at Rusagornis, Charges *re* Political Activity (Ques.) 6642 (iv).
Chase's Point, N.B., Pet. *re* Wharf (Ques.) 7937 (iv).
G.T.P., Nationality of Messrs. Foley, Welsh & Stewart, Discrimination against Canadians (Ques.) 7936 (iv).
Immigration Agents in N. B., Apptmt. (Ques.) 843 (i).
Live Stock, N. B., Figures *re* Census, Methods of Obtaining, &c. (Ques.) 1506 (i).
Mill Settlement and Newcastle Creek Post Office, Establishment of, Pets., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 2982 (ii).
N.B. Inland Waters, Wharfs, Construction Policy, &c. (Ques.) 5465 (iii).
Scotch Town, N.B., Wharf, Application (Ques.) 7202 (iv).

WILSON, Mr. N. F., *Russell.*

Budget, The, 6610 (iv).

WILSON, Mr. U., *Lennox and Addington.*

Australian Mission of Sir Mackenzie Bowell, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 2218 (ii).
Australian Representative from Canada in 1901, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 2168 (ii).
Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 4500 (iii).
British Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 21 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3621 (ii).
Budget, The, 6082 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4231 (iii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 189 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 11353; in Com., 11365, 11661; (amt.) 11930 (vi).

WILSON, Mr. U.—*Con.*

Doukhobors, Destitute Condition at Fort William, on M. for Sup., 5016 (iii).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co. B. 213 (Mr. Graham) on prop. Res., 13260; in Com. on Res., 13280 (vii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3625 (ii).

Gold and Silver Marking Act Amt. B. 123 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5496 (iii).

Governor General's Expenditure since 1892 (M. for ret.*) 555 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3581 (ii).

Haycock, Mr. J. L., Interference in Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 648 (i).

Immigrants deported, Expenditure *re* Transportation, &c. (Ques.) 5080 (iii).

Immigrant Detention Hospitals, Amount expended (Ques.) 5081 (iii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 6434 (iv).

Immigration Agent M. C. Dunne, Number of Immigrants located by him in Lennox and Addington County (M. for ret.*) 555 (i).

Immigration Agent Miller, Number of Immigrants located by him in Lennox and Addington (M. for ret.*) 555 (i).

Immigration Agents, Names, Addresses (Ques.) 180 (i).

Immigrant Agents in G. B., Names, Salary, Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 2169 (ii).

——— Reps. received from (M. for copies*) 557 (i).

Immigration Agents, Names of those paid Commissions to in Europe, &c. (Ques.) 3844 (ii).

——— Agents in Ont., &c., on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 3178 (ii).

——— Special Agents in G. B., Salaries, Names, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2398 (ii).

Immigration Bonuses, Abolition of, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 3300 (ii).

Immigration and Commercial Agents, Rets., Inquiry for, 1108 (i).

Immigration, O.Cs. and Circulars issued *re* (M. for copies*) 2171 (ii).

I.C.R., Dartmouth Branch Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13290 (vii).

Iron and Steel Bounties, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 4244 (iii).

Kettle River Valley Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13287 (vii).

Lead Bounties B. 191 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 11240; in Com., 11247 (vi).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13290 (vii).

Nipigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13288 (vii).

WILSON, Mr. U.—*Con.*

North Atlantic Trading Co., Bonuses, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 806 (i).

Owen Sound and Meaford Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 13288 (vii).

Post Office Act (postage) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 10709 (vi).

Railway Subsidies B. 215 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 13286 (vii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Patent Record) 672 (i).

Canals—Generally (repairs) 10312 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen.'s Office (salaries) 635; Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 984; Trade and Commerce (salaries) 648 (i).

Interior—Miscellaneous (park reservations) 5755 (iii).

Post Office (boots for letter carriers) 8880 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vernon) 10878; (Victoria, immigration) 10878 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg, immigration) 8573 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (rents) 10983; (Rideau Hall) 11007 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (commissioner's house) 10884 (vi).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11083 (vi).

Railways—G.T.P. (A. Brunet) 10379 (vi).

Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. 125 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 6186 (iii).

WORTHINGTON, Mr. A. N., *Sherbrooke.*

Cavalry Brigade Eastern Townships, Camp at Quebec, &c. (Ques.) 9273 (v).

Church of England Woman's Auxiliary to the Missionary Society, incorp. (B. 75) 1°*, 1584 (i).

Customs Duty on Militia Uniforms, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9567 (v).

Diseases and Public Health Bureau, on prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2584 (ii).

Dom. Arsenal, Cor. with Ross Rifle Co. *re* Building (Ques.) 7991 (iv).

Dominion Camp Equipment Co., Incorporation, &c. (Ques.) 3238 (ii).

Drill Halls, Number constructed since 1896, Location, &c. (Ques.) 177 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 556 (i).

——— Inquiry for, 4834 (iii), 6222 (iv).

Eastman Rifle Match, Accident, Inquiry *re* (Ques.) 1125 (i).

Fortifications, Construction of, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 6646 (iv).

Garrison Artillery, 5th Regiment, B.C., Complaints *re* (Ques.) 5792 (iii).

Lee-Enfield Rifles, Number purchased, Dates, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 6644 (iv).

Militia Allowances, Arrears of (Ques.) 8442 9273 (v).

Military Camp in Eastern Townships, Proposed Arrangements, &c. (Ques.) 3842 (ii).

WORTHINGTON, Mr. A. N.—*Con.*

Militia Promotions, Names and Records, &c. (Ques.) 352 (i).
—— (M. for ret.*) 559 (i).
Militia Supplies at Halifax, Tenders, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 6405 (iv).
Postal Arrangements between Canada and U. S., on Statement (Mr. Lemieux) to Com. of Sup., 3167 (ii).
Quebec Bridge, Accident, Material on Hand, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 1290 (i).
Quebec Tercentenary, Protests from Regiments *re* Attendance (Ques.) 7992 (iv).
Returns, Inquiry for, 2024 (ii).
Rifles, Purchase of from other Cos. (Ques.) 1123 (i).
Ross Rifle Co., Advances *re* Contracts, Cor. with Bank of Montreal (M. for copies*) 4773 (iii).
Ross Rifle Bayonets, Adoption of by Govt. (Ques.) 5786 (iii).
—— Contracts *re* Bayonets, &c. (Ques.) 6235, 8176 (iv), 8442 (v).
—— (M. for copy*) 5476 (iii).
Ross Rifle, Bonus Loans, Service of Govt. Employees, &c. (M. for ret.*) 559 (i).
—— Consignment to N. W. Mounted Police, Manufacture, &c. (Ques.) 5259 (iii).
—— Contracts *re* Supply of Rifles, &c. (M. for copy*) 557 (i).
—— Contract Price, Inspection, &c. (Ques.) 8174 (iv).
—— Disposition of Manufactured Rifles, Number, &c. (Ques.) 3237 (ii).
—— Evidence before Pub. Accounts, Inquiry for Rep., 5914 (iii).
—— Imp. Govt., Cor. with *re* Defects, &c. (M. for cor.*) 5210 (iii).
—— Inefficiency and Extravagance of Dept. of Militia, 8902; (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 8953; Amt. neg. (Y. 18; N. 55) 9090 (v).
—— Inter-changeable parts with Lee-Enfield Rifles, Cor. with Imp. Govt., &c. (Ques.) 3898 (ii).
—— Military Associations, &c., Rep. from, *re* Efficiency (M. for ret.*) 557 (i).
—— Negotiations with Vickers Maxim Co., &c. (Ques.) 178 (i).
—— Number reported unfit for Use (Ques.) 3841 (ii).
—— Payments for since Jan. 1, 1908 (Ques.) 7209 (iv).
—— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. S. Hughes) 9333 (v).
—— Rep. of Col. Gaudet, &c. (Ques.) 9713 (v).
—— Sealed Pattern, Discovery of (Ques.) 3237 (ii).
—— Services of Govt. Officials, Names, Rank, &c. (Ques.) 365 (i).

WORTHINGTON, Mr. A. N.—*Con.*

Ross Rifle, Target Practice, Suspension by N.W.M. Police (Ques.) 3847 (ii).
—— Tests in England, Reps. *re* (remarks) 8170 (iv).
Sherbrooke Militia Corps, Establishment of (Ques.) 9273 (v).
Sutherland Rifle Sight, Contract *re* Additional Number (Ques.) 5257 (iii).
—— Number, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 569 (i).
—— Contracts, &c. (M. for copies*) 5476 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Customs—Inspectors (salaries) 9567 (v); Marine (ice-breakers) 1897 (i).
Vickers Maxim Co., Purchases from by Govt. (Ques.) 356 (i).

WRIGHT, Mr. A. A., *Renfrew, S.*

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res (Mr. Blain) 5131 (iii).
Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 47 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3794 (ii).
Georgian Bay Canal, on M. (Mr. McCool) for Plans, &c., 5228 (iii).
Govt. Railways, Change of Name, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6270 (iv).
House of Commons, Accommodation for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 10494 (vi).
—— Rules *re* Hours of Adjournment (prop. Res.) 584 (i).
P.E.I. Winter Communication, Tunnel Construction, on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor., 4646 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Penitentiaries (binder twine) 5527 (iii); Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 11083 (vi).
Tobacco and Cigarette Restraint B. 173 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 10695 (vi).

WRIGHT, Mr. W., *Muskoka.*

Address, The, 396 (i).
'Arctic,' Str., Payments *re* Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4175 (ii).
Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5108 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 8271 (iv), 11716; in Com., 11869 (vi), 12935 (vii).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 4239 (iii).
Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3613 (ii).
Georgian Bay Canal, Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. McCool) for Copies, 2018 (i).
Gravenhurst Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vii).

WRIGHT, Mr. W.—*Con.*

Hoppins, Mr. Wm., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 3842 (ii).

Indian Department, Extravagant Management, &c., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 11057 (vi).

Indians in Man. and Sask., Investigation of Mrs. A. M. Paget and Miss Ferguson, Rep. *re* (Ques.) 6919 (iv).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 188 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 12571 (vii).

Naturalization Act Amt. B. 130 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 11991 (vi).

Old Age Annuities B. 120 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 10849 (vi).

Ottawa Post Office, Completion of Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 3842 (ii).

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. W. McIntyre) in Com., 4232 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Patent Record) 672 (i).

Civil Govt.—Railways (Butler, M. J.) 12756 (vii).

Indians—B.C. (land sales) 12753; N.B. (salaries) 12738; Ont. and Que. (land sales) 12735 (vii).

Marine and Fisheries (Hudson Bay patrol) 4175 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vernon) 10875; (Victoria, immigration) 10875 (vi); Ont. (Glencoe) 7491 (iv).

Timber Limits, Disposal of, on Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2488 (ii).

ZIMMERMAN, Mr. A., *Hamilton, W.*

Battlefields of Canada B. 111 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 4386 (iii).

Canada and France SS. Subsidy B. 145 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6179 (iii).

Coal Duties, Refunds *re* Coke, &c. (Ques.) 6924 (iv).

Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty B. 57 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 3612 (ii); on M. for 3°, 4333 (iii).

Gold and Silver Marking Act Amt. B. 123 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5497 (iii).

——— B. 197 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 12558 (vii).

Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 3745 (ii).

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 7228; on M. for 3°, 7216 (iv).

Militia Uniforms, and Customs Duties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9569 (v).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. 82 (Mr. Calvert) on Amt. (Mr. Bristol) in Com., 5066 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Trade and Commerce (salaries) 664 (i).

Customs—Inspectors (salaries) 9569 (v).

Marine (ice-breakers) 1901 (i).

Militia (annual drill) 5745 (iii), 10294 (v).

Ocean and River Service (masters and mates) 2971 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 10902 (vi); Man. (Dauphin) 8528 (v); Ont. (Owen Sound) 7818 (iv); Ottawa (mint) 1472 (i).

INDEX—SUBJECTS.

Absinthe and Brandy Importations, Total Amount: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 689 (i).

Accounts and Claims against Govt., Total Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 362 (i).

——— remaining unpaid by Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 352 (i).

Accountants, Payments to by Dept. of Justice: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3233 (ii).

Acetylene Gas Works at Prescott, Employmt. of Political Officials: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3292 (ii).

Actonvale Public Building, Total Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 6232 (iv).

Adams Lake, Construction of Dam, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5798 (iii).

Address The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech from Throne: moved (Mr. Hall) 9; seconded (Mr. Lanctot) 17.

Debate:—(Mr. R. L. Borden) 23; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 40; (Mr. Foster) 66; (Mr. Fielding) 94; (Mr. Cockshutt) 123, (amt.) 147; Neg. (Y. 95; N. 56)274; (Mr. Miller) 148; (Mr. Clements) 194; (Mr. Fisher) 213; (Mr. Lewis) 242; (Mr. Clarke) 254; (Mr. T. Chisholm) 263; (Mr. W. Roche) 267; (Mr. Barr) 276; (Mr. Lalor) 292; (Mr. Elson) 304; (Mr. Crawford) 316; (Mr. Armstrong) 335, 366, (amt.) 380; (Neg. Y. 54; N. 103) 505; (Mr.. J. J. Hughes) 380; (Mr. Staples) 383; (Mr. Wm. Wright) 396; (Mr. Geo. Smith) 407; (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 412; (Mr. A. A. McLean) 420; (Mr. Kemp) 434; (Mr. W McIntyre) 445; (Mr. Perley) 449; (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 455; (Mr. Lake) 459; (Mr. A. Lavergne) 476; (Mr. W. J. Roche) 485; (Mr. Paquet) 505; (Mr. Barker) 519, (amt.) 530; (Neg. Y. 50; N. 96) 552; (Mr. Fielding) 531; (Mr. Monk) 535; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 544; (Mr. Haggart) 548 (ii).

——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to present, 554 (i).

Administrative Buildings, Erection of: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 10984 (vi).

Admiralty Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 122.'

Adulteration of Food, Number of Firms penalized, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 4402 (iii).

Advertisements in Newspapers, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 509 (i).

Advertising in Mar. Prov. Newspapers, Amts. paid, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 936 (i).

Advertisements for Tenders *re* Govt. Works, Supplies, &c.: Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4702; Neg. (Y. 50; N. 95) 4735 (iii).

See 'Tenders,' &c.

Agricultural Committee, 2nd Rep.: M. (Mr. Mackenzie) to conc., 12409 (vii).

Agricultural Implements, Amount of Rebates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1112 (i).

AGRICULTURE.

Agriculture, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 7 (i).

——— Dep. Minister O'Halloran's Salary: in Com. of Sup., 12878 (vii).

——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 645, 671 (i), 10569 (vi), 12879 (vii).

Anglo-French Exhibition, Canadian Representative: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8611 (v).

——— Goods purchased from T. Lindsay Co.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 8615 (v).

——— Purchase of Goods, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8443 (v).

——— Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8443 (v).

Cattle Embargo in G. B., Removal of, Action by Govt. since 1896: Ques. Mr. Armstrong) 2167 (ii).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 2795 (ii).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 6223 (iv).

Cattle Embargo in G. B.: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 12879 (vii).

——— Cable *re* Removal by G. B.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 13228 (vii).

Cattle exported to U. S., Fees *re* Thoroughbreds: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 2767 (ii).

Cattle Exports and Imports from Canada to G. B.: Ques. (Mr. Christie) 6460 (iv).

Cattle Registered, Importation from U. S., from 1904-7: Ques. (Mr. Christie) 6238 (iv).

Cattle Inspection *re* Ocean Service: in Com. of Sup., 3220 (ii).

Cattle sold from Experimental Farm: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 2389 (ii).

Cold Storage, Assistance *re* East Elgin Establishment: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 351 (i).

Dairy and Cold Storage Commissioner's Report: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2786 (ii).

AGRICULTURE—*Con.*
Dairying and Fruit Industry: in Com. of Sup., 10397 (vi).
Exhibitions: in Com. of Sup., 10569 (vi), 12889 (vii).
——— Amount of Subsidies paid to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beauparlant) 4406 (iii).
Exhibitions outside of Canada, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4584 (iii).
Experimental Farm, Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 1018 (i).
——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 12549 (vii).
Experimental Farm (Central) Amounts paid for Seeds, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 556 (i).
——— Sale of Cattle, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 2795 (ii).
Experimental Farms, Establishment of, Names of Provs.: Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 7990 (iv).
——— in Quebec District, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2593 (ii).
——— Pet. from Quebec Board of Trade: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 8182 (iv).
Experimental Farms, Number controlled by Dom. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 3897 (ii).
——— Total Receipts from Sales, Expenditure, &c: (Mr. Armstrong) 4585 (iii).
Fumigation Stations: in Com. of Sup., 12879 (vii).
Hog Cholera in Essex, Number of Animals slaughtered, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 9280 (v).
Hogs slaughtered, Compensation paid, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 13085 (vii).
Horses and Cattle, Imports to U. S. as Thoroughbreds, Prevention of: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 6000 (iii).
Imperial Institute: in Com. of Sup., 10623 (vi).
Jamestown Exhibition, Canadian Exhibits, Permission *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5079 (iii).
Live Stock, N.B., Figures *re* Census, Methods of Obtaining, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 1506 (i).
Piggeries at Experimental Farm: Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 12895 (vii).
Seeds Inspection Act: in Com. of Sup., 12891 (vii).
Sheep Quarantine by U. S., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 13064 (vii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Christie) 13537 (vii).
Tuberculin Tests, Results of: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 9270 (v).
Aids to Navigation, Construction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5040 (iii).
Aids to Navigation, Construction of Lighthouses: in Com. of Sup., 5773 (iii).
See 'Marine.'
Alberta and B. C. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 192'
Alberta Development Co., Control of Coal Lands: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 6241 (iv).
Alberta Closed Leases, Number granted, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 3037 (ii).
Alberta Northern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 45.'
Alberton Fire Damage Claims: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. A. A. Lefurgey) 1209 (i).
Alcohol for Industrial Uses, Commission of Inquiry: prop. Res. (Mr. Bole) 3853 (ii).
Alexander, Mary, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 177.'
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Subsidies, Reports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 892 (i).
Algoma Steel Co., Orders from Govt. for Steel, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8606 (v).
See 'I. C. R.'
Alien Act: *See* B. No. 130.'
Alien Labour, Protection to Canadians: Pet. (Mr. Boyce) read in Com. of Sup., 12156 (vii).
See 'Immigration,' &c.
Allan, Mr., Interference in Dom. Elections: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 614 (i).
All-Red Line: prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12414; Agreed to (Y. 109; N. 47) 12501; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) Neg. (Y. 108; N. 48) 12499 (vii).
——— Irish Route, Opposition by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10253 (v).
——— Negotiations, Canadian Representative in England, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 353 (i).
——— Omission of, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 28 (i).
——— Route, Letter to Mr. Sifton from Prime Minister: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 948 (i).
——— Mr. Sifton's Address *re* Canada's Attitude: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 947 (i).
All-Red Route, &c., ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 87 (i).
——— Remarks *re* (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12162 (vii).
——— Statement *re* Negotiations: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 366 (i).
——— Tenders, Proposals, &c., Cor. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 6460 (iv).
——— Mr. White's Duties in England: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 694 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 608 (i).
American Bank Note Co., Agreement *re* Printing Stamps: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2593 (ii).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
American Cereal Co., Customs Refunds, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3484 (ii).

Amherst Station Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12233 (vii).
Ancoin *vs.* The King, Cor. *re* Suit in Supreme Court, N. S.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McLennan) 558 (i).
Anglo-American Cable between P.E.I. and Mainland, Breaking of: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 8439 (v).
Anglo-American Treaty, Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 937 (i), 6985 (iv).
——— Further Information: (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7447, 7834 (iv).
——— Information *re* Presenting (Mr. R. L. 8516 (v).
——— Anglo-American Treaties, Cor. *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9715 (v).
——— Inquiry for Cor. (Mr. Sproule) 10120 (v).
——— Treaty submitted to Can. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 6926 (iv).
See 'Fisheries,' &c.
Anglo-Canadian and Continental Bank: *See* 'B. No. 141.'
Anglo-Canadian Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 126.'
Anglo-French Exhibition, Canadian Representative: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8611 (v).
——— Goods purchased from T. Lindsay Co.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 8615 (v).
——— Purchase of Goods, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8443 (v).
——— Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8443 (v).
Anglo-French Treaty, Ratification by Imperial Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 11705 (vi).
See 'Franco-Canadian.'
Anglo-Japanese Treaty, Cor., Reps., &c.; M. for copies (Mr. Monk) 594 (i).
See 'Japanese,' &c.
Annapolis and Digby Mail Service, Amounts paid: Ques. (Mr. Lanctot) 12653 (vii).
Annapolis Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11207 (vi).
Annual Drill: in Com. of Sup., 5662 (iii).
See 'Militia.'
Anuities by Govt. for Old Age: *See* 'B. No. 120.' *See* 'Old Age,' &c.
Anse à la Barbe Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 12028 (vi).
Anse à l'Ilot Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).
Anse St. Jean Bridge, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vii).
Anthracite Coal, Qantity imported from U. S. and other Countries: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 1510 (i).
Anti-Cigarette Bill: *See* 'Tobacco.'
Antigonish Armoury, Leasing, &c., Letters, Tels., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. W. Chisholm) 1131 (i).
Antigonish, Increased Accommodation, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
Antigonish Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7110 (iv).
Appeal Court, B.C., Salary of Judge: M. to withdraw Res. (Mr. Aylesworth) 7992 (iv).
See 'Justice,' &c.
Apple and Fruit Inspectors, Number of Apptmts.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 353 (i).
Apples, &c., Marking of: *See* 'B. No. 148.'
Apples seized by Inspectors at Montreal, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 1508 (i).
Architects of Canada: *See* 'B. No. 88.'
Architectural Institute of Canada: M. (Mr. Ethier) to Refund Fees, 11234, 11404 (vi).
Architects on Public Works Payments, &c.: Remarks, in Com. of Sup., 7122 (iv).
Architectural Branch, Public Works Dept., Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11096 (vi).
Archives Dept., Index Cards purchased, Names of Firms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 6057 (iii).
Archives Fittings, Furnishings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5700 (iii).
Archives: in Com. of Sup., 671 (i).
'Arctic, Str., Amounts expended for Repairs, Supplies, &c., from June, 1904, to June, 1907: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 184 (i).
——— History of Cruise in Northern Waters: in Com. of Sup., 4009 (ii).
Armouries, Construction of: in Com. of Sup., 10886 (vi).
See 'Militia,' &c.
Army and Navy Veterans at the Tercentenary: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7448 (iv).
See 'Que. Tercentenary.'
Arnprior Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7454 (iv).
Arsenault, Mr. Auguste, Emplymt. in Customs, Montreal, Charges against: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1347 (i).
Arthabaskaville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
Artz, J. G., Apptmt. of. Remarks (Mr. Foster) on Conc., 13578 (vii).
Ashcroft, Barkerville and Fort George Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 58.'
Ashcroft-Dawson Telegraph Lines: in Com. of Sup., 5731 (iii).
Ashouapmouchouan, Peribonka Training Dykes: in Com. of Sup., 12035 (vi).
Ash Wednesday, Adjournment: Notice of Motion (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4221; M. 4314 (iii).
Asiatic Immigration into B.C.: *See* 'Immigration Act.'
Asiatic Labour in B.C., Rep. in Victoria 'Times': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6526 (iv).
See 'Japanese,' &c.
Assaults on Women, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 79.'

Assay Office, Vancouver, Results, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) on Conc., 13573 (vii).
Assurance Fund of Saskn. and Alta.: *See* B. No. 168.'
Astronomical Boundary Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 9737 (v).
Astronomical Observatory: in Com. of Sup., 1450, 1485 (i).
Atlantic, Que. and Western Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 134.'
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s Bridge Construction: in Com. on Res., 13306 (vii).
Atlantic Steamers, Mail Service, Cost per Annum: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5656 (iii).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
Aud. Gen.'s Office: in Com. of Sup., 635 (i).
Aud. Gen.'s Rep. (Vol. i): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 7 (i).
——— (Vol. ii): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 766 (i).
——— (Vol. iii): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 6 (i).
Auditor General's Salary: *See* 'B. No. 208.'
Audits and Inspection of Banks, Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 12658 (vii).
See 'Banks,' 'Finance,' &c.
Australia, G. B. and Canada Fast Line Steamers, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 558 (i).
See 'Can. and Australia.'
Australian Mission of Sir Mackenzie Bowell, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 2218
Australian Representative from Can. in 1901, Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Wilson) 2168 (ii).
Automobiles injuring Persons: *See* 'B. No. 140.'
Autonomy Act, Validity of: Return, Inquiry for (Mr. Lake) 5727 (iii).
Aylmer Customs Collector, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 1506 (i).
Aylmer Drill Shed: Remarks (Mr. Marshall) in Com. of Sup., 10894 (vi).
Baddeck Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11219 (vi).
Badgley Island, Trespass by T. H. Jackman, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 1937 (i), 2217 (ii).
Baie St. Paul, Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).
Bait Freezer and Cold Storage Co., N.B., Lease of Land to, Cost and Terms: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 563 (i).
——— Cor., Agreements, &c., with Govt.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 558 (i).
See 'Cold Storage,' 'New Brunswick,' &c.
Bait Freezer at North Sydney, Govt. Assistance *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 3848 (ii).
Balsam Lake Section, Trent Canal, Claims for Damages: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 10308 (vi).
Balsam Lake and Gull River, Ret. Incomplete: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 6059 (iii).
See 'Canals, Trent.
Bank Act, (additional circulation), Amt. *See* 'B. No. 160.'
Banks, Financial Stringency: *See* 'Wheat Transportation.'
Banks, Govt. Assistance *re* Grain Blockade: *See* 'No. 159.'
Bank of Hamilton, Pension Fund: *See* 'B. No. 56.'
Banking System: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Pringle) *re* Newspaper Reports, 2306 (ii).
——— Par. in 'Financial Post': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pringle) 4770 (iii).
See 'Can. Bank of Commerce.'
Bank of Vancouver: *See* 'B. No. 32.'
Bank of Winnipeg: *See* 'B. No. 19.'
Banque de St. Jean, Investigation *re* Failure, Remarks (Mr. Foster) 9335 (v).
Barachois de Malbaie Training Pier: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).
Barachois Training Pier: in Com. of Sup., 11223 (vi).
Barlow, Dr. A. E., Emplymt. in Geological Survey: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5205 (iii).
——— Survey *re* Temagami District: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5473 (iii).
——— Payments *re* Survey of Temagami District: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5787 (iii).
Bate & Co., and W. C. Edwards & Co., Amts. paid to *re* Supplies: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 3435 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3234 (ii).
Batiscan River, Dredging Channel: in Com. of Sup., 12036 (vi).
Batiscan Wharf, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).
Battlefields: *See* 'Can. Patriotic,' &c.
Battlefields at Quebec: *See* 'B. Nos. 111 and 219.'
Battlefields: *See* 'Quebec.'
Battleford Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8576 (v).
Bayfield, &c.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Armstrong) 6223 (iv).
See 'Grand Bend,' &c.
Bay St. Lawrence, Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).
Bear River Station Dwelling House, Tenders, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2161 (ii).
Beauchemin, A., Emplymt. at Sorel (Mr. Taylor) 5467 (iii).
Beauharnois Canal, Investigation by M. Dupuis, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3038 (ii).
——— Lease, Conditions, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bergeron) 1131 (i).
———Inquiry for (Mr. Bergeron) 1740 (i).

Beauharnois Canal, Lease to Robert Co., Employment of Mr. Deschenes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 8443 (v).
——— Lease of Water Power to McIntyre and Roberts Syndicate: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 13175 (vii).
——— Robert Syndicate: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 13475 (vii).
——— Water Power, New Lease, Copy of: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 946 (i).
Beaver Harbour Wharf: Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Beaverton Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12090, 13344 (vii).
Becancour, &c., Counties, Dredging at during 1907, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3040 (ii).
See 'Dredging,' &c.
Becancour Harbour Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 2392 (ii).
——— Dredging, Commencement of Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 7212 (iv).
Behring Sea Commission, Expenses *re*: Ques. (Mr. Finlayson) 1733 (i).
——— Sir C. H. Tupper's Travelling Expenses: Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) 4669 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2883 (ii).
Belgian Immigrants, Number and Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 176 (i).
Belgian Syndicate, Royal Commission, and Chap. 138, R.S.C., Judges as Commissioners, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 842 (i).
Bell, Dr., Additional Remuneration *re* Acting Director of Geological Survey: Remarks (Mr. Foster) on Conc., 13569 (vii).
Bellechasse Islet Lighthouse Keeper, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 4830 (iii).
Belle River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12090 (vii).
Belle River Harbour Improvements, Expenditure, *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 685 (i).
Belleville Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 7455 (iv).
Belleville Drill Hall, Negotiations for Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1509 (i).
——— Payments to Mr. J. Hurley, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1737 (i).
Belleville Floods, Investigation by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Porter) 3319 (ii), 4744 (iii).
Belleville Harbour, Issue of Bonds, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 6237 (iv).
——— Total Revenue, Expenditure for 1903-7: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 2592 (ii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Porter) 2983 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Porter) 4408 (iii).
Belleville Hospital Lot, Purchase Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 4830 (iii).
———M. for Ret.* (Mr. Porter) 5211 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 7506 (iv).
Belleville and North Hastings Ry. and G. T. Ry. Co.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Northrup) 2796 (ii).
Belleville Post Office, Excessive Postage: Remarks (Mr. Porter) 7933 (iv).
Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co.: *See* 'B. No. 20.'
Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Co. Bill, on Order for 2°: Remarks (Mr. Porter) 681 (i).
Belleville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7678 (iv).
Bell Memorial Association, Grant by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Cockshutt) on M. for Sup., 11206 (vi).
See 'Brantford.'
Bell Rapids P. O., Establishment of: Remarks (Mr. Porter) 8883 (v).
Berins Fish Hatchery, Failure of Spawn Supply: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 3240 (ii).
Bernier, Capt., Islands, Customs Ports, &c., Flagged by him: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5208, 5466 (iii).
Berthier Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).
'Bessie Butler,' Str., Dimensions, Use of by R. C. Clergy: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 12411 (vii).
Bic Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12030 (vi).
——— Material supplied, Quantity, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 9713 (v).
Big Lorraine Harbour, Dredging Entrance Channel: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).
Bills of Exchange Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 142.'
Bills, Royal Assent, Mess. from His Ex.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 2974, 2995 (ii), 5135, 6157 (iii), 6526 (iv), 13587 (vii).
BILLS:
Bill (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier)
1°*, 3 (i).
Bill (No. 2) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. Lancaster).
1°, 90 (i); 2°m., 3014; in Com., 3034 (ii).
Bill (No. 3) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Lancaster).
1°, 91; 2°, 570; in Com., 583; 3°*, 583 (i).
Bill (No. 4) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Turriff).
1°, 91 (i); 2°m., 3406 (ii).
Bill (No. 5) Respecting Co-operation.—(Mr. Monk).
1°, 92; 2°m., (i); M. to place on Govt. Orders, 3654 (ii); 2°m., 4547; in Com., 4564; 3°*, 4566 (iii).
Bill (No. 6) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Maclean, South York).
1°, 93; 2°m., 938 (i), 3320, 3363 (ii).
Bill (No. 7) To incorporate the North Empire Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Adamson).
1°*, 231; 2°*, 463 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5077 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 8) Respecting the Tobique Manufacturing Company, and to change its name to 'Fraser Lumber Company, Limited.—(Mr. Carvell).
1°*, 231; 2°*, 463 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 9) Respecting Surveys of Public Lands of the Dominion and the Surveyors entitled to make such surveys (Mr. Oliver).
1° 231; 2° and in Com., 754, 948; 3°*, 953 (i), Sen. Amts., 3755 (ii).

Bill (No. 10) To amend the Irrigation Act. —(Mr. Oliver).
1°*, 231; 2°, 766; in Com., 767, 953 (i); wthdn., 2974 (ii).

Bill (No. 11) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Maclean, S. York).
1°, 231 (i).

Bill (No. 12) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. Maclean, Lunenburg).
1°, 313 (i); 2°, 3414 (ii).

Bill (No. 13) Respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Galliher).
1°*, 350; 2°*, 680; in Com., and 3°*, 1469 (i).

Bill (No. 14) Respecting the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. McColl).
1°*, 350; 2°*, 680; in Com., and 3°*; 1469 (i).

Bill (No. 15) Respecting the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company.—(Mr. Sloan).
1°*, 350; 2°*, 680; in Com., and 3°*, 1469 (i).

Bill (No. 16) Respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Guthrie).
1°*, 350; 2°*, 680; in Com., 1894; 3°, 1929 (i).

Bill (No. 17) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. McCarthy, N. Simcoe).
1°, 349 (i); 2°m., 3414 (ii).

Bill (No. 18) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Kennedy).
1°, 350; 2°, 938 (i).

Bill (No. 19) To incorporate the Bank of Winnipeg.—(Mr. Bole).
1°*, 430; 2°*, 680 (i); in Com., 2787; 3°*, 2924 (ii).

Bill (No. 20) Respecting the Belleville Prince Edward Bridge Company.—(Mr. Porter).
1°*, 430; 2°m., 681, 779; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., 7669 (iv), 8332, 8552, 8609, 9066 (iv).

Bill (No. 21) Respecting the British Yukon Railway Company.—(Mr. Stewart).
1°*, 430; 2°*, 645 (i); in Com., 3621 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 22) Respecting the Macleod, Cardston and Montana Railway Company.—(Mr. Herron).
1°*, 430; 2°*, 680; in Com., and 3°*, 1894 (i).

Bill (No. 23) Respecting the Ministers' Widows' and Orphans' Fund of the Presbyterian Church in Canada.—Mr. Bickerdike).
1°*, 430; 2°*, 645 (i); in Com., 2788; 3°*, 2924 (ii).

Bill (No. 24) Respecting the West Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Calvert).
1°*, 430; 2°*, 645; in Com., and 3°*, 1468 (i).

Bill (No. 25) Respecting the Hamilton Radial Electric Railway Company.—(Mr. Clarke.)
1°*, 430; 2°*, 645 (i); in Com., 3194, 3226; M. to ref. back to Com., 3228; in Com., 3362, 3621, 3692, 3793 (ii), 4224; 3° m., 4357, 4536 (iii).

Bill (No. 26) Respecting the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Cash.)
1°*, 430; 2°*, 645; in Com., and 3°*, 1469 (i).

Bill (No. 27) To amend the Government Railways Act.—(Mr. Macdonald.)
1°, 430 (i); 2°, 5211; in Com., 5246; 3°*, 5247 (iii).

Bill (No. 28) To amend the Copyright Act.—(Mr. Macdonell.)
1°, 508; 2°, 939; in Com., 940 (i); 3°*,3014 (ii).

Bill (No. 29) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°, 508 (i); 2°, 5247 (iii).

Bill (No. 30) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Ethier).
1°, 560 (i).

Bill (No. 31) To amend the Fisheries Act.—(Mr. Sinclair).
1°*, 562 (i); 2°, and in Com., 5247 (iii).

Bill (No. 32) To incorporate the Bank of Vancouver.—(Mr. Macpherson).
1°*, 606; 2° m., 779; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., 4580; 3°*, 4582 (iii).

Bill (No. 33) Respecting the Calgary and Fernie Railway Company.—(Mr. Galliher).
1°*, 606; 2°*, 779 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 34) Respecting the Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Railway Company.—(Mr. Hughes, Victoria).
1°*, 606; 2°*, 779; in Com., 1894; 3°*, 1931 (i).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 35) To incorporate the Travellers Life Assurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Gervais).
1°*, 606; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5077 (iii).

Bill (No. 36) Respecting the Boundary, Kamloops and Cariboo Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Ross, Yale-Cariboo).
1°*, 606; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 37) To incorporate the Canada Weather Insurance Company.—(Mr. Schell, Oxford).
1°*, 753; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., 5077, 5174; 3°*, 5174 (iii).

Bill (No. 38) Respecting the Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company.—(Mr. Ross, Yale-Cariboo).
1°*,754; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 39) Respecting the Kamloops and Yellowhead Pass Railway Company.—(Mr. Ross, Yale-Cariboo).
1°*, 754; 2°*, 1059; in Com., and 3°*, 1895 (i).

Bill (No. 40) Respecting the Pacific Coast Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Macpherson).
1°*, 754; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., 6182 (iii), 6227; 3°*, 6231 (iv).

Bill (No. 41) To incorporate the Standard Plate Glass Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°*, 754; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., 6183; 3°*, 6184 (iii).

Bill (No. 42) Respecting Insurance.—(Mr. Fielding).
1°, 827; 2°, 1741 (i).

Bill (No. 43) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Barr).
1°, 840 (i); 2° m., 5212 (iii).

Bill (No. 44) To incorporate the Alberta Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Talbot).
1°*, 891; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 45) Respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona).
1°*, 891; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 46) Respecting the Cumberland Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Monk).
1°*, 891; 2°*, 1109 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 47) Respecting the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.—(Mr. Stewart).
1°*, 891; 2°, 1059 (i); in Com., 3622, 3794 (ii), 4230; 3°*, 4230 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 48) Respecting the Niagara Grand Island Bridge Company.—(Mr. German).
1°*, 891; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 49) To incorporate the Shuswap and Thompson Rivers Boom Company.—(Mr. Ross, Yale-Cariboo).
1°*, 891; 2°*, 1059 (i); in Com., 5109; 3° m., 5519 (iii).

Bill (No. 50) Respecting the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Copp).
1°*, 1108; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., 4231; 3°*, 4231; Sen. Amts., 5785 (iii).

Bill (No. 51) Respecting the Erie, London and Tilsonburg Railway Company.—(Mr. Pardee).
1°*, 1108; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4240 (iii).

Bill (No. 52) Respecting a Patent of Eugene Francois Giraud.—(Mr. Gordon).
1°*, 1108; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 53) Respecting the New Brunswick Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Carvell).
1°*, 1108; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5762 (iii).

Bill (No. 54) To incorporate the Northwestern Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Galliher).
1°*, 1108; 2°, 1468 (i).

Bill (No. 55) To incorporate the Western Rivers Improvement Company.—(Mr. Sloan).
1°*, 1108; 2°*, 1469 (i)

Bill (No. 56) To incorporate the Bank of Hamilton Pension Fund.—(Mr. Barker).
1°*, 1207; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5077 (iii).

Bill (No. 57) Respecting a certain Convention between His Majesty and the President of the French Republic.—(Mr. Fielding).
Res. prop., 941; in Com. on Res., 1213; 1° m., 1215, 1384 (i); 2°, 2221, 3493; in Com., 3577, 3581, 3636 (ii); 3° m., 4317, 4372 (ii).

Bill (No. 58) Respecting the Ashcroft, Barkerville and Fort George Railway Company.—(Mr. Ross, Yale-Cariboo).
1°*, 1283; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 59) To incorporate the Chartered Bank of British Columbia.—(Mr. Macpherson).
1°*, 1283; 2°*, 1469 (i).

Bill (No. 60) Respecting Patents of the Goodwin Car Company.—(Mr. Osler).
1°*, 1283; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2924 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 61) Respecting Patents of Montague Moore and Thomas James Heskett.—(Mr. Osler).
1°*, 1283; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2924 (ii).

Bill (No. 62) Respecting the Subsidiary High Court of the Ancient Order of Foresters in the Dominion of Canada—(Mr. Guthrie).
1°*, 1283; 2°*, 1469 (i); in Com., 5077, 5174; 3°*, 5175 (iii).

Bill (No. 63) Respecting Patents of the Sutherland Rifle Sight Company, Limited.—(Mr. Macdonald).
1°*, 1283; 2°*, 1469 (i).

Bill (No. 64) To amend the Inspection and Sale Act.—(Mr. Porter).
1°, 1283 (i); on order for 2°, 5226 (iii).

Bill (No. 65) To amend the Immigration Act.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 1284 (i).

Bill (No. 66) To amend the House of Commons Act.—(Mr. Borden).
1°, 1346 (i); 2° m., 5226 (iii).

Bill (No. 67) Respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. Pardee).
1°*, 1424; 2°*, 1616 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4240; Sen. Amts., 5955 (iii).

Bill (No. 68) Respecting the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Turriff).
1°*, 1424; 2°*, 1616 (i); in Com., 4239, 4545, 4577; 3°*, 4579 (iii).

Bill (No. 69) To incorporate the Ruthenian Catholic Mission of the Order of Saint Basil the Great in Canada.—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona).
1°*, 1424; 2°*, 1616 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3194 (ii).

Bill (No. 70) To incorporate the Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Railway Company.—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona).
1°*, 1424; 2°*, 1616 (i); in Com., 4231, 4546, 4579; 3°*, 4580 (iii).

Bill (No. 71) Respecting the Standard Mutual Fire Insurance Company, and to change its name to 'the Standard Fire Insurance Company.'—(Mr. Maclean, South York).
1°*, 1424; 2°*, 1616 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 9964 (v).

Bill (No. 72) Respecting Patents of the Windsor Pump and Foundry Company, Limited.—(Mr. Clarke).
1°*, 1424; 2°*, 1616 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2346 (ii).

Bill (No. 73) Respecting the Quebec Railway, Light and Power Company.—(Mr. Power).
1°*, 1584; 2°*, 1895 (i); in Com., 4240; in Com., and 3°*, 4545 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 74) Respecting the Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Railway Company.—(Mr. Grant).
1°*, 1584; 2°*, 1931 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4240; Sen. Amts., 6189 (iii).

Bill (No. 75) To incorporate the Woman's Auxiliary to the Missionary Society of the Church of England in Canada.—(Mr. Worthington).
1°*, 1584; 2°*, 1931 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2790 (ii).

Bill (No. 76) Respecting the Interprovincial Railway Bridge Company of New Brunswick.—(Mr. C. Marcil).
1°*, 1584; 2°*, 1895 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4240 (iii).

Bill (No. 77) Respecting the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company.—(Mr. Dubeau).
1°*, 1584; 2°*, 1895 (i); in Com., 4240; in Com., and 3°*, 4545 (iii).

Bill (No. 78) To amend the Provisions of the Criminal Code respecting Offensive Weapons.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 1668 (i).

Bill (No. 79) To amend the Provisions of the Criminal Code respecting Assaults on Women and Children.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 1670 (i).

Bill (No. 80) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Alcorn).
1°, 1671 (i); 2°, 5228 (iii).

Bill (No. 81) Respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona).
1°*, 1732; 2°*, 1931 (i); in Com., 4231; in Com., and 3°*, 4545 (iii).

Bill (No. 82) Respecting the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company.—(Mr. Adamson).
1°*, 1732; 2°*, 1931 (i); in Com., 4996, 5049; 3°*, 5077 (iii); Sen. Amts., 10511 (vi).

Bill (No. 83) Respecting the Owen Sound and Meaford Railway Company.—(Mr. Telford).
1°*, 1732 (i); 2°*, 2062 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4240 (iii).

Bill (No. 84) To incorporate the Dominion Transportation and Storage Company.—(Mr. German).
1°*, 1859 (i); 2°*, 2062 (ii).

Bill (No. 85) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Lavergne, Montmagny).
1°, 2021 (ii); 2° m., 5242 (iii).

Bill (No. 86) To incorporate the Northern Empire Railway Company.—(Mr. Caron).
1°*, 2160; 2°*, 2386 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5387 (iii).

Bill (No. 87) To incorporate the Vancouver Island and Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Sloan).
1°*, 2160; 2°*, 2346 (ii); in Com., 4545; 3°*, 4545; Sen. Amts., 6189 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 88) To incorporate the Institute of Architects of Canada.—(Mr. Walsh, Montreal, Ste. Anne).

1°*, 2214; 2°*, 2386 (ii); in Com., 5379, 5408, 5785, 5953; 3°*, 5955 (iii).

Bill (No. 89) To authorize the Sale to the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, of a portion of Major's Hill Park, in the City of Ottawa, as a Hotel Site.—(Mr. Pugsley).

Res. prop., 1584 (i), 2221; in Com. on Res., 2258; 1°*, 2260 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 12061; 3°*, 12084 (vii).

Bill (No. 90) To amend the Passenger Ticket Act.—(Mr. Reid, Grenville).

1°,2466 (ii); 2° m., 5244 (iii).

Bill (No. 91) To amend the Act respecting the Supreme Court of Canada.—(Mr. Gervais).

1°, 2542 (ii).

Bill (No. 92) To amend the Criminal Code with regard to the Speedy Trial of Indictable Offences.—(Mr. Gervais).

1°, 2543 (ii).

Bill (No. 93) To amend the Criminal Code and punish homicide while hunting.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°, 2590 (ii).

Bill (No. 94) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial year ending 31st March, 1908.—(Mr. Fielding).

In Com. on Ways and Means, 2780; 1°, 2°, and in Com., 2782; 3°*, 2785 (ii).

Bill (No. 95) To amend the Winding-up Act.—(Mr. Macdonell).

1°, 2974 (ii).

Bill (No. 96) To amend the Criminal Code with regard to conspiracy in restraint of trade.—(Mr. Gervais).

1°, 2976 (ii).

Bill (No. 97) Respecting the hours of labour on Public Works.—(Mr. Verville).

1°, 3157 (ii).

Bill (No. 98, from the Senate) Respecting the St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Company.—(Mr. Blain).

1°, 3315 (ii); 2°*, 4240; in Com., 4580; 3°*, 4580 (iii).

Bill (No. 99) To amend the Irrigation Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 3315 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 4671; 3°*, 4674 (iii).

Bill (No. 100) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Martin, St. Mary's).

1°*, 3316 (ii).

Bill (No. 101) Respecting the Fort William Terminal Railway and Bridge Company.—(Mr. Macpherson).

1°*, 3477 (ii); 2°*, 4240; in Com., 6180 (iii), 6223; 3°*, 6225 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 102) To amend the Winding-up Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 3477; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 3933 (ii).

Bill (No. 103, from the Senate) Respecting the Eastern Trust Company.—(Mr. Guthrie).

1°*, 3653 (ii); 2°*, 4240; in Com., and 3°*, 6191 (iii).

Bill (No. 104, from the Senate) To amend the Companies Act.—(Mr. Fielding).

1°*, 3653 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 5492; 3°, 5495 (iii).

Bill (No. 105) To regulate the placing and maintaining of Booms in International Streams.—(Mr. Pugsley).

1°, 3654 (ii).

Bill (No. 106) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Lavergne, Montmagny).

1°, 3655 (ii).

Bill (No. 107 from the Senate) Respecting the Trans-Canada Railway Company.—(Mr. Girard).

1°*, 3834 (ii); 2°*, 4240; in Com., 5386; 3°*, 5387 (iii).

Bill (No. 108 from the Senate) Respecting the Windsor, Chatham and London Railway Company.—(Mr. Clarke).

1°*, 3834 (ii); 2°*, 4240; in Com., and 3°*, 5387 (iii).

Bill (No. 109) To authorize a Bounty to Volunteers who served the Crown in South Africa.—(Mr. Oliver).

Res. prop., 3316; in Com. on Res., 3756, 3805; 1°* of B., 3834 (ii); Res. prop., 11938; in Com on Res., 12595; 2°, and in Com., 12595, 13047; 3°, 13207; Sen. Amts., 13524 (vii).

Bill (No. 110, from the Senate) Respecting a certain Patent of Frederick C. Rehm, Elias Frank and Isidore Frank.—(Mr. Béland).

1°*, 3896 (ii); 2°*, 4240; in Com., and 3°*, 4996 (iii).

Bill (No. 111) Respecting the Canadian Battlefields at Quebec.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier).

Res. prop., 3579; in Com. on Res., 3901; 1°, 3902 (ii); 2° m., 4376; in Com., 4393, 4408, 4497; 3° m., 4529 (iii).

Bill (No. 112) To amend the Railway Act as respects the Constitution of the Board of Railway Commissioners.—(Mr. Graham).

Res. prop., 3751; in Com. on Res., 3903; 1°*, 3933 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 4964 (iii), 8510; 3°*, 8514 (v).

Bill (No. 113) To amend the Land Titles Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 4221 (iii); 2° m., 6517; in Com., 6518; 3°*, 6520 (iv).

Bill (No. 114) To amend the Inspection and Sale Act.—(Mr. McIntyre, Strathcona).

1°, 4312 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 115) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 4566 (iii); 2° m., 7835, 7939, 7998; on Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 8076, 8089, 8138, 8185 (iv), 8296, 8332, 8387, 8619 (v), 11707; Amt. wthdrn., and in Com., 11796; in Com., 11827, 11885 (vi), 12919, 12984; 3° m., 13229; 3°*, 13258; Sen. Amts., 13579 (vii).

Bill (No. 116) To amend the Exchequer Court Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 4576 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 8501; 3°*, 8510 (v).

Bill (No. 117) To amend the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways Employees' Provident Fund Act.—(Mr. Graham).

1°, 4576; 2°, and in Com., 4994; 3°*, 4995 (iii).

Bill (No. 118) To amend the Railway Act with respect to Telegraphs and Telephones, and the Jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners.—(Mr. Graham).

1°, 4658 (iii); 2°, 10625; in Com., 10636, 10658; 3° m., 10777, 11124, 11590; ref. back to Com., 11633; 3°*, 11633 (vi).

Bill (No. 119) To encourage the Construction of Dry Docks.—(Mr. Fielding).

Res. prop., 4314; in Com. on Res., 4675; 1°*, 4689 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 6911 (iv); in Com., 10761; 3°*, 10771; Sen. Amts., 11633 (vi).

Bill (No. 120) To authorize the Issue of Government Annuities for Old Age.—(Mr. Fielding).

In Com. on Res., 4689; 1°*, 4702 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 10848 (vi), 12053; 3°*, 12054; Sen. Amts., 13316 (viii).

Bill (No. 121) To amend the Supreme Court Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 4826; 2°, and in Com., 5497; 3°*, 5499 (iii).

Bill (No. 122) To make better Provision for the exercise of Admiralty Jurisdiction within Canada, in accordance with the Colonial Courts of Admiralty Act, 1890.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

Res. prop., 2881 (ii); in Com. on Res., 4835; 1°*, 4867 (iii).

Bill (No. 123, from the Senate) To amend the Gold and Silver Marking Act.—(Mr. Fisher).

1°*, 5337; 2°*, and in Com., 5495; 3°*, 5497 (iii).

Bill (No. 124, from the Senate) For the relief of Andrew Walker.—(Mr. Guthrie).

1°*, 5336; 2°*, 5464 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 7142 (iv).

Bill (No. 125, from the Senate) Respecting the Western Alberta Railway Company.—(Mr. Macpherson).

1°*, 5255; 2°*, 5464; in Com., 6183; 3°*, 6189 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 126, from the Senate) To change the name and head office of the Anglo-Canadian Insurance Company.—(Mr. Gervais).

1°*, 5256; 2°*, 5464 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 7725 (iv).

Bill (No. 127, from the Senate) Respecting the Dominion Guarantee Company, Limited.—(Mr. Pringle).

1°*, 5255; 2°*, 5464; in Com., 6183 (iii), 6231; 3°*, 6231 (iv); Sen. Amts., 12773 (vii).

Bill (No. 128, from the Senate) Respecting the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway Company.—(Mr. Michaud).

1°*, 5255; 2°*, 5464; in Com., 6181 (iii), 6225; 3°*, 6227 (iv).

Bill (No. 129, from the Senate) To incorporate the London and Lancashire Guarantee and Accident Company.—(Mr. Macdonell).

1°*, 5255; 2°*, 5464 (iii).

Bill (No. 130, from the Senate) To amend the Naturalization Act.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier).

1°*, 5256 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 11990 (vi); 3°*, 12393 (vii).

Bill (No. 131, from the Senate) Respecting the Occidental Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Ross, Yale-Cariboo).

1°*, 5337; 2°*, 5464 (iii); in Com., 7724 (iv); 3°*, 8332 (v).

Bill (No. 132, from the Senate) To incorporate the Standard Accident and Guarantee Company.—(Mr. Macdonell).

1°*, 5337; 2°*, 5464; in Com., and 3°*, 6191 (iii).

Bill (No. 133, from the Senate) To amend the Boards of Trade Act.—(Mr. Fielding).

1°*, 5337 (iii); 2°, 11987; in Com., 11987 (vi), 12393; 3°*, 12393 (vii).

Bill (No. 134, from the Senate) Respecting the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Marcil).

1°*, 5649; 2°, 5763; in Com., and 3°*, 6191 (iii).

Bill (No. 135) To amend the Immigration Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 5657 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 6429; 3°*, 6517 (iv).

Bill (No. 136) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the financial years ending respectively the 31st March, 1908, and the 31st March, 1909.—(Mr. Fielding).

In Com. on Ways and Means, 5919, 5955; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 5957 (iii).

Bill (No. 137, from the Senate) Respecting the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.—(Mr. Dyment).

1°*, 5913; 2°*, 6191 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 8332 (v).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 138, from the Senate) Respecting the Pacific and Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Dyment).
1°*, 5913; 2°*, 6191 (iii); in Com., 8610, 9069; 3°*, 9070 (v).

Bill (No. 139, from the Senate) For the relief of Edith Maud Rosario Gammell.—(Mr. Galliher).
1°*, 5913; 2°, 6190 (iii); in Com., 7141; 3°*, 7142 (iv).

Bill (No. 140) To amend the Criminal Code respecting injuries to Persons due to Motor Vehicles.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°*, 5993 (iii).

Bill (No. 141, from the Senate) To incorporate the Anglo-Canadian and Continental Bank.—(Mr. Guthrie).
1°*, 6054; 2°*, 6191 (iii); in Com., 7724; 3°*, 7724 (iv).

Bill (No. 142) To amend the Bills of Exchange Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).
1°, 6054 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 6520; 3°*, 6523 (iv).

Bill (No. 143) To amend the Inland Revenue Act.—(Mr. Templeman).
Res. prop., 5161; in Com. on Res., 6118; 1°*, 6142 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 6466; 3°*, 6517 (iv).

Bill (No. 144) To amend the Winding-up Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).
1°, 6142 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 6523; 3°*, 6525 (iv).

Bill (No. 145) To amend the Act relating to Ocean Steamship Subsidies.—(Mr. Brodeur).
Res. prop., 3493; in Com. on Res., 6161, 6191; 1°*, 6215 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 6408; 3°*, 6429 (iv).

Bill (No. 146) Respecting Proprietary and Patent Medicines.—(Mr. Templeman).
Res. prop., 4963; in Com. on Res., 6215; 1°*, 6218 (iii); 2°, 10551 (vi); in Com., 12622; 3°*, 12628 (vii).

Bill (No. 147) To repeal the Canned Goods Act.—(Mr. Fisher).
1°, 6221; 2°, and in Com., 6870; 3°*, 6890 (iv).

Bill (No. 148) To amend the Inspection and Sale Act.—(Mr. Fisher).
1°, 6221; 2°, 6900; in Com., 6900 (iv), 10553; 3°*, 10569 (vi).

Bill (No. 149) To amend the Meat and Canned Foods Act.—(Mr. Fisher).
1°, 6221; 2°, and in Com., 6890; 3° m., 7215; ref. back to Com., 7227; 3°*, 7257 (iv).

Bill (No. 150) To amend the Yukon Placer Mining Act.—(Mr. Oliver).
1°*, 6221 (iv); 2° m., 8481; in Com., 8483 (v), 10518; 3°*, 10526 (vi).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 151, from the Senate) Respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company.—(Mr. Crawford).
1°*, 6287; 2°, 6561; in Com., 7141, 7667, 8125 (iv), 8332, 8552, 8609, 8741, 9066, 9377, 9461; 3°*, 9472 (v).

Bill (No. 152) Respecting Signal Dues at Halifax.—(Mr. Brodeur).
1°, 6457 (iv); 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 8510 (v).

Bill (No. 153, from the Senate) To incorporate the Saskatchewan Power Company, Limited.—(Mr. McCraney).
1°*, 6525; 2°*, 6636; in Com., 7675, 7722 (iv), 8560, 8610, 9166; 3° m., 9167 (v).

Bill (No. 154, from the Senate) Respecting the Board of the Presbyterian College, Halifax.—(Mr. Sinclair).
1°*, 6525; 2°*, 6636; in Com., 7667; 3°*, 7669 (iv).

Bill (No. 155, from the Senate) Respecting the Pontiac Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Bickerdike).
1°*, 6525; 2°*, 6636 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 8332 (v).

Bill (No. 156, from the Senate) Respecting the Northern Bank and Crown Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Guthrie).
1°*, 6525; 2°*, 6636; in Com., and 3°*, 7725 (iv).

Bill (No. 157) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).
1°, 6843 (iv).

Bill (No. 158) Respecting Meaford Harbour.—(Mr. Brodeur).
1°, 7195 (iv); 2°, and in Com., 8510; 3°*, 8510 (v).

Bill (No. 159) Respecting a certain Issue of Dominion Notes.—(Mr. Fielding).
1°, 7307 (iv); 2°, and in Com., 10795; 3°*, 10848 (vi).

Bill (No. 160) To amend the Bank Act.—(Mr. Fielding).
1°, 7307 (iv); 2°, 10919; in Com., 10933; 3°*, 10952 (vi).

Bill (No. 161) To amend the Criminal Code.—(Mr. Beauparlant).
1°, 7307 (iv).

Bill (No. 162) To amend the Post Office Act.—(Mr. Lemieux).
1°, 7931 (iv); 2°, and in Com., 10703; 3°*, 10746 (vi); Sen. Amts., 12393 (vii).

Bill (No. 163) To authorize the exchange of certain School Lands for other Dominion Lands.—(Mr. Oliver).
1°, 8086 (iv); 2° m., 8467; in Com., 8478; 3°*, 8480 (v).

Bill (No. 164, from the Senate) For the relief of Edith May Gilmore.—(Mr. Reid, Grenville).
1°*, 8377; 2°*, 8610 (v); in Com., and 3°*, 10472 (vi).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 165) Respecting the Court of Appeal of British Columbia.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

Res. prop., 8185 (iv); in Com. on Res., 8465; 1°, 8466 (v); 2°, and in Com., 10862; 3°*, 10863 (vi).

Bill (No. 166, from the Senate) To amend the Prisons and Reformatories Act in so far as the same affects the Province of Nova Scotia.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°*, 8604 (v); 2°, 10690; in Com., 10691; 3°*, 10693 (vi).

Bill (No. 167, from the Senate) Respecting the Phœnix Assurance Company, Limited.—(Mr. Macdonald).

1°*, 8603; 2°*, 9070; in Com., and 3°*, 9964 (v).

Bill (No. 168) To authorize the payment to the Provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta of part of the Assurance Fund under the Land Titles Act, 1894.—(Mr. Oliver).

Res. prop., 7094 (iv); in Com. on Res., 8480; 1°*, 8481 (v); 2°, 10525; in Com., 10526; 3°*, 10528 (vi).

Bill (No. 169) To amend the Yukon Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 8604 (v); 2°, 10528; in Com., 10529; 3°, 10545; Sen. Amts., 11634 (vi).

Bill (No. 170, from the Senate) Respecting the Nipissing Central Railway Company.—(Mr. McCool).

1°*, 8694; 2°*, 9070; in Com., and 3°*, 9964 (v).

Bill (No. 171) Respecting the Government Guaranteed Bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Fielding).

1°, 8835 (v); 2°, and in Com., 10771; 3°*, 10777 (vi).

Bill (No. 172) To incorporate the Dominion Power Company.—(Mr. Hall).

1°*, 9021; 2°*, 9168 (v).

Bill (No. 173) To restrain the Use of Tobacco by Young Persons.—(Mr. Aylesworth).

1°, 9021 (v); 2°, and in Com., 10693; 3°*, 11235 (vi); Sen. Amts., 13044 (vii).

Bill (No. 174, from the Senate) Respecting certain patents of the General Chemical Company.—(Mr. Stewart).

1°*, 9126; 2°*, 9472 (v); in Com., and 3°*, 10472 (vi).

Bill (No. 175, from the Senate) For the relief of Catherine Ann Cannon.—(Mr. Stewart).

1°*, 9126; 2°*, 9472 (v); in Com., and 3°*, 10472 (vi).

Bill (No. 176, from the Senate) For the relief of Ada Katurah Stewart Paulding.—(Mr. Stewart).

1°*, 9126; 2°*, 9472 (v); in Com., and 3°*, 10472 (vi).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 177, from the Senate) For the relief of Mary Alexander.—(Mr. Stewart).

1°*, 9126; 2°*, 9472 (v); in Com., and 3°* 10472 (vi).

Bill (No. 178, from the Senate) Relating to the Water-Carriage of Goods.—(Mr. Johnston).

1°*, 9330 (v); M. for 2°, 13508 (vii).

Bill (No. 179, from the Senate) To incorporate the Synod of the Diocese of Keewatin.—(Mr. McCraney).

1°*, 9330; 2°*, 10008 (v); in Com., and 3°*, 11460 (vi).

Bill (No. 180, from the Senate) Respecting the Crown Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. Tisdale).

1°*, 9330; in Com., 9962; 3°*, 9964 (v).

Bill (No. 181) To consolidate and amend the Acts respecting the Public Lands of the Dominion.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 9333 (v); 2°, 11125; in Com., 11158, 11408, 11460, 11502, 11940; 3° m., 11970 (vi), 12394; 3°*, 12399; Sen. Amts., 13522 (vii).

Bill (No. 182, from the Senate) For the relief of Hattie Spratte.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).

1°*, 9889; 2°*, 10008 (v); in Com., and 3°*, 10472 (vi).

Bill (No. 183, from the Senate) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. Brodeur).

1°*, 10119 (v); 2°, and in Com., 12851, 13052; 3°*, 13223 (vii).

Bill (No. 184, from the Senate) To amend the Chinese Immigration Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°*, 10008 (v); 2°, 10545; in Com., 10546, 10743, 11020; 3°*, 11022 (vi).

Bill (No. 185, from the Senate) Respecting the Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal.—(Mr. Johnston).

1°*, 10008; M. for 2°, 10122 (v); in Com., and 3°*, 12595 (vii).

Bill (No. 186) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the financial year ending the 31st March, 1909.—(Mr. Fielding).

In Com. on Ways and Means, 10510; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 10510 (vi).

Bill (No. 187, from the Senate) To amend the Canada Temperance Act.—(Mr. Black).

1°*, 10717 (vi); 2° m., 13506; in Com., 13507; 3°*, 13508 (vii).

Bill (No. 188, from the Senate) To amend the Manitoba Grain Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°*, 10717 (vi); 2°, and in Com., 12559, 13207; 3°*, 13215 (vii).

Bill (No. 189) To amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. Fisher).

Res. prop., 11300; in Com. on Res., 11351; 1°, 10717; 2°, 11315; in Com., 11362, 11535, 11634 (vi), 12163; 3°*, 12189; Sen. Amts., 13520 (vii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 190, from the Senate) Respecting Juvenile Delinquents.—(Mr. Aylesworth).
1°*, 10915 (vi); 2°, and in Com., 12399; 3°* 12406 (vii).

Bill (No. 191) Respecting the payment of Bounties on Lead contained in Lead-bearing Ores Mined in Canada.—(Mr. Fielding).
Res. prop., 10952; in Com. on Res., 10952; 1°* of B., 10953; 2°, 11235; in Com., 11243; 3°, 12054 (vii).

Bill (No. 192, from the Senate) To incorporate the Alberta and British Columbia Railway Company.—(Mr. Herron).
1°*, 11120; 2°*, 11460 (vi); in Com., and 3°*, 12594 (vii).

Bill (No. 193) To amend the Timber Marking Act.—(Mr. Fisher).
1°, 11120 (vi); 2°, and in Com., 12408; 3°*, 12408 (vii).

Bill (No. 194) To amend the Customs Act.—(Mr. Paterson).
Res. prop., 11233; in Com. on Res., 11312; 1°* of B., 11315; in Com., 11980 (vi).

Bill (No. 195, from the Senate) To incorporate the Waterloo and Guelph Railway Company.—(Mr. Zimmerman).
1°*, 11589; 2°*, 11885 (vi); in Com., and 3°*, 12595 (vii).

Bill (No. 196, from the Senate) For the relief of Arthur James Townsend.—(Mr. Copp).
1°*, 11589; 2°*, 11885 (vi); in Com., and 3°*, 12984 (vii).

Bill (No. 197, from the Senate) Respecting the Sale and Marking of Manufactures of Gold and Silver, and Gold and Silver Plated Ware.—(Mr. Fisher).
1°*, 11990 (vi); 2°, and in Com., 12554; 3°*, 12559 (vii).

Bill (No. 198, from the Senate) Respecting a certain Patent of William B. Smith.—(Mr. Galliher).
1°*, 12393; in Com., and 3°*, 12984 (vii).

Bill (No. 199) To provide for the payment of Bounties on Crude Petroleum.—(Mr. Fielding).
Res. prop., 12162; in Com. on Res., 12406; 1°* of B., 12407; 2°, and in Com., 12644; 3°*, 12644 (vii).

Bill (No. 200) Respecting the Salary of the Superintendent of Insurance.—(Mr. Fielding).
Res prop., 12162; in Com. on Res., 12407; 1°* of B., 12407; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 12644 (vii).

Bill (No. 201) To assist in maintaining an Independent and Efficient service of Telegraphic news from Great Britain for Publication in the Canadian Press.—(Mr. Fielding).
Res. prop., 12052; in Com. on Res., 12407; 1°* of B., 12408; 2°, 12644, 12837; in Com., 12848; 3°*, 12851 (vii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No 202) To authorize the Construction of a Branch Line of the Prince Edward Island Railway from Harmony, on the Souris Branch to Elmira.—(Mr. Graham).
Res. prop., 12052; in Com. on Res., 12408; 1°* of B., 12409; 2°, 12628; in Com., 12631; 3°*, 12643 (vii).

Bill (No. 203, from the Senate) To amend the Inspection and Sale Act as regards Grain.—(Mr. Oliver).
1°*, 12594; 2°, and in Com., 13048, 13208; 3°*, 13215 (vii).

Bill (No. 204) To amend chapter 38 of the Statutes of 1907, in amendment of the Railway Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).
1°, 12549; 2°, and in Com., 13046; 3°*, 13047 (vii).

Bill (No. 205) To Prohibit the Importation, Manufacture and Sale of Opium for other than Medicinal Purposes.—(Mr. Lemieux).
Res. prop., 12503; in Com. on Res., 12550; 1°* of B., 12551; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 12851; Sen. Amts., 13523 (vii).

Bill (No. 206) To amend the Judges' Act.—(Mr Aylesworth)
Res. prop., 12392; in Com. on Res., 12551; 1°* of B., 12554; 2°, and in Com., 13048; 3°*, 13051 (vii).

Bill (No. 207, from the Senate) Respecting certain Patents of the Metal Shingle and Siding Company, Limited.—(Mr. Galliher).
1°*, 12649; 2°, 12649; in Com., and 3°*, 12984 (vii).

Bill (No. 208) Respecting the office of the Auditor General.—(Mr. Fielding).
Res. prop., 12502; in Com. on Res., 12644; 1°* of B., 12645; 2°, and in Com., 12645; 3°*, 12645 (vii).

Bill (No. 209) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. Fielding).
Res. prop., 12392; in Com. on Res., 12645; 1°* of B., 12649; 2°, and in Com., 13053; 3°*, 13207 (vii).

Bill (No. 210) To amend the Northwest Territories Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).
1°*, 12650; 2°, and in Com., 13051; 3°*, 13052 (vii).

Bill (No. 211) To amend the Act of the present session intituled 'An Act respecting the Dominion Guarantee Company, Limited.'—(Mr. Pringle).
1°*, 2°*, 12773; in Com., and 3°*, 13224 (vii).

Bill (No. 212) To amend the Criminal Code, and to repeal section 415 of the Railway Act.—(Mr. Aylesworth).
1°, 12919; 2°, and in Com., 13316; 3°*, 13320 (vii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 213) Respecting Aid for the extension of the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway.—(Mr. Graham).

Res. prop., 13066; M. for Com. on Res., 13258; in Com. on Res., 13278; 1°* of B., 13282; 2°, and in Com., 13419; 3°*, 13420 (vii).

Bill (No. 214) Respecting certain Aid for the Extension of the Canadian Northern Railway.—(Mr. Graham).

Res. prop., 13069; in Com. on Res., 13282; 1°* of B., 13285; 2°, and in Com., 13420; 3°*, 13420 (vii).

Bill (No. 215) To authorize the granting of Subsidies in aid of the construction of the Lines of Railway therein mentioned. —(Mr. Graham).

Res. prop., 13071; in Com. on Res., 13285; 1°* of B., 13315; 2°, and in Com., 13478; 3°*, 13490 (vii).

Bill (No. 216) Respecting the Canadian Patriotic Funds Association.—(Sir Frederick Borden).

1°*, 2°, and in Com., 13320; 3°*, 13321 (vii).

Bill (No. 217) Respecting the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company.—(Mr. Graham).

Res. prop., 13080; in Com. on Res., 13416; 1°* of B., 13417; 2°, and in Com., 13491; 3°*, 13493 (vii).

Bill (No. 218) To authorize the sale or other disposal of certain Ordnance Lands in the Cities of Toronto and Montreal.—(Sir Frederick Borden).

Res. prop., 13226; in Com. on Res., 13417; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., 13418; 3°*, 13419 (vii).

Bill (No. 219) Respecting the National Battlefields at Quebec.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier).

1°, 13495; 2°, and in Com., 13501; 3°*, 13506 (vii).

Bill (No. 220) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the financial year ending 31st March, 1909.—(Mr. Fielding).

M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 13579; in Com. on Ways and Means, 13579; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., 13579; 3°*, 13579 (vii).

Binder Twine Bounty, Amounts paid from 1903 to 1907, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 4583 (iii).

Binder Twine in Kingston Penitentiary, Sale and Contracts: in Com. of Sup., 5522 (iii).

Binder Twine, Purchasers' Names and P. O. Addresses: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 9715 (v).

——— Seizures, and Payments to Mr. A. Smith: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 653 (i).

Blackhalls Estate, Claims *re* Caraquet Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 11686 (vi).

Blairmore Townsite: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 10087 (v).

Blanche River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12090 (vii).

Blankets purchased by Militia and Indian Depts., Amount, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 4584 (iii).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. Clements) 6465 (iv).

Blind River Wharf Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12091 (vii).

Blood Indian Reserve, Lease to McEwan Cattle Co.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 12739 (vii).

Blue Books, Distribution to Members, Changes: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 194 (i).

——— Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 241 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 432 (i).

Blunden, Fred. W., Imprisonment of: Remarks (Mr. Ward) in Com. of Sup., 12902

——— Trial and Conviction, Cor. *re*: M. for Copy (Mr. Ward) 3466 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Ward) 5211 (iii).

Boards of Trade Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 133.'

Bobcaygeon Dam, Flooding of Highways, &c., Protection *re*: Prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2992 (ii).

——— Transfer of Power Plant, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1114 (i).

See 'Canals—Trent.'

Boiler Inspection Insurance Co., Payments to Mr. R. Stewart: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 5941 (iii).

Boivin, Cote & Co., Amounts paid to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 12650 (vii).

Bonanza Post Office Theft, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1291 (i).

Bonaventure River Training Pier: in Com. of Sup., 12036 (vi).

Boneless Meat, Frozen, Imported into G.B., Par. in English Newspapers: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3230 (ii).

Bonn Post Office, Application *re* Establishment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 10516 (vi).

Bonusing System *re* Immigration: Notice of Motion (Mr. Monk) 6288 (iv).

See 'Immigration,' &c.

Booms in International Streams: *See* 'B. No. 105.'

Boone, C. S., Co., Amounts paid for Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 4244, 5083 (iii).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bennett) 5476 (iii).

Borden, Sir Frederick, and Cold Storage Co.: *See* 'New Brunswick.'

Boundary Delimitations, Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 9738 (v).

Boundary, Kamloops and Cariboo Central Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 36.'

Bounties on Crude Petroleum: *See* 'B. No. 199.'

Bounties on Lead: *See* 'B. No. 191.'

Bounties paid on Binder Twine, Lead, &c., Amount from 1903 to 1907: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 4583 (iii).

See 'Lead,' &c.

Bounties, Total Amount paid by Govt since 1906: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 895 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Clements) 1130 (i).
Bounties paid by Govt. for 1908-9: Ques. (Mr. R. L Borden) 13226 (vii)
Boyle Concessions, Memorials from Dawson Legislature: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 509, 562, 681 (i).
Brampton Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 10888 (vi).
Brampton Post Office, Repairs, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 7480 (iv).
Brandon Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 8517 (v), 10953, 10974 (vi).
Brantford Drill Hall: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 10891 (vi).
Brantford Public Building, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7455 (iv).
Brantford Stove Works Strike, Arrests *re* Picketing: Remarks (Mr. R. Smith) 9027 (v).
——— Cor. with Justie Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 10016 (v).
Brantford Telephone Monument: on Conc., 13567 (vii).
See 'Bell.'
Brass, Mr. Albert, Postmaster at Rusagnoris, Charges *re* Political Activity: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 6642 (iv).
Brass, Quantity and Quality, Importation into Canada: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 6232 (iv).
Braund, Samuel, Apptmt. as Inspector of Port Maitland Pier: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 5674 (iii).
Breton Cove Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).
Brewster and Park Hill Mail Route, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6404 (iv).
Bridge Strengthening, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12259 (vii).
Bridge Subsidies to Rvs.: Amt. (Mr. Leonard) in Com. on Res., 13310 (vii).
Bridgewater Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7135 (iv).
Brier Island Fog Alarm, Installation of, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 9473 (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. Foster) 9266 (v).
Brighton Wharf, Repairs *re*: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 5913 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Owen) in Com. of Sup., 12133, 12138 (vii).
B.C., Chartered Bank of: *See* 'B. No. 59.'
B.C., Court of Appeal: *See* 'B. No. 165.'
B.C., Fisheries Commission, Report *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5728 (iii).
B.C., Fishing Licenses issued to Packers' Association: Ques. (Mr. Kennedy) 8173 (v).
See 'Fisheries,' &c.
B.C., Revenue contributed from 1872-3 to 1905: M. for Ret.* (Mr. D. Ross) 3435 (ii).
B. C. Southern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 13.'

B. C. Telegraphs, Claims of C. P. Ry. *re* Cape Beale Lines: in Com of Sup., 5732(iii).
British Pensioners, Notice from Imp. Govt. of Deductions: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 7501 (iv).
British Yukon Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 21.'
Britton, Mr. Justice, Payment *re* Treadgold Commission: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5474 (iii).
Brock, Mr., Emplymt. *re* Geological Survey: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5204 (iii).
Brockville, Cheese Curing Room, Lease, Rental, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Brodeur) 3897 (ii).
———Cold Storage Plant, Disposal of: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 3234 (ii).
Brockville and Ottawa, Ry. Connections, Charges against Ry. Commission: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 1429 (i).
——— M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn. House, 186 (i).
——— Connection with C.P.R.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 432 (i).
——— Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Taylor) 9 (i).
Brodeur, Hon. L. P., Advances *re* Travelling Expenses for Priv. Sec., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1690 (i).
——— Travelling Expenses since July, 1904: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1689 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1347 (i).
See 'Travelling Expenses.'
Brome County, Number of Employees, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Clements) 6241 (iv).
Bronte Harbour, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 5708 (iii).
——— Dues for Wharfage, Amount collected: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 13064 (vii).
——— Pier Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 12091 (vii).
Bronze Coat-of-Arms, Duty *re*: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 7150 (iv).
Bubonic Plague, Prevention of into Canada: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 686 (i).
Buchanan Townsite, Application *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 10079, 10083 (v).
——— Homestead Entry by Mr. Ramsland: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 10082 (v).
Buctouche Channel, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 11679 (vi).
Budget, The, Financial Statement (Mr. Fielding) 5137 (iii).
Debate:—(Mr. Foster) 5260; (Mr. Paterson) 5296; (Mr. Cockshutt) 5314; (Mr. Sifton) 5338; (Mr. Bergeron) 5357; (Mr. Pardee) 5364; (Mr. E. D. Smith) 5375, 5388; (Mr. Thompson) 5405; (Mr. M. S. Schell) 5616, 5957; (Mr. W. Jackson) 5959; (Mr. Armstrong) 6046, 6062; (Mr. Guthrie) 6011; (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6097; (Mr. U. Wilson) 6082 (iii); (Mr. Loggie) 6553; (Mr. Mackenzie) 6573; (Mr. Sinclair) 6615; (Mr. Sproule) 6595; (Mr. N. F. Wilson) 6610 (iv).
See 'Financial Review,' &c.

Budget Speech sent out by Deptl. Clerks: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10349 (vi).
Budget Speech: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 519, 559 (i), 4316, 4670 (iii).
Buell, W. S., Emplymt. *re* Telephone Commission: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 10011 (v).
Buffalo imported for Game Preserve, Alberta, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 847 (i).
Buffalo purchased for Park Reserves, Authority for Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 896 (i).
Buffalo Herd, Location at Elk Park, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5208 (iii).
—— Name of Purchaser: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5795 (iii).
—— Purchase of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 5755 (ii), 10102 (v).
Buildings B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 10864 (vi), 13338 (vii).
Buildings, Cost of Construction: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12661 (vii).
—— Construction of: Papers laid on Table (Mr. Pugsley) 12771 (vii).
See 'Public Works.'
Buildings, Generally, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10886 (vi).
Buildings, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 10953 (vi), 13335 (vii).
Buildings, Man. and N. W., Amounts paid by Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 698 (i).
Buildings, Man. and N. W. T., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8517 (v).
—— N. B.: in Com. of Sup., 7186 (iv), 13328 (vii).
—— N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 7110 (iv), 13326 (vii).
—— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vii).
—— P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 7183 (iv).
—— Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
—— Saskatchewan and Alberta: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
See 'Public Works.'
Burlington Channel, Lighthouse, Damages to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 5467 (iii).
—— Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12092 (vii).
—— Repairs, Apptmt. of Foreman, &c.: Ques (Mr. E. D. Smith) 4403 (iii).
Business of the House: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to take in Wednesdays, 5135 (iii).
—— Precedence *re* Questions: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 430 (i).
—— Precedence on Tuesday: Remarks: (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 2982 (ii).
—— Public Bills and Orders, Priority of Procedure: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 2939 (ii).
Business of the House, Public Bills, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) *re* Procedure, 2786 (ii).
—— Remarks on M. for Sup., 10688 (vi).
See 'Govt. Business,' &c.
Butler, Mr. M. J., Dep. Min. of Rys., Salary: in Com. of Sup., 12755 (vii).
Butter and Cheese exported from Prov. of Quebec, Quantity, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 2162 (ii).
Butter Imports, Quantity and Countries of Origin: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1116 (i).
Cabinet Changes: ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 24; (Mr. Foster) 80; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 44 (i).
Cabinet Ministers and Govt. Contracts, &c.: *See* 'Cold Storage,' &c.
Cable Service in St. Lawrence: in Com. of Sup., 5731 (iii).
Calgary and Fernie Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 33.'
Calgary P.O., and Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 8578 (v).
Calgary Town Sites: Remarks (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) on M. for Sup., 9775 (v).
Cameron, John, Homestead Inspector, Employment by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4769 (iii).
Campaign Funds, Charges by Min. of Public Works, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 26 (i).
—— ref. to in debate on Address (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 65 (i).
Campaign Literature sent out by Depts.: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 10343 (vi).
Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Ry, Co.: *See* 'B. No. 14.'
Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Ontario Ry. Co., Exercise of Powers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Owen) 236 (i).
Campbellton, Harbour, Gas Buoys, Tender *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 8612 (v)
—— I.C.R. Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12258 (vii).
Campbellton Wharf, Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11685 (vi), 13344 (vii).
—— Tenders *re* Piling Supply, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 8612 (v).
Canada-Australia SS. Service, Yearly Subsidies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 1289 (i).
—— Discontinuance of: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 941 (i).
Canada and Australia SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 13152 (vii).
Canada and China, Japan, &c., SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 13152 (vii).
Canada Eastern Ry., Cattle killed, Compensation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Loggie) in Com. of Sup., 13175 (vii).
Canada and France SS. Communication, Provision *re* Treaty: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 12391
See 'Franco-Canadian.'

Canada and Germany Trade Relations: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 10601 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lalor) 13081 (vii).
Canada Shipping Act: *See* 'B. Nos. 2, 12, 17, 183, 209.'
Canada Shipping Act: *See* 'Masters and Mates.'
Can. Temperance Act Amt.: *See* 'Bill No. 187.'
Canada Temperance Act: M. (Mr. Fielding) to place on Order Paper, 13493 (vii).
Canada Weather Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 37.'
Canadian Associated Press: *See* 'B. No. 201.'
Canadian Associated Press, Govt. Subventions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5080 (iii).
Canadian Bank of Commerce, Letter of Mr. B. E. Walker: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pringle) 6005 (iii).
Can. Battlefields at Quebec: *See* 'B. Nos. 111, 219.'
Canadian Battlefields: *See* 'Battlefields,' &c.
Canadian Building, Rental, Space, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5207 (iii).
Canadian Ensign: *See* 'Red Ensign.'
Canadians entering U. S., Deportation of Macedonians, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 2738; Letter of Messrs. Allen, Cassels & Defries: Read, 2739 (ii).
Canadian Naturalization and British Rights: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) on M. for Sup., 12084 (vii).
Canadians at Niagara, Indignity by U. S. Customs Officers: Remarks (Mr. Bristol) 11121 (vi).
Can. Northern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 81.'
Can. Northern Ry. Extension, Aid to: *See* 'B. No. 214.'
Can. Northern Ont. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 67.'
Can. Northern Que. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 77.'
Canadian Northern Ry., Erwood and Pas Mission Branch, Rep. of Engineer: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 13309, 13475 (vii).
C. P. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B No. 45.'
C. P. Ry., Compensation *re* Right of Way: in Com. of Sup., 5561 (iii).
——— Land Taxation, Test Cases, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lake) 2170 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lake) 5049 (iii).
——— Papineauville and Little Nation River Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13303 (vii).
——— Plaster Rock Branch Line Ry. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13299 (vii).
——— Saskatchewan Bridge Subsldy: in Com. of Sup., 13305 (vii).
Can. Patriotic Funds Association: *See* 'B. No. 216.'
Canadians repatriated from U. S., Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 684 (i).
Canadian Timber used in Govt. Works: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 11208 (vi).
Canadian Towing and Wrecking Co., Payments *re* Contracts, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bennett) 3241 (ii).
Canada and U. S., Boundary Treaties: Information *re* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7834 (iv).
——— Trade Treaty Negotiations, Completion of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 937 (i).
See 'Anglo-American.'
CANALS—
Beauharnois Canal, Investigation by M. Dupuis, Expenditure, *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3038 (ii).
Beauharnois Canal, Lease, Conditions, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bergeron) 1131 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Bergeron) 1740 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 946 (i).
——— Lease to Robert Co., Emplymt. of Mr. Deschenes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 8443 (v).
——— Lease of Water Power to McIntyre and Roberts Syndicate: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 13175 (vii).
——— Robert Syndicate: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 13475 (vii).
Canals: in Com. of Sup., 5663 (iii).
——— Extra Remuneration: in Com. of Sup., 5697 (iii).
——— Generally, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 10325 (vi).
——— Remuneration *re* Sunday Attendance: in Com. of Sup., 13174 (vii).
——— Staff and Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 10304 (vi).
——— Statistical Branch: in Com. of Sup., 10317 (vi).
——— list of officers: Read (Mr. Graham) 10317 (vi).
Carillon Dams and Slides: in Com. of Sup., 12768 (vii).
Chambly Canal, Towpath: in Com. of Sup., 12226 (vii).
Cornwall Canal, Accident *re* Banks: Statement (Mr. Graham) 11120 (vi).
——— Further Information *re* Break: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11406 (vi).
——— Opening of: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 12660 (vii).
——— Repairs *re* Break in Banks: in Com. of Sup., 12768 (vii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Graham) 12161 (vii).
Cornwall Canal, Arrangements with M'f'g. Cos. *re* Water Power: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 13084 (vii).

CANALS—*Con.*
Cornwall Canal, Electric Lighting, &c.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 12198 (vii).
——— Gate Lifter: in Com. of Sup., 12226 (vii).
——— Wharf: in Com. of Sup., (Mr. Pringle) 12095 (vii).
Galops Canal, Upper Entrance, Dredging, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5671 (iii).
Georgian Bay Canal, Reps., &c.: Laid on Table (Mr. Pugsley) 8378 (v).
See main heading.
Lachine Canal, Basin Walls: in Com. of Sup., 12226 (vii).
——— Compensation to Richards *re* Horse: in Com. of Sup., 13174 (vii).
——— Lock Repairs: in Com of Sup., 5672 (iii).
——— Slope Walls, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5663 (iii).
——— Staff: in Com. of Sup., 5696 (iii).
Murray Canal, Bridgemen's Houses: in Com. of Sup., 12226 (vii).
Quebec Canals, Steam Road Rollers: in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).
Rideau Canal, Buoys between Merrickville and Edmond Rapids, Contract *re* Lighting: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 8613, 9476 (v).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12227 (vii).
St. Lawrence Canal, District Office: in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).
Sault Ste. Marie Canal Construction: in Com. of Sup., 12223 (vii).
Soulanges Canal, Claims *re* Accidents, &c.: M. for Reports* (Mr. Boyer) 6239 (iv).
——— Electric Power, Contract with Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10011 (v).
——— Expenditure *re* Investigation: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10513 (vi).
——— Floods, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 10339 (vi).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).
——— Investigation *re* Charges against Overseer: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6407 (iv).
——— Report of Mr. Boyer: Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 9890 (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. Monk) 12413 (vii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 10304 (vi).
——— Manning & Macdonald's Claims: in Com. of Sup., 5668 (iii).
Trent Canal, Balsam Lake Section, Claims for Damages: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 10308 (vi).
——— Bobcaygeon Dam, Flooding of Highways, &c., Protection *re*: Prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2992 (ii).

CANALS—*Con.*
Trent Canal, Bobcaygeon Dam, Transfer of Power Plant, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1114 (i).
——— Bradford Canal, Building of: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 13476 (vii).
——— Buckhorn Dam: in Com. of Sup., 12227 (vii).
——— Cameron Lake Water Levels, Purchase of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 9772 (v).
——— Claims for Damages: Remarks (Mr. Ward) in Com. of Sup., 10308 (vi).
——— Clearing of Logs, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 10310 (vi).
——— Construction: in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).
——— Contracts, Deposits, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1734 (i).
——— Damages *re* Floods: in Com. of Sup., 12768 (vii).
——— Engineers Rep.: Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 6925 (iv).
———Extension from Balsam Lake to Gull River, Reps., Plans, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. S. Hughes) 2991 (ii).
———ret. incomplete: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 6059 (iii).
——— Holland River Dredging, Advertisements, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bennett) 3241 (ii).
——— Holland River Extension: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 11939 (vi).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12227 (vii).
——— Lindsay Lock and Dam: in Com. of Sup., 12227 (vii).
——— Newmarket Canal Reps., Surveys, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10315 (vi).
———Newmarket Canal Extension to Devil's Elbow: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 10306 (vi), 12225 (vii).
——— Surveys: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 10338 (vi).
——— Surveys, Reports *re*: Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 6988 (iv).
——— Tributary Works, Completion of Works, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1115 (i).
——— Tributary Works, Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1114 (i).
——— Wilberforce Dam, Obstructions to Traffic, Cor., Plans, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. S. Hughes) 2988 (ii).
Welland Canal, Boundary Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 12207 (vii).
——— Contract Power Co., Amount diverted at De Cew Falls, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 897 (i).

CANALS—*Con.*
Welland Canal, Cost of Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4245 (iii).
——— Culvert and Dock, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4245 (iii).
———Deepening, Estimated Cost: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) in Com. of Sup., 10311 (vi).
——— Dredging Deep Cut Slide: in Com. of Sup., 5673 (iii).
———Electric Lighting, Power Plant: in Com. of Sup., 12195 (vii).
———Feeder, Rep. of Judge Madden *re* Investigation: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lalor) 852 (i).
——— Investigation *re* Water Rents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 174 (i).
——— Piers and Bridges at Queenston Heights: in Com. of Sup., 12207 (vii).
——— Port Colborne Elevator and Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12211 (vii).
——— Port Colborne, Total Expenditure *re* Improvements: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4403 (iii).
——— Port Colborne Elevator, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4245 (iii).
——— Resignation of John R. Scott: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 6058 (iii).
——— Widening: in Com. of Sup., 12210 (vii).
Canned Foods Inspection Act, Enforcement of: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3846 (ii).
———Cor. *re* Regulations, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Clements) 557 (i).
——— Names of Counties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 514 (i).
Canned Goods Act: *See* 'B. No. 147.'
Canned Pease imported from France, Quantity &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 3847 (ii).
Cannon, Catherine Ann, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 175.'
Canso Medical Officer, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 6646 (iv).
——— Successor to Dr. Brane: Ques. (Mr Stanfield) 1735 (i).
Cape St. Mary, Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).
Cap St. Ignace Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12030 (vi).
Captains of Govt. Vessels, Examinations *re* Efficiency, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 3236 (ii).
Caraquet Wharf, Ice-breakers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11685 (vi).
Caribou Island Causeway: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).
Carillon Dams and Slides: in Com. of Sup., 12768 (vii).
'Carlotta G. Fox,' Schr., Seizure of: *See* 'Pelagic Sealing.'
Caron and Thiberge, Messrs., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 10517 (vi).
Cascumpec Harbour Buoys, Tenders for Placing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 681 (i).
Cassels, Mr. Justice, Acceptance *re* Investigation of Marine Dept.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6059 (iii).
——— Statement *re* Conditions of Investigation of Marine Dept.: Remarks on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn. Hse., 6143 (iii).
——— Papers laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6464 (iv).
See 'Marine,' &c.
'Castle,' Tug, Removal of Wreck, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 6641 (iv).
Cataract Power Co., Welland Canal, Amount diverted at De Cew Falls, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cookshutt) 897 (i).
'Catharine C.,' Incomplete Return: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5727 (iii).
Catholics and Public Offices, Ref. to Speech in Senate: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Sproule) 5047 (iii).
Cattle Embargo in G. B., Removal of, Action by Govt. since 1896: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2167 (ii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 2795 (ii).
———inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 6223 (iv).
——— Cable, *re* Removal by G. B.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 13228 (vii).
——— Par. in Montreal 'Gazette' (Mr. Armstrong) 13081 (vii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 12879 (vii).
Cattle Exports and Imports from Canada to G.B.: Ques. (Mr. Christie) 6460 (iv).
Cattle exported to U.S. during 1900-7, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 1507 (i).
Cattle exported to U.S., Fees *re* Thoroughbreds: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 2767 (ii).
Cattle Inspection *re* Ocean Service: in Com. of Sup., 3220 (ii).
Cattle Quarantine Stations: in Com. of Sup., 11008 (vi).
Cattle registered, Importation from U.S. from 1904-7: Ques. (Mr. Christie) 6238 (iv).
Cattle sold from Experimental Farm: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 2389 (ii).
Cavalry Brigade, Eastern Townships, Camp at Quebec, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 9273 (v).
Cement Testing Laboratory: in Com. of Sup., 11078 (vi).
——— Stmnt. (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 11206, 11250 (vi).
Census and Statistics: in Com. of Sup., 673 (i), 12879 (vii).
Census Map, Publishing of: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 4406 (iii).

Census (complete) of the N. W. Provs., Report: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 3422 (ii).
Central Ry. of Canada, Charter Grant, Deposit *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 4767 (iii).
'Challenge,' Dredge, Quantity of Material removed: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 12651 (vii).
Chambly Canal, Towpath: in Com. of Sup., 12226 (vii).
Chambly Canton, Complaints *re* Postmaster: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 5653 (iii).
Chambly Common, Area, Rental, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 5652 (iii).
'Champlain,' Str., Use in Quebec for Political Purposes: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9126, 9280, 9342, 9460 (v).
Chapel Point Ferry Wharf, Tenders *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 513 (i).
Chapman, Mr. F. O., Emplymt. in Immigration Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 9964 (v).
Charlan, Mr., Salary as Tobacco Expert: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 11495 (vi).
Charlemagne and Terrebonne Dredging, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 685 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bergeron) 853 (i).
Charlos Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11225 (vi).
Charlotte County Wharf, Pet. *re* Erection: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 5202 (iii).
Charlotttown Board of Trade, Pets. *re* Sailing Vessels: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. Martin) 6240 (iv).
Charlottetown Pipe Line to Tank, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5655 (iii).
Charlottetown Ry. Station, Contract Price *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 517 (i).
——— Specifications, &c., *re* Construction: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3241 (ii).
Chartered Bank of B. C.: *See* 'B. No. 59.'
Chartered Banks of Canada, Report: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 8086 (iv).
Charwomen, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 10508 (vi).
Chase's Point, N.B., Pet. *re* Wharf: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 7937 (iv).
Chateauguay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12030
Chatham, N.B., Ry. Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 12757 (vii).
Cheese Adulteration: *See* 'B. No. 148.'
Chicoutimi Boom, Payments from Pulp Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 8174 (iv).
Chicoutimi, Dredging Contract, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 7203 (iv).
——— Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12030 (vi).
——— Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7279 (iv).
——— Public Works, Expenditures, &c: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vii).
Chilliwack Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Chilvers, Messrs., Emplymt. of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 8894, 9266 (v), 10515 (vi).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 184.'
Chinese Immigration into B.C., O.Cs., Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 554 (i).
Chinese Immigration, Decision of N. S. Supreme Court *re* Evasion of Poll Tax: Ques. (Mr. Macpherson) 513 (i).
Chinese and Japanese Riots, B.C., Legal Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 13155 (vii).
Christmas Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 754 (i).
Church of England, Missionary Society, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 75.'
Church Point Wharf, Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 11225 (vi).
Chute a Blondeau Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12092 (vii).
Cigarettes, Prohibition of: Prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 5087; Amt. (Mr. Macpherson) to adjn. Debate, agreed to (Y. 61; N. 51) 5133 (iii).
——— on M. to resume adjn. debate: Remarks Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5246, 5251 (iii).
Cigarettes, Legislation *re*, Res. of W.C.T.U. of Brampton: Read (Mr. Blain) 7278 (iv).
Cigarettes: *See* 'Tobacco.'
Cigar Stamps, Use of Black Ones: Ques. (Mr. Dubeau) 12390 (vii).
Cimon, Hon. Mr. Justice, Apptmt. to Quebec District: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2978 (ii).
——— Jurisdiction of Justice Dept. *re* Residence: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2545 (ii).
——— Payment *re* Travelling Expenses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2978 (ii).
——— Residence in District: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2218 (ii).
Cirkel, Franz, Remuneration *re* Rep. of Geological Survey *re* 'Graphites': Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 7935 (iv).
See 'Graphite.'
Civil Servants, General Increases to: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com of Sup., 12913 (vii).
Civil Service Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 189.'
Civil Service Bill, Correction in 'Hansard' *re* Increases: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11494 (vi).
——— and Employees of House of Commons: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 13528 (vii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8516 (v).
——— Procedure, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 11124 (vi).
——— Resolutions *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11016 (vi).

Civil Service Commission, Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 13168 (vii).
Civil Service Commission Report, Distribution to Press: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 5723 (iii).
—— Govtl. Action, &c.: on M. for Sup. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7322 (iv).
—— Inquiry for (Mr R. L. Borden) 3317 (ii), 4963, 5408, 5567 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 5491 (iii).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 938, 1740 (i), 2787 (ii), 4315, 4495 (iii).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. Perley) 90 (i).
—— Issue of Commission of Investigation: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6466 (iv).
—— Investigation, Enlargement of Judge Cassel's Powers: (amt.) to Com. of Sup. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7506, Neg. (Y. 48; N. 99) 7618 (iv).
—— Instructions to Judge Cassels: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 7505 (iv).
—— O.C. to Mr. Justice Cassels *re* Investigations: M. to adjn. Hse., 6143 (iii).
See 'Cassels,' &c.
—— Marine, Deptl. Dismissals: Announcement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6003 (iii).
—— Number distributed: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 6060 (iii).
—— Policy of Govt., on M. to adjn. Hse. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5882 (iii).
—— Report: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 5620 (iii).
—— Translation into French: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 6222, 6925 (iv), 11312 (vi), 13477 (vii).
Civil Service Employees, 1905-6-7, Dates of Apptmts., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barker) 558 (i).
Civil Service Examiners: in Com. of Sup., 12917 (vii).
—— Report: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 8086 (iv).
Civil Govt.: *See* 'Supply.'
Civil Service List: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 93 (i).
Civil Service System, Reorganization of: Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 9132; Neg. (Y. 30; N. 72) 9218 (v).
—— Prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) M. to drop, 6242 (iv).
Clarke, Capt. Arthur, Compensation *re* Death, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8179 (iv).
—— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vii).
Clarke City, Seven Islands: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
—— Expenditure *re* Public Works: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2394 (ii).
Clarke's Harbour, Dog Fish Works: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vii).
Clearwater Lake, Half-breeds Rights: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 175 (i).
—— Squatters Rights to Lands: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9995 (v).
Clement, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt., Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11300 (vi).
Clement, Mr. W. H. P., Services in Yukon, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 5650 (iii).
See 'Yukon.'
Clerical and Temporary Clerks, Public Works Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 11099 (vi).
Clerk of Crown in Chancery, Office: in Com. of Sup., 10508 (vi).
Clerk of Works on Public Buildings: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7119 (iv).
Clifton Breakwater, N.B., Amount of Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 695 (i).
Clifton Wharf Repairs, Extension of Contract: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4831 (iii).
Closure Rule: *See* 'Obstruction.'
Cloutier, J. E., Payments to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 8380 (v).
Coal and Govt. Lands, Acres in possession of Gov.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 843 (i).
Coal Areas, Agents for Applicants: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 5469 (iii).
—— Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5468 (iii).
—— held by F. E. Keniston, Cor., Papers, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 5476 (iii).
—— Names and Addresses of Agents *re* Applications: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 5789 (iii).
Coal Deposits in P.E.I., Boring for, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 515 (i).
Coal Duties, Refunds *re* Coke, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Zimmerman) 6924 (iv).
Coal Lands in Alberta and Sask., Total Area sold, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 9278 (v).
—— Royalty Fees, Sale or Lease of: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 11019 (vi).
Coal Lands, Applicants, Names, Price, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 3434 (ii).
Coal Land Leases, Applications *re*: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 2395 (ii).
Coal Lands, Disposed of by Govt., Original Applicants, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3480 (ii).
—— Leased by Govt., Names of Original Grantees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3232 (ii).
—— Leased, Sold or Assigned, since March, 1907: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 698 (i).
Coal Lands in N.W.T., Leases granted, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 5087 (iii).
Coal Lands, O.Cs., Regulations, &c., *re* Disposal: M. for Copies* (Mr. Barker) 4246 (iii).
—— Purchase Price on Sections 16, 20 and 21: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 10512 (vi).
—— Purchases on Sections 27, 28, 33 and 34, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 10512 (vi).
—— Sale through J. W. Bettes, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 6242 (iv).

Coal Lands, sold by P. E. Lessard: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 6241 (iv).
——— Sale by McGivern & Hayden: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 6241 (iv).
Coal Lands in Sections 2, 4, 9, 15, 17 and 28, First Applicants, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 3850 (ii).
——— Section 13, First Applicants, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 3851 (ii).
Coal Lands, Timber, &c., Dates of Regulation, O.Cs., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 12656 (vii).
Coal Mining Privileges in Section 11, Applications, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Ames) 3850 (ii).
Coal Mine Royalties in Alberta, Sums received: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 12391 (vii).
Coal Mining in Sask. and Alberta, Returns made to Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 10257 (v).
Coal Shipments from N.S. and Cape Breton, Res. from Board of Trade, P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 5470 (iii).
See 'Shipping,' &c.
Coasting Privileges, Prop. Rps. withdrawn, 2795 (ii).
Coasting Trade, O.Cs. *re* Foreign Vessels, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4586 (iii).
Coasting Trade *re* Norwegian Ships, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 6237 (iv).
Cobourg Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12095 (vii).
——— Harbour, Amount expended *re* Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 359 (i).
Colborne Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12095 (vii).
Colchester Election, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 39 (i).
Colchester Electoral District, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 680 (i).
Colchester Point, Essex County Pier,, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 12652 (vii).
Cold Storage, Assistance *re* East Elgin Establishment: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 351 (i).
Cold Storage Plant, Canso, Total Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8379 (v).
Cold Storage Plants, Construction in Alberta, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 1685 (i).
——— Construction of, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 236 (i).
——— Grants to: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 1937 (i).
See 'Butter,' 'Cheese,' 'Brockville,' &c.
Cold Storage Ret., Letter of Mr. McKeown, on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 4223, 4407 (iii).
See 'N.B. Cold Storage,' &c.
Cold Storage Shipments, Number for year ending March, 1908: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6403 (iv).
Collingwood Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12096 (vii).
Colonial Conference, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 82; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 41 (i).
See 'Intercolonial,' &c.
——— Travelling Expenses, ref. to in Com. of Sup. on Marine Estimates, 3985 (ii).
——— Travelling Expenses of Minister: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 998, 1040 (i).
See 'Travelling Expenses.'
Colonial Securities and Investment of Trust Funds, Cor., &c., Govtl. Action: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 174 (i).
Colonization Lands: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Sproule) 3752 (ii).
Colonization Societies, Quebec, Amounts paid to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 684 (i).
Commercial Agents, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 648 (i).
Commercial Travellers, Provincial Tax, Agreement *re* Abolition, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Guthrie) 5794 (iii).
Commerical Treaty with Italy: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 10593 (vi).
Commissions appointed between 1896 and 1908, Costs, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Porter) 1295 (i).
Committees, Sel. Standing: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6 (i).
——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to conc. in Rep., 90 (i).
——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to add Names, 1207 (i), 3315 (ii).
Committee Meeting, Rep. in Toronto 'Globe': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bennett) 2382 (ii).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. Johnston) 2383; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 2383 (ii).
Committees, Organization of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 507, 560 (i).
——— Sitting concurrently with Hse.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9579 (v).
See 'Pub. Accts.'
Companies Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 104.'
Conciliation Boards, Applications *re* Industrial Disputes Investigations, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 3482 (ii).
Concrete Wharfs, Dissatisfaction in Ont.: Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 11278 (vi).
Congdon, Mr. F. T., Instructions *re* Trust Estates: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 12413 (vii).
——— Stmnt. *re* Estates Administration: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10141 (v).
——— Reply from Yukon: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 13420, 13518 (vii).
Congdon vs. Mrs. Wiley, Investigation, Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 565 (i).
——— Papers laid on Table (Mr. Aylesworth) 841 (i).
See 'Yukon.'

Contractors' Securities, Amounts retained: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1112 (i).
Convict Labour, Control of, Sale of Articles, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 238 (i).
Cookshire Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7281 (iv).
Co-operation: *See* 'B. No. 5.'
Cooper & White, Payments *re* Rental for Govt. Lands, Welland County: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 3841 (ii).
Copper Cliff Postmaster, Charges *re*: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 658 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com., 11913 (vi).
Copyright Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 28.'
'Coquitlam,' Str., Seizure of, Compensation *re*: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 2389 (ii).
Corby Distillery, Deficits in Spirit Production: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 12410 (vii).
Cornwall Canal, Accident to Banks: Statement (Mr. Graham) 11120 (vi).
——— Arrangements with Mfg. Cos. *re* Water Power: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 13084 (vii).
——— Electric Lighting, &c.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 12198 (vii).
——— Further Information *re* Break: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11406 (vi).
———Gate Lifter: in Com. of Sup., 12226 (vii).
——— Opening of: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 12660 (vii).
——— Repairs *re* Break in Banks: in Com. of Sup., 12768 (vii).
——— Repairs: Remarks (Mr. Graham) 12161 (vii).
——— Wharf: in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Pringle) 12095 (vii).
Corry Building, Total Rental per Annum, Taxes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 11938 (vi).
Cosgrave, Mr. J. J., Total Cost of Investigation: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 5797 (iii).
Coteau Landing Wharf, Repairs to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9277 (v).
Cotton, Raw, Imported from U.S. in 1905-7, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 1511 (i).
Cotton Strikers, Montreal, Commission Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 13156 (vii).
Court of Appeal, B.C.: *See* 'B. No. 165.'
Cow Bay (Port Morien) Breakwater Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 11225 (vi).
Cowie, Mr. F. W., Salary, Travelling Expenses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5649 (iii).
See 'Marine,' &c.
Cowly, and Highwood, Railway Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13299 (vii).
Cranbrook Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10864 (vi), 13338 (vii).
Credit by False Pretences: *See* 'B. No. 212.'
Criminal Code Amendments, Placing on Govt. Orders: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 9281 (v).
Criminal Code (assault) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 79.'
——— (homicide while hunting) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 93.'
——— (injuries by motor vehicles) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 140.'
——— (libel) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 161.'
——— (offensive weapons) Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 65, 78.'
——— (speedy trials) Amt. *See* 'B. No. 92.'
——— (trade restraint) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 96.'
——— (trading stamps, credit) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 212.'
Criminal Statistics: *See* 'Pardoning Power.'
Crooked Lake Indian Reserve, Sale of: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 634 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lake) 10916 (vi).
Crossings of Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 3.'
Crown Bank of Canada: *See* 'B. No. 156.'
Crown Life Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 180.'
Crude Petroleum Bounty: *See* 'B. No. 199.'
Cumberland Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10864 (vi).
Cumberland Ry. and Coal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 46.'
Currie, W. D., Payments to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 7731 (iv)
Customs Act Amt: *See* 'B. No. 194.'
CUSTOMS:
Absinthe and Brandy Importations, Total Amount: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 689 (i).
Agricultural Implements, Amount of Rebates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1112 (i).
American Cereal Co., Customs Refunds, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3484 (ii).
Anthracite Coal, Quantity imported from U.S. and other Countries: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 1510 (i).
Apples seized by Inspectors at Montreal, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 1508 (i).
Arsenault, Mr. Auguste, Emplymt. in Customs, Montreal, Charges against: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1347 (i).
Aylmer Customs Collector, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 1506 (i).
Bernier, Capt., Islands, Customs Ports, &c., Flagged by him: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5203, 5466 (iii).
Brass, Quantity and Quality, Importation into Can.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 6232 (iv).
B.C., Revenue contributed from 1872-3 to 1905: M. for Ret.* (Mr. D. Ross) 3435 (ii).
Bronze Coat-of-Arms, Duty *re*: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 7150 (iv).
Butter Imports, Quantity and Countries of Origin: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1116 (i).
Canned Pease imported from France, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 3847 (ii).
Coal Duties, Refunds *re* Coke, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Zimmerman) 6924 (iv).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*

Cotton, Raw, Imports from U.S. in 1905-7, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 1511 (i).

Customs Dept., Apptmts. and Civil Service Report: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9553 (v).

—— Criticism of Civil Service Commission: (Mr. Cockshutt) on M. for Sup., 10428 (vi).

—— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 637 (i).

—— Estimates, Obstruction in Sup.: Remarks (Mr. Paterson) in Com. of Sup., 10133 (v).

—— Inspectors, Travelling Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 9536 (v).

—— Legal Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 9578 (v).

—— Outside Service, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 9226, 9430 (v).

—— Printing, Stationery, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9577 (v).

—— Salaries, Payments of, Speech of Hon. Mr. Paterson, *re* Obstruction: Remarks (Mr. Owen) to Com. of Sup., 9894 (v).

Customs and Excise Revenues from June 1st to 15, 1908: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 10791 (vi).

Customs Receipts and Expenditures, 1907-8: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 12655 (vii).

Customs Statistics, and Trade and Commerce Rets., Dupliate Printing: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9549 (v).

—— Remarks (Mr Foster) on M. for Sup., 9732 (v).

Detroit River Tunnel, Duties on Construction Material, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1116 (i).

—— Customs Collection *re* Construction Materials: M. for O.Cs.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5477 (iii).

—— Ques (Mr. McLaren) 3840 (ii).

—— Material entered free of Customs: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 10254 (v).

—— Material imported for Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 4583 (iii).

Detroit River Tunnel and Customs Tariff on Material from U.S.: M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10417 (vi).

—— Explanation (Mr. Paterson) 13524 (vii).

Dillon, Michael, Emplymt. by Customs at Windsor: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7201 (iv).

Farm and Garden Produce at Sault Ste. Marie, Customs Duties collected: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 13060 (vii).

Foreign Purchases, Customs Collections *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5475 (iii).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*

Franco-Canadian Treaty, Shipments from Canada, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4763 (iii). *See* main heading.

Fraser, Donald, Customs Collector, Investigation *re* Defalcations: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 5200 (iii).

—— Dismissal from Customs Service: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 5473 (iii).

—— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9442 (v).

French Books, Reductions of Customs *re* French Treaty: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2160 (ii).

German Goods imported under Preferential Tariff, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 689 (i).

Guarantee Cos.: in Com. of Sup., 9577 (v).

Halifax Customs House: in Com. of Sup., 7144 (iv).

Honey Imports from 1898-1908, Amount, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8177 (iv).

Hull Customs Imports, Amount for 1906-8: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 11703 (vi).

Imports and Exports, Values from June to Dec., 1907: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1112 (i).

—— ending Sept. 30th and Oct. 30th, 1907: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 350 (i).

Imports from France, Value for Five Years, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1124 (i).

Imports for Home Consumption, Values for 1907-8: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 13063 (vii).

Japanese Trade with Canada, Total Amount for 1905-6-7: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 897 (i). *See* main heading.

Man. Customs Collectors, Brokerage Fees charged, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9550 (v).

Massey-Harris Co., Rebate of Duty, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 8441 (v).

Montreal Examining Warehouse, Valuations, Reps., Cor., Expenditure, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 698 (i).

Montreal Customs Frauds, Penalties, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 9558 (v).

Niagara Falls, Fort Erie, &c., Customs Officers, Salaries: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6980 (iv).

Opium, Amount received *re* Customs Duties, Pet. from B.C., *re* Prohibition: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 8614 (v).

Pacaud, Benjamin, Apptmt. to Customs at Windsor: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 5200 (iii).

Pork, Fresh, Quantity imported for Home Consumption: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 5650 (iii).

Port South Bar, C.B., Vessels entered for Customs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9271 (v).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*
Prince Rupert Customs Collectors, Transfer of Mr. B. R. McDonald: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 6401 (iv).
Pulp Wood, Exported to U.S., Quantity, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 1511 (i).
Revenue Cruisers: in Com. of Sup., 9578 (v).
Sand, Cement or Clay Utensils, imported from G.B. in 1904-5-6-7: Ques. (Mr. Demers) 1506 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie Port, Farm Produce entered, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 898 (i).
Seizures for 1905-7, Reasons, Fines, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Cockshutt) 4588 (iii).
Sugar Imports for 1908, Total Amount: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 13064 (vii).
Unleavened Bread, Pet. *re* Customs Duties: Ques. (Mr. Bristol) 8616 (v).
Venoit, Mr., Collector of Customs at Bathurst, N.B., Political Interference: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 7730 (iv).
Windsor Customs, Pepin, J. A., Emplymt.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7201 (iv).
——Customs Officers, Ages, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 12655 (vii).
—— Wallace, Michael J., Emplymt.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7500 (iv).
Winnipeg Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 8566 (v).
Wool, Raw, Quantity imported into Canada: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 5201 (iii).
Cypress Hill Homestead Lands, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 9991 (v).
Cypress Hills Timber Reserve, Preservation of: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3841 (ii).
Cyr, Mr., Letter from *re* Stmnt. of Mr. Foster: Read (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 8460; Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) 8460; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 8461 (v).
Dairy and Cold Storage Commissioner's Report: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2786 (ii).
Dairying and Fruit Industry: in Com. of Sup., 10397 (vi).
Dairy Products: *See* 'B. No. 148.'
Daley, Mr. R., Emplymt. in Geological Survey: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5204, 5473 (iii).
Dauphin Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8519 (v).
—— Valuation of Site: Remarks (Mr. Lalor) in Com. of Sup., 10866 (vi).
Dawson City Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vii).
Debates of the House, Statement *re* Speakers (Mr. Kennedy) 13537 (vii).
Debates, Official Reports of, Analytical Index: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10504 (vi).
—— Average Price per Column: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 3479 (ii).
Debates, French Edition, Apptmt. of French Supt. of Printing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2978 (ii).
—— Delay in Printing: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2978 (ii).
—— Delay in Distribution: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Beland) 3486 (ii).
Debates Committee, Correction of Clerical Error in Res. of House (Mr. Gervais) 824 (i).
—— 1st Rep. of Com.: M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 2590 (ii).
—— 2nd and 3rd Reports of Committee: Presented (Mr. Gervais) 6979 (iv).
—— 2nd Rep. of Com.: M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 7834 (iv).
—— 2nd Rep., Adoption of: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 12504 (vii).
—— 2nd Rep. of Com.: Amt. (Mr. Gervais) on M. to adopt, 13224 (vii).
—— 4th Rep. of Com.: M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 8835 (v).
—— Conc. without Notice: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8896 (v).
—— M. (Mr. Monk) to ref. back to Com., 10225; Neg. (Y. 48; N. 94) 10252 (v).
—— Remarks (Mr. Monk) *re* conc., 9709, 9889, 10119 (v).
See 'Hansard.'
Debt of Canada, Portions falling due, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 315 (i).
—— Falling Due, 1908: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 315 (i).
See 'Finance.'
Deep Sea Fisheries on Pacific Coast, Cruiser, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 1934 (i).
Deep Waterways Commission, Proceedings *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 11205 (vi).
—— St. Lawrence, Damming at Long Sault: Remarks (Mr. Broder) 13142 (vii).
See 'St. Lawrence.'
—— Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11101 (vi).
Demurrage on Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 6.'
Denis, Mr. Gaspard, Postmaster at St. Michel des Saints, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 9474 (v).
Deptl. Buildings, Mackenzie Avenue: in Com of Sup., 1505 (i).
See 'Public Works—Ottawa.'
Deputy Ministers, Payments for Special Services, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1736 (i).
Desaulniers, Mr. Gonzalve, Emplymt. as Translator: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 1121, 1290 (i).
Deschambault Wharf, Tenders *re*, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5464 (iii).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 5801 (iii).
Detroit Tunnel, Customs Collection *re* Construction Materials: M. for O.Cs.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5477 (iii).

Detroit Tunnel, Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1116 (i), 4583 (iii).
——— M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 10417 (vi).
——— Material entered free of Customs: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 10254 (v).
——— explanation (Mr. Paterson) 13524 (vii). *See* 'International.'
Devil's Elbow, Canal Work: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).
'D. H. Thomas,' Tug, Dom. Grant: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 8184 (iv).
Digby Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11226 (vi).
Digby to Westport Mail Contract, Name of Contractor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7203 (iv).
Dillon, Gerald P., Apptmt. to N.W.M. Police Force: Ques. (Mr. D. Ross) 6001 (iii).
Dillon, Michael, Emplymt. by Customs at Windsor: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7201 (iv).
Diocese of the Synod of Keewatin: *See* 'B. No. 179.'
Diseases and Public Health Bureau, Establishment of: Prop. Res. (Mr. Black) 2562 (ii).
Distilleries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 814 (i).
Divorce of Mary Alexander: *See* 'B. No. 177.'
Divorce of Catherine Ann Cannon: *See* 'B. No. 175.'
Divorce of Edith Maud Rosario Gammell: *See* 'B. No. 139.'
Divorce of Edith May Gilmore: *See* 'B. No. 164.'
Divorce of Ada Katurah Stewart Paulding: *See* 'B. No. 176.'
Divorce of Hattie Spratte: *See* 'B. No. 182.'
Divorce of Arthur James Townsend: *See* 'B. No. 196.'
Divorce of Andrew Walker: *See* 'B. No. 124.'
Docks, Piers, &c., constructed at Bayfield, Grand Bend, &c., Cor. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Armstrong) 2397 (ii).
Dockyards, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5039 (iii).
Documents in Departments, Access to Originals by Members: M. (Mr. Ames) for Ret., 1132; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 86) 1201 (i).
Debate:—(Mr. Oliver) 1133; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1137; (Mr. Foster) 1135; (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1140; (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) 1143; (Mr. Sproule) 1147; (Mr. Brodeur) 1140; (Mr. Bennett) 1151; (Mr. Lennox) 1155; (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 1160; (Mr. Barker) 1162; (Mr. Galliher) 1170; (Mr. D. Ross) 1172; (Mr. Haggart) 1175; (Mr. Devlin) 1177; (Mr. Bergeron) 1180; (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1183; (Mr. Northrup) 1190; (Mr. Sproule) 1194; (Mr. Ames) 1195 (i).
Documents, Original, Production of, &c., Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 1617, 1622; Agreed to, 1668 (i).
Debate:—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1623; (Mr. Foster) 1628; (Mr. D. Ross) 1632, 1653; (Mr. Oliver) 1636; (Mr. Barker) 1655; (Mr. Northrup) 1658; (Mr. Bristol) 1663; (Mr. Boyce) 1666 (i).
Documents, Original, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 1766 (i).
Debate:—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1775; (Mr. Haggart) 1778;; (Mr. Sproule) 1782; (Mr. Lennox) 1786; (Mr. Barker) 1793; (Mr. Bristol) 1797; (Mr. Osler) 1800; (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1801; (Mr. Fielding) 1805; (Mr. Lancaster) 1814; (Mr. Perley) 1818; (Mr. Broder) 1825; (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1827; (Mr. Northrup) 1830; (amt.) 1839; Neg. (Y. 50 · N. 95) 1883; (Mr. Lake) 1839; (Mr. Alcorn) 1843; on M. (Mr. Macdonald) to adjn. debate (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1844; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1847; (Mr. Foster) 1851; (Mr. Crocket) 1861; (Mr. Blain) 1871; (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1875; (Mr. Armstrong) 1878 (i).
Documents, Original, Custody of: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 7810 (iv).
——— Detention, &c., Par. in Press. Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Clements) 6010 (iii).
——— Examination of by Public Accounts Com.: Remarks (Mr. Ames) 3853 (ii).
——— Notice of Motion, on Order being called: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2794 (ii).
——— Production of Originals, Announcement *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 1425 (i).
——— Production in Committees: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 1427 (i).
——— Production of on Order from Hse. Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1617; Agreed to, 1667 (i).
——— Production of to Members: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Foster) 1766 (i).
——— Papers laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1927 (i).
——— and Public Accounts Com.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 2305, 2308 (ii).
——— Member's remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 2305 (ii).
Dodds, Mr. W., Information *re* Immigration Frauds at Halifax: Ques. (Mr. Finlayson) 5655 (iii). *See* 'Halifax.'
Dog Fish Reduction Plant, Canso, Operation at: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5651 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 5777 (iii)
——— Total Cost of Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8179 (iv).
——— Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. McLennan) 5790 (iii).
Dog Fish Scrap, Shipments from Canso to U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 1126 (i). *See* 'Clarke's,' &c.
Dokis Indian Land Sale, Commission to Mr. P. Ryan: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 12732 (vii).

Dokis Indians Reserve, Consent from Chief, *re* Sale of Timber: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 8175 (iv).
—— Name of Govt. Agent: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5084 (iii).
—— Notice of Sale, Names of Newspapers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 7500 (iv).
—— Protests *re* Sale: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 10918 (vi).
—— Sale of Timber: Remarks (Mr. Perley) on M. for Sup., 7801 (iv).
—— Surrender of Timber, O.Cs., Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5087 (iii).
—— Surrender of Title, Negotiations *re*: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3849 (ii).
—— Total Expenditure *re* Surrender: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 10512 (vi).
Dom. Arsenal, Cor. with Ross Rifle Co. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 7991 (iv).
Dominion Arsenal, Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 7434 (iv), 12154 (vii).
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 50.'
Dominion Camp Equipment Co., Incorporation of: Ques (Mr. Worthington) 3238 (ii).
Dom. Buildings, Furniture, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11007 (vi).
—— Ont., Renewals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7467 (iv).
—— Que., Renewals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7286 (iv).
—— Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10981 (vi). *See* 'Public Works—Buildings.'
Dom. Coal Lands: in Com. of Sup., 10066 (v). *See* 'Coal,' &c.
Dom. Elections Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 29, 80, 115.'
Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 115) 2° m., 7835.
Debate:—(Mr. R. L. Borden) 7859; (Mr. Greenway) 7880; (Mr. Alcorn) 7890; (Mr. Bole) 7939; (Mr. Boyce) 7949; (Mr. Conmee) 7982, 7998; (Mr. W. J. Roche) 8012; (amt.) 8076; (Mr. Crawford) 8076, 8089; (Mr. Monk) 8116, 8138; (Mr. Devlin) 8143; (Mr. Lake) 8150; (Mr. D. Ross) 8185; (Mr. Schaffner) 8200; (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 8242; (Mr. W. Wright) 8271; (Mr. Dugas) 8282 (iv); (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8296 (v); (Mr. Foster) 8321; (Mr. Burrows) 8357; (Mr. Staples) 8387; (Mr. Carvell) 8401; (Mr. R. L. Borden) on Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 8423; (Mr. Galliher) 8619; (Mr. Armstrong) 8645; (Mr. Oliver) 8659; (Mr. Bergeron) 8681 (v); (Mr. Miller) 11707; (Mr. Conmee) on Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 11727; (Mr. Boyce) on Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 11739; (Mr. Alcorn) on Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 11753; (Mr. Aylesworth) on Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 11755 (vi).
In Com., 11796 (vi).
Ballot Papers, Fraudulent Marking (sec. 20) 11890; Amt. (Mr. White) 11890; Amt. (Mr. Porter) 11892 (vi), 13013; Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 13022, 13027; Amt. (Mr. Aylesworth) 13025; Amt. (Mr. Borden) 13026; (Mr. Crocket) 13028; Amt. (Mr. Alcorn) 13028; Amt. (Mr. Lancaster) 13036; Amt. (Mr. Bennett) 13037; Amt. (Mr. Alcorn) 13037; Amt. (Mr. Daniel) 13037 (vii).
Boards of Registration (sub.-sec. 4) 12995 (vii).
Canvassing by Aliens (sec. 25), Amt. (Mr. Lake) 11898 (vi).
Contributions for Political Purposes (sec. 28) Amt. (Mr. Alcorn) 11927; Amt. (Mr. Wilson) 11930; Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 11931 (vi).
Contributions, Statement (sec. 18) 11884; Amt. (Mr. Alcorn) 11884 (vi).
Conveyances of Voters (sec. 23) 11894; Amt. (Mr. Clarke) 11896; Amt. (Mr. Lancaster) 11897 (vi).
Conveyances, paying for (sec. 10) 11829; Amt. (Mr. Alcorn) 11835 (vi).
Corrupt Practices, Amt. (Mr. Fowler) 13044 (vii).
Enumerators, Posting of Notices (sec. 6) 11824 (vi).
Lists transmitted by Clerk of Crown in Chancery (sec. 1, sub.-sec. 8) 13004 (vii).
Manitoba Lists, Transmission (sec. 1, subsec. 10) 13009 (vii).
—— Polling Divisions (sec. 1, subsec. 2) 13005 (vii).
Nomination Papers, Address of Candidate (sec. 3) 11815; Amt. (Mr. Lancaster) 11816; Amt. (Mr. Bristol) 11820; Amt. (Mr. Ames) 11820, 11827 (vi), 13010 (vii).
Ontario, Unorganized Territories (sec. 1) 11796 (vi), 12919 (vii).
Persons on General List, omitted from Special List (sec. 13) 11865 (vi), 13009 (vii); Amt. (Mr. Clarke) 11881 (vi).
Polling Divisions (sec. 6) 13001 (vii).
Posters, Names and Addresses (sec. 26) 11922; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11922 (vi).
P.E.I., Oath (sec. 16) 11882 (vi).
Returning Officers, Instructions to (sec. 11) 11845 (vi); Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13032 (vii).
Voters' Lists Preparation (subsec. 5) 12998 (vii).
Yukon Enumerators (sec. 5) 11823, 11829 (vi), 13013 (vii).
3° m., 13229; Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13230; Neg. (Y. 60; N. 99) 13249; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 13251; Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) 13255; Amt. (Mr. Foster) 13257; 3° Agreed to, 13258 (vii).
Dom. Elections, Forms, Writs, Instructions, &c., issued in 1907: M. for Copies* (Mr. Barker) 555 (i).
Dom. Elections Act, and Govt. Measures, Proceeding with: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7721 (iv).
Dom. Elections Bill and Obstruction Tactics: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9225 (v).
Dom. Guarantee Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. Nos. 127 & 211.'
Dom. Govt. Employees, Interference at Election: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 614 (i).
Dom. Lands Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 9 & 181.'

Dom. Lands, Agents, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10038 (v).
—— Area disposed of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3431 (ii).
Dom. Lands and Exchange of School Lands: *See* 'B. No. 163.'
Dom. Land Grants to Rys. prior to 1896, Total Acreage: Ques. (Mr. W. McIntyre) 8182 (iv).
Dom. Lands, Sales of, during 1907: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lake) 3435 (ii).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. Lake) 5727 (iii).
—— Total Area disposed of from 1896 to 1905, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Lake) 3852 (ii).
Dom. Lands Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9987, 9996 (v).
Dom. Liabilities due N.B. from 1869 to 1884: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 2217 (ii).
See 'Finance.'
Dom. Loan and Overdrafts, Disposition of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 313 (i).
Dom. Notes, Issue of : *See* 'B. Nos. 159 & 160.'
Dom. Notes, Outstanding, Total Amount, 1907, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 691 (i).
—— Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5562 (iii).
Dominion Police Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5509 (iii).
Dom. Post Offices, Fittings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11007 (vi).
Dom. Power Co.: *See* 'B. No. 172.'
Dominion Power Co.'s Bill: Inquiry for (Mr. Cockshutt) 10919 (vi).
Dom. Revenue from 1873 to 1907: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1733 (i).
Dom. Transportation and Storage Co.: *See* 'B. No. 84.'
Dorchester Wharf Addition: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Dorval, Dredging at St. Lawrence Yacht Club: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 13060 (vii).
Doukhobors bonused as Immigrants: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 9952 (v).
Doukhobors, Condition of: Par. in Montreal 'Gazette' (Mr. Foster) 2218 (ii).
—— Destitute Condition at Fort William (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5007 (iii).
—— Homesteads cancelled, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9957 (v).
—— Manner of living, Letter from Yorkton: Read (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 5751 (iii).
—— Prisoners at Fort William, Release of by Justice Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Lake) 6847 (iv).
—— Religious Fanatics: Par. in 'Press' (Mr. J. D. Reid) 12161 (vii).
—— Tels. *re* Pardon by Justice Dept.: Ques.: (Mr. Lake) 6983 (iv).
Doukhobors, Yorkton, Tel. from Sec. of Bard of Trade: Read (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7620; Remarks (Mr. Lake) on M. for Sup., 7621 (iv).
Dover Wharf on Petitcodiac River: in Com. of Sup., 11692 (vi).
Dowling, Dr. D. B., Emplymt. in Geological Survey: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5206 (iii).
—— Emplymt. by German Development Co.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5564 (iii).
—— Leave of Absence from Geological Survey: Remarks (Mr. Templeman) in Com. of Sup., 10581 (vi).
Doyle, Mr. P., Immigration Agent, Superannuation of: Ques. (Mr. Oliver) 6923 (iv).
Draper, P. M., Candidate for Municipal Office: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 612 (i).
—— and Mr. Pepper, Candidates for Municipal Office: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 687 (i).
Dredges registered in Canada, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11497 (vi).
Dredging Companies, Contracts, Investigations *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 5924 (iii).
Dredging Contracts, Basis of Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9710 (v).
—— Midland, &c., Renewals without Tender, O.Cs. *re*: M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 6741 (iv).
—— advertisements *re* tenders: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 7195 (iv).
Dredging Contracts, O.C. *re*: Inquiry for (Mr. Bennett) 6853, 6927 (iv), 8696 (v).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10259 (v).
—— Payments to Great Lakes Dredging Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1736 (i).
—— Quebec Harbour: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 7104 (iv).
—— Renewal without Tenders: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 6633 (iv).
—— Tenders *re*, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9773 (v).
Dredging at Fort William, Amount paid to Great Lakes Dredging Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8839 (v).
Dredging Instructions to Inspectors, Circular Letter: Read in Com. of Sup., (Mr. Pugsley) 12043 (vi).
Dredging in Ontario Harbours, Tenders, Contracts, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 1129 (i).
Dredging in Ontario and Quebec, Tenders, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 9276, 10008 (v).
Dredging, Ont. and Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).

Dredging in Quebec Counties in 1907, Tenders, Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3240 (ii).
Dredging in Quebec Province, Claims Pending, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7200 (iv).
Dredging in St. Lawrence, &c.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Bergeron) 2896 (ii).
Dredging Plant (new) for Mar. Provs.: in Com. of Sup., 12142 (vii).
Dredging Plant for St. Lawrence River (lower): in Com. of Sup., 4754 (iii).
Dredging Works at Nicolet River, &c., Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3896 (ii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 4247 (iii).
Dredging Work at Rigaud River, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Boyer) 6240 (iv).
Dredging in Vaudreuil County, Supt.'s Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4587 (iii).
See 'Public Works,' &c.
Drill Halls, Number constructed since 1896, Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 177 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 556 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5659 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Worthington) 4834 (iii), 6222 (iv).
Drill Shed, Lindsay, Date of Construction: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1111 (i).
See 'Militia.'
Drop Letter, One-Cent Rate: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 3158 (ii).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
Drug Contracts with Bole Drug Co.: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Bole) 5562 (iii).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5513 (iii).
Drury, R. L., O.C. *re* Apptmt. to Japan: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4963 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4769 (iii).
Dry Docks, Construction of: *See* 'B. No. 119.'
Drysdale, Hon. Mr. Justice, Date of Acceptance of Office: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 4768 (iii).
——— Date of Communication *re* Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5084 (iii).
——— O.Cs. &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Taylor) 5086 (iii).
Dundee Custom House: in Com. of Sup., 7286 (iv).
Dunsmuir, Hon. Mr., Lt. Gov. of B.C., Assent to Natal Act and Dom. Interference: Remarks (Mr. R. Smith) 1738 (i).
——— Tel. from Sec. of State: Read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1859 (i).
——— Cor. with Govt. *re* Legislation: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1861 (i).
Eagle Lake Coal Lands, Surrender of: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 694 (i).
Easter Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6464, 6843 (iv).
Eastern Block Extension: in Com. of Sup., 1504 (i).
Eastern Trust Co.: *See* 'B. No. 103.'
Eastman Rifle Match, Accident, &c., Inquiry *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1125 (i).
East Templeton Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
Eclipse Manufacturing Co., Payments to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 3239 (ii).
——— Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 6461 (iv).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Blain) 3435 (ii).
Eclipse Manufaturing and Office Specialty Co., Supplies: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 7468 (iv).
Edmonton, Dunvegan and B.C. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 38.'
Edmonton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 5705 (iii), 8579 (v), 13336 (vii).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. Nos. 68 & 213.'
Egypte and St. Ephrem d'Upton, Mail Contract, Renewal of: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5257 (iii).
Eight Hour Day for Ry. Employees: *See* 'B. No. 157.'
Elder-Dempster SS. Subsidy to South Africa: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 2792 (ii).
Election Bills: *See* 'B. Nos. 29, 80, 115.'
Election in N.B., Interference of Dom. Govt. *re* Patronage: Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. Crocket) 3043 (ii).
See 'N. B.' &c.
Election of New Members, Certificates: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
Elections, Petitions, Supreme Court Judgments: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
Election Writs, Issue of: *See* 'B. No. 66.'
Electoral Districts, Issue of Writs: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
——— Ottawa and Labelle, Certificates of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 890 (i).
Electrical Power exported from Niagara Falls, Cor., &c., *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Macdonell) 2397 (ii).
Electric and Gas Power Licenses, granted under Statute, c. 16, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 360 (i).
Elmwood Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vii).
Emerson Public Building: in Com. of Sup. 8534 (v), 13335 (vii).
Empire and Ascension Day Adjnmt.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8894 (v).
Employees of Parlt. and Printing Bureau, Salaries, Religions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 5206 (iii).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Sproule) 5479 (iii).
Engineering Branch, Public Works Dept., Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11093 (vi).

Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 51.'
Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13296 (vii).
Escoumains Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
Esquimalt and Halifax Garrisons, Equipment, of &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 1293 (i).
Esquimalt Naval Station, Cor., &c., *re* Maintenance: M. for Copies (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1128 (i).
——Maintenance of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1117 (i).
—— Transfer to Canada: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 1293 (i).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13299 (vii).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 15.'
Essex County, Junior Judge, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1939 (i).
Estevan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8581 (v), 13336 (vii).
Estevan Quarantine Lands, Disposal of: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 10093 (v).
Estimates, Basis of Appropriations *re* Interim Supply Bill: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5919 (iii).
—— Discussion *re*: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 5661 (iii).
—— Discussions on Resolutions: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 3154 (ii).
—— Insufficient Votes *re* Public Works, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5923 (iii).
Estimates of 1908-9: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 554 (i).
—— Suppl. (1908): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 2381 (ii), 5134 (iii), 12503 (vii).
Exchange of Schools' Lands: *See* 'B. No. 163.'
Exchequer Court Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 116.'
Exchequer Court, Printing Reports, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5508 (iii).
—— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5505 (iii).
Excise Collectors, Payments for Customs Collections: in Com. of Sup., 817 (i).
Excise, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 813 (i).
—— Inspectors' Travelling Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 814 (i).
—— Provisional Allowance to Inland Revenue Officers: in Com. of Sup., 817 (i).
Exhibitions: in Com. of Sup., 10569 (vi), 12889 (vii).
Exhibitions, Amount of Subsidies paid to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beauparlant) 4406 (iii).
Exhibitions outside of Canada, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4584 (iii). *See* 'Anglo-French.'
Experimental Farm (Central) Amounts paid for Seeds, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 556 (i).
Experimental Farm Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vii).
——Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10904 (vi).
Experimental Farms, Establishment of, Names of Provs.: Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 7990 (iv).
—— Number controlled by Dom. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 3897 (ii).
Experimental Farm in Quebec District, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2593 (ii).
—— Pet. from Quebec Board of Trade: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 8182 (iv).
Experimental Farm, Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 1018 (i).
—— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 12549 (vii).
—— Sale of Cattle, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 2795 (ii).
—— Total Receipts from Sales, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4585 (iii).
Express Charges in Mar. Provs., Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 518 (i).
Expropriation of Lands by Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 30.'
Facilities and Increased Accommodations, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12259 (vii).
Fairville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).
Fair Wages Schedule on Dredging Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 7200 (iv).
Falconer, Kenneth, Arrangement *re* Balance of Payments: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 10516 (vi).
—— Emplymt. by Ry. Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5078 (iii).
—— Payments to *re* Services: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8890 (v).
—— Payments by Ry. Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10211 (v).
Falconer, Mr. K.: *See* 'Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Book-keeping.'
Farm and Garden Produce at Sault Ste. Marie, Custom Duties collected: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 13060 (vii).
Farnell, Gordon, Contractor for Halifax Mails: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7731 (iv).
Farnham Post Office, Alterations: in Com. of Sup., 7287 (iv).
—— Vote *re* Improvement: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6399 (iv).
Father Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
Favoured Nation Treatment, Conventions *re* Commercial Relations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 846 (i).
Fence Posts Fees, Memorial from Union of Manitoba Municipalities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 10258 (v).

Fernie Public Building, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 5706 (iii), 10866 (vi).
'Fielding,' Dredge, Number of Days Working, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 7199 (iv).
Financial Arrangements with Banks: *See* 'Wheat Transportation.'
Financial Review: Amt. (Mr. Foster) on M. for Sup., 13420 (vii).
——— Reply (Mr. Fielding) 13442 (vii).
See 'Budget.'
FINANCE:
Accounts and Claims against Govt., Total Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 362 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 352 (i).
American Bank Note Co., Agreement *re* Printing Stamps: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2593 (ii).
Audits and Inspection of Banks, Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 12658 (vii).
——— Independent Audit, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Bickerdike) 11232 (vi).
Bank Act Amendments: Prop. Res. (Mr. Pringle) 4248 (iii).
——— Par. in 'Financial Post': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pringle) 4770 (ii).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pringle) *re* Newspaper Reports, 2306 (ii).
Banks, Financial Stringency: *See* 'Wheat Transportation.'
Banque de St. Jean, Investigation *re* Failure: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 9335 (v).
Bounties paid on Binder Twine, Lead, &c., Amount from 1903 to 1907: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 4583 (iii).
Bounties paid by Govt., for 1908-9: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 13226 (vii).
Canadian Bank of Commerce, Letter of Mr. B. E. Walker: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pringle) 6005 (iii).
Chartered Banks of Canada, Report: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 8086 (iv).
Colonial Securities and Investment of Trust Funds, Cor., &c., Govtl. Action: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 174 (i).
Debt. of Canada, Portions falling due, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 315 (i).
See 'Loans.'
Dom. Liabilities due N.B. from 1869 to 1884: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 2217 (ii).
Dom. Notes Outstanding, Total Amount, 1907, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 691 (i).
Dom. Revenue from 1873 to 1907: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1733 (i).
Estimates of 1908-9: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 554 (i).
——— Suppl. (1908): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 2381 (ii), 5134 (iii), 12503 (vii).
Financial Arrangements with Banks: *See* 'Wheat Transportation.'

FINANCE—*Con.*
Finance, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 637 (i), 12914 (vii).
Financial Review: Amt. (Mr. Foster) on M. for Sup., 13420 (vii).
——— Reply (Mr. Fielding) 13442 (vii).
See 'Budget.'
Financial Stringency, &c., ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 35 (i).
Govt. Securities in Gold *re* Dom. Notes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 6235 (iv).
Grain Shipments, Financial Aid, Extended Explanation, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 607 (i).
See 'Wheat.'
Insurance Companies' Deposits, Total Amount, Securities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 241 (i).
Loan of Aug., 1907, Names of Banks where Discounted: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 564 (i).
Loans to Govt. Outstanding, Rates of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 235
Loan of 1874, Commission for Renewal: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11501 (vi).
Loans negotiated in London, Conditions *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 12654 (vii).
Loans and Overdrafts, Disposition of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 313 (i).
——— Personal Explanation (Mr. Foster) 13582 (vii).
Loans, Temporary, Total Amount, Rate of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 233, 314 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 554 (i).
Loans, Temporary or Advances, Rate of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 12654 (vii).
Mint, Amount of Silver and Gold Coins, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8612 (v).
——— Cor. with Imp. Govt.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Caron) 5210 (iii).
——— Date of Operation, Values of Coinage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11296 (vi).
——— Issue of Gold Coins: Ques. (Mr. Thompson) 2593 (ii).
——— Sums expended, Apptmts., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 232 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 557 (i).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Amounts collected and expended, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 1688 (i).
——— Claim of Govt., &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3465 (ii).
——— Indebtedness, Payments, Audit, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1931 (i).
——— Bonds, Payment of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2979 (ii).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3436; Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3442; Agreed to (Y. 108; N. 53) 3464 (ii).

FINANCE—*Con.*
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Toll Gates upon Island of Montreal, Abolition of: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3299 (ii).
Mutual Reserve Life Insurance Co., Govt. Deposit, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 3485 (ii).
N.B. Credit, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1937 (i).
Provincial Subsidies, Amounts paid under present Agreement and Previously: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 315 (i).
—— Dates of last Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 237, 564 (i).
—— Increased Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 173 (i).
—— ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 79; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 61 (i).
Quebec Bridge, Dom. Govt. Guarantee, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 2394 (ii).
—— Investigation *re*: M. for Sel. Com.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2547 (ii).
See main heading.
Receiver General's Office: in Com. of Sup., 12160 (vii).
Treasury Board: in Com. of Sup., 5562 (iii).
Truro, N.S., Tax Bill, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3480 (ii).
Trust Funds: *See* 'Colonial Securities.'
Wheat Transportation from N.W., Financial Aid by Govt., Cor., Memorials, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Foster) 2173 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1938 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. Pringle) 173 (i).
See 'Grain.'
Fire caused by Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 18.'
Fire Extinguishers, Purchase by Govt., Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 1510 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 1690 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Taylor) 4832 (iii).
—— Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) 7663 (iv).
—— File, Cor., quoted by Minister, custody of: Remarks (Mr. Blain) on M. for Sup., 7763 (iv).
—— Inquiry for Original Papers (Mr. Foster) 8901, 9281 (v).
—— Personal Explanation (Mr. Pugsley) 5658 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) on M. for Sup., 7639 (iv).
Fire Guardians, Number employed in Alberta: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 3433 (ii).
Fisheries Act (jurisdiction of officers) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 31.'
FISHERIES:
Bait Freezer and Cold Storage Plant in St. John, N.B., Cor., Agreements, &c., with Govt.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 558 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 563 (i).

FISHERIES—*Con.*
Bait Freezer at North Sydney, Govt. Assistance *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 3848 (ii).
Behring Sea Commission, Expenses *re*: Ques. (Mr. Finlayson) 1733 (i).
—— Expenses of Sir Charles H. Tupper: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2883 (ii).
—— Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) 4669 (iii).
Berins Fish Hatchery, Failure of Spawn Supply: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 3240 (ii).
Bounties paid to Cape Breton Fishermen, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1130 (i).
B.C. Fisheries Commission, Report *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5728 (iii).
B.C., Licenses issued to Packers' Ass'n.: Ques. (Mr. Kennedy) 8173 (iv).
—— Grants to Japanese: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 7445 (iv).
—— Negotiations, Instructions to Mr. Bastedo: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4407 (iii).
—— Reports *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. Smith) 6849 (iv).
'Carlotta G. Cox,' Seizure of: *See* 'Pelagic Sealing.'
Deep Sea Fisheries on Pacific Coast, Cruiser, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 1934 (i).
Clarke's Harbour, Dog Fish Works: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vii).
Dog Fish Reduction Plant, Operation at Canso: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5651 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 5777 (iii).
—— Total Cost of Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8179 (iv).
—— Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. McLennan) 5790 (iii).
Dog Fish Scrap, Shipments from Canso to U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 1126 (i).
Fisheries Committee, Sel. Standing, Apptmt. of: Prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 1691 (i).
Fisheries Inspectors: in Com. of Sup., 12261 (vii).
—— Inspectors in Alberta, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 12390 (vii).
Fisheries Jurisdiction with Provinces, Conference *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 3235 (ii).
—— Instructions to Agent: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 3429 (ii).
—— Jurisdiction *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 2395 (ii).
Fisheries in Mar. Provs., Violation of Act: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sinclair) 1513 (i).
—— Officers Jurisdiction, Convictions, Fines, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sinclair) 4247 (iii).

FISHERIES—*Con.*
Fisheries Negotiations, &c., Between U.S and Canada: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2023 (ii), 6844 (iv).
——— Boundary between Can. and U.S.: Information *re* (Mr. Sproule) 6632, 6739 (iv).
——— Regulations, Violation of: Remarks (Mr. Lalor) in Com. of Sup., 5781 (iii).
Forchu Fish Hatchery, Duties of Supervisor: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3427 (ii).
Georgian Bay Fisheries Commission, Payments to Messrs. Noble and Birnie: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 980 (i).
——— Report from Mr. Birnie: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 5729 (iii).
See 'Noble.'
Lake Winnipeg Hatchery, Failure *re* Spawn, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1683 (i).
——— Fisheries, Legislation *re* Closing: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 2389 (ii).
Leases granted between Lake Superior and Rocky Mountains, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 1683 (i).
Leases, Sessional Papers No. 207: M. for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 6241 (iv).
Licenses granted in Clearwater, &c., Lakes, Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 555 (i).
——— on Lesser Slave Lake, Date of Lease, Protest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 6398 (iv).
Licenses issued in Saskatchewan Lakes, Number, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. T. Chisholm) 559, 697 (i).
——— Issue of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 351 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 2896 (ii).
Lobster Fish Factory, License to E. H. McLennan, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2983 (ii).
Lobster Fishing Fines, Names and Amounts: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 10256 (v).
——— Fishing and Packing Licenses, Granting in P.E.I.: M. for Cor. (Mr. A. Martin) 5475 (iii).
——— Fishing in Lunenburg, &c., Complaints *re* Undersized, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2792 (ii).
——— Fishing in St. John, N.B., Legal Size &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 10257 (v).
——— Fishing at Pictou: Inquiry for Ret (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12772 (vii).
——— Licenses, Refusals in Northumberland Co.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 9472 (v).
——— Licenses in Savage Harbour, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 4404 (iii).
——— Overseers in Lunenburg, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 2793 (ii).

FISHERIES—*Con.*
Lobster Fishing, Pet. from Fishermen's Union of N.S. *re* Regulations: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 6644 (iv).
——— P.E.I. Pets. *re* Issue of Licenses: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2388 (ii).
Louisburg Bait Freezer, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4406 (iii).
Man., Fish Exportations from, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 4240 (iii).
Mar. Provs., Fisheries, Violation of Act: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sinclair) 1513 (i).
Markey Fishing Leases, Copy of Ret. laid on Table (Mr. Brodeur) 11404 (vi).
Matane River Fishing, Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 5775 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 7446 (iv).
Noble, Mr. James, Conviction *re* Fishery Regulations: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5650 (iii).
See 'Georgian Bay.'
Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, Seizure of Schr. 'Carlotta G. Cox': on M. for Sup. (Mr. Sloan) 3934 (ii).
——— Notice of Motion (Mr. Sloan) 3156 (ii).
Port Hood Fishery Officer, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10254 (v).
Pound Net Licenses granted in 1905, Cor. with A. E. Dyment, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bennett) 2795 (ii).
Protection, Amounts expended since 1885, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1118 (i).
Protection Service: in Com. of Sup., 13326 (vii).
Quahaug and Clam Fishing, Contemplated Change: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1940 (i).
River John Licenses, Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10511 (vi).
Salmon Licenses, Leases, &c., in B.C.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5652 (iii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5801 (iii).
——— Licenses in Gardner's Inlet, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 5652 (iii).
——— Number granted in B.C., Conditions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 5998 (iii).
——— Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 5651 (iii).
Salmon Net Fishing in Restigouche River Privileges, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 13518 (vii).
Seizures of Schooners, B.C., Compensation by Russian Govt.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 683 (i).
Selkirk Fish Hatchery, Failure of Spawn Supply: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 3240 (ii).
Shad Hatchery, Windsor, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. Black) 8894 (v).
Townsend Whaling Licenses: *See* 'Whaling.'

FISHERIES—*Con.*
Trap Bag Nets in Pokemouche River, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 9476 (v).
Trap-Net Licenses issued to John A. Webster, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 7204 (iv).
Washington Fisheries Commission, Expenses *re*: Ques. (Mr. Finlayson) 1732 (i).
Washington Treaty and Behring Sea Commission, Duration of: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2165 (ii).
Whale Fishing Cos. in B.C., Licenses granted, &c.: M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10259 (v).
——— Moneys Due, Penalties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5996 (iii).
Fish Island Lighthouse, Name of Present Keeper: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 6058 (iii).
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, Apptmt. to Hague Tribunal: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 8294 (v).
Floods at Chatham, Damages, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 4742 (iii).
Fog Signal Co., Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 11497 (vi).
Forbes, Mr Justice, Personal Status, &c., Cor., &c.: M. (Mr. Taylor) for Copies*,899 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2390, 3840 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Taylor) 1860 (i).
Forchu Fish Hatchery, Duties of Supervisor: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3427 (ii).
Foreign Purchases, Customs Collections *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5475 (iii).
Foresters, Ancient Order of: *See* 'B. No.62.'
Foresters, Order of, Charges in 'Le Canada': Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Bennett) 6005 (iii).
Forest Rangers *re* Dom. Lands: in Com. of Sup., 10049 (v).
Forest Reserves, Dom. Lands: in Com. of Sup., 10049 (v).
Fortier, Mr. Eugene, Payments *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 8613 (v).
Fortifications, Construction of, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 6646 (iv).
Fort William Terminal Ry. and Bridge Co.: *See* 'B. No. 101.'
Foss, Mr. C. O., Apptmt. on G.T.P. Engineering Staff, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 358 (i).
Foster, Frederick, Emplymt. of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 12652 (vii).
Franco-Canadian SS. Subsidy: *See* 'B. No. 145.'
Franco-Canadian Trade Treaty: Prop. Res. (Mr. Fielding) 941 (i).
——— Preparation of Stmnt. *re* Duty Units (Mr. Foster) 943 (i).
——— M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Res., Stmnt., 1213 (i).
——— Remarks *re* Discussion (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3754 (ii).
——— *See* 'B. No. 57.'
Franco-Canadian Treaty, Canadian Products enjoying Benefits of Minimum Tariff, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 851 (i).
——— Consideration of Proposed Convention: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. Monk) 923 (i).
——— Correction *re* Travelling Expenses of Sir Charles Tupper (Mr. Ames) 1424 (i).
——— Delay in Approval, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Talbot) 12655 (vii).
——— Delay due to Canadian Govt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 13534 (vii).
——— Discussion *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1206 (i).
———Distribution to Members: Remarks (Mr. Beland) 605 (i).
——— Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 12651
——— Favoured Nation Clause, Foreign Powers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 845 (i).
——— Favoured Nation Clause: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 514 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Foster) 564 (i).
——— and German Surtax, Effect of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 844 (i).
——— Imports from U.S., Exclusion of: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 845 (i).
——— Information in Detail asked for (Mr. Foster) 1585 (i).
——— Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 570 (i).
———Maximum and Minimum Rate, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 178 (i).
——— Mess. from His Ex.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 6 (i).
——— Papers to be Distributed (Mr. Fielding) 848 (i).
——— Preferential Tariff, Names of Countries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 844 (i).
——— Printing and Distribution: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 93 (i).
——— Ratification by French Senate: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 13083 (vii).
——— ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 28; (Mr. Foster) 82; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 43 (i).
——— Shipments from Canada, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4763 (iii).
——— Stmnt. *re* Tariffs: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8 (i).
——— U.S. Exports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 896 (i).
Fraser, Mr. A. W., Emplymt. as Counsel *re* Sussex St. Property Purchase: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 3478 (ii).
——— Payments to for Legal Services: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 2979 (ii).
Fraser, Mr. Donald, Dismissal from Customs Service: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 5473 (iii).
——— Investigation *re* Defalcations: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 5200 (iii).
See 'Customs Defalcations,' &c.

Fredericton Military Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).
Fredericton Ry. Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12758 (vii).
Free Transportation of Members by SS. Cos.: *See* 'B. No. 106.'
Freight Rates, Discrimination *re* City of St. John, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Crocket) 2397 (ii).
French Books, Reduction of Customs Duties *re* French Treaty: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2160 (ii).
French Immigration Agents, Names, Facilities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 176 (i).
French Immigrants, Number and Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 176 (i).
French Language, Legislation *re*, Par. in 'La Presse': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 8291 (v).
——— Par. in 'Le Soleil': Ques. of Privilege (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1209 (i).
French Language, Pet. *re*: Read (Mr. A. Lavergne) 8886; Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) 8886 (v).
French Language on Ry. Crossings, &c. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2021 (ii).
French Translation of Govt. Statutes and Documents: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) on M. for Sup., 3179 (ii).
See 'Debates.'
French Treaty, Taking Effect: Ques. (Mr. Bristol) 8614 (v).
French Treaty: *See* 'B. No. 57.'
Fritz Cirkel, Mining Engineer, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 7202 (iv).
See 'Graphite.'
Frozen Wheat, Shipments from Man., Inspection under Seed Act: M. (Mr. Blain) to adjn. House, 825 (i).
Fruit and Dairy Divisions, Separation of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2166 (ii).
Fruit Inspection in Closed Packages, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 2981 (ii).
Fruit Inspection, Complaints *re* Apple Packing: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 2754 (ii).
Fruit Marks Act, Prosecutions *re* Apple Packing: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 4830 (iii).
Fruit and Vegetable Inspectors, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 516 (i).
Fumigation Stations: in Com. of Sup., 12879 (vii).
Fushimi, Prince, Expenditure *re* Visit: in Com. of Sup., 5783 (iii).
Gaetz Brothers, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 10514 (vi).
Galops Canal, Upper Entrance, Dredging, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5671 (iii).
Game Preserve, Alberta, Payments for Buffalo imported from Montana: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 847 (i).
Gammell, Edith Maud Rosario, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 139.'
Gananoque and Burnt Island Lights, Buoys, &c., Apptmt. of Keeper: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 8383 (v).
Gananoque Drill Shed: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 10894 (vi).
Garrison Artillery, B.C., 5th Regiment, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5792 (iii).
Garrison Commons, Toronto, Date of Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 353 (i).
Garthby Wharf, Inspection by Midraud, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 3844 (ii).
See 'Lake Aylmer.'
Gatineau Point Bridge, Sums contributed by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 355 (i).
Gaudette, Mr. Victor, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 1120 (i).
——— Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 515 (i).
Gelinas, Mr., Repayment of Travelling Expenses: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 654, 668 (i).
General Chemical Co., Patents of: *See* 'B. No. 174.'
Geological Museum, Progress *re* Construction: Remarks (Mr. Blain) on Conc., 13568 (vii).
See 'Public Works—Ottawa.'
Geological Specimens: in Com. of Sup., 12261 (vii).
Geological Survey Department, Total Expenditure from 1896 to 1908: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6402 (iv).
——— Technical Officers, Salaries, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) on Conc., 13574 (vii).
——— Yacht, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 11231 (vi).
Georgetown Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7182 (iv).
Georgian Bay Canal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 47.'
Georgian Bay Canal, Plans, Reports, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. McCool) 1941, 1992 (i), 5228 (iii).
Georgian Bay Canal Scheme: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 10312 (vi).
——— Report *re* Estimated Cost: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 12053 (vii).
——— inquiry for (Mr. Bergeron) 12836 (vii).
Georgian Bay Canal, Survey, Final Report of Engineer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Brabazon) 240 (i).
——— Final Report *re*: Ques. (Mr. White) 240 (i), 5465 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. White) 11827 (vi).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Haggart) 1739 (i).
——— Reps., &c.: Laid on Table (Mr. Pugsley) 8378 (v).
Georgian Bay Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 12145 (vii).

Georgian Bay Fisheries Commission, Payments to Messrs. Noble and Birnie: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 980 (i).
—— Report from Mr. Birnie: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 5729 (iii).
See 'Fisheries.'
German Development Co.: Remarks (Mr. Talbot) in Com. of Sup., 10579 (vi).
See 'Dowling.'
German Goods imported under Preferential Tariff, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 689 (i).
Gillis, Release from Penitentiary: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 510 (i).
Gilmore, Edith May, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 164.'
Girard, Eugene Francois, Patent of: *See* 'B. No. 52.'
Girouard, J. E., Resignation from Yukon Council: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11938 (vi).
—— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 11634 (vi).
Glace Bay, Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11228 (vi).
—— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7139 (iv).
Glencoe Post Office, Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 3846 (ii).
Glencoe Public Building: in Com. of Sup. 7486 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Glucose, Quantity imported from G.B.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6980 (iv).
Gobeil, Mr., Dep. Min. of Public Works, Retirement, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1452 (i).
Goderich Harbour, Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
—— Claims of Smeeth & McGillicuddy: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
—— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12101 (vii).
Goderich Military Camp, Target Practices, &c.: Ques. (Mr Bristol) 9712 (v)
—— Remarks (Mr. Maclaren) 9779 (v).
Godfroi River Wharf, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3423 (ii).
Gold and Silver Marking Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 123 & 197.'
Gold Commissioner's Office, Yukon, Number of Clerks, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10108 (v).
See 'Yukon.'
'Golspie, Str., Payments *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 1084 (i).
Gooderham & Worts Distillery, Deficit in Spirit Production: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 12411 (vii).
Goodwin Car Co., Patents of: *See* 'B. No. 60.'
Gore's Landing Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12101 (vii).
Govt. Business: Announcement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7834 (iv), 12049, 12163 (vii).
—— Introduction of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10258 (v), 10303, 10403, 10511, 11123, 11826 (vi).
—— M. for Precedence on Mondays (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6287 (iv).
—— Precedence *re* Motion for Want of Confidence: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 6917 (iv).
—— Ry. Subsidies: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12504 (vii).
Govt. Business: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 13207 (vii).
—— Suppl. Estimates, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 11016 (vi).
Govt. Employees at Ottawa, Number of Permanent and Temporary, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Northrup) 558 (i).
Govt. Grounds, Condition of: Remarks (Mr. Talbot) 1741 (i).
See 'Public Works—Ottawa.'
Govt. Officials and Municipal Elections, &c.: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Sproule) 2890 (ii).
Govt. Officials as Political Partizans in Elections: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. on B. 115, 11903 (vi).
Govt. Ownership, &c., ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 75; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 51 (i).
Govt. Rys. Act: *See* 'B. No. 27.'
Govt. Railways System: *See* 'I.C.R.,' &c.
Govt. Securities in Gold *re* Dom. Notes, &c.: Ques. (Mr Marshall) 6235 (iv).
Govt. Steamers, Amounts paid for Provisions, &c., for Three Years: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1512 (i).
—— Captains' Residences, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Stanfield) 3241 (ii).
—— Ice-breakers, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5763 (iii).
—— Maintenance and Supplies: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1049 (i).
—— Number purchased, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 10731 (vi).
—— Pay of Officers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10736 (vi).
—— Purchase of Supplies, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 1099 (i).
—— Trips of Mr. Cowie, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5467 (iii).
Govt. Works, Emplymt. of Technical Students: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3288 (ii).
Governor General's Expenditure since 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. U. Wilson) 555 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. U. Wilson) 3581 (ii).
Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 610 (i).
Grain Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 188.'
Grain Blockade in the West: *See* 'B. No. 159.'

Grain Commission, Names of Members, Distribution of Evidence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 3486 (ii).
Grain Commission's Report: Inquiry for (Mr. Lake) 2381 (ii), 4224, 4316 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr .Staples) 180 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Staples) 180, 609 (i).
Grain Inspection in 1906, Total Expenditure, Receipts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4586 (iii).
Grain Shipments, Financial Aid, Extended Explanation, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 607
See 'Wheat,' &c.
Grain Standards Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 203.'
Grand Bend, &c., Pier, Delays in Ret.: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 4408 (iii).
——— Final Estimate of Chief Engineer Lafleur: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8892 (v).
Grand Bend Wharf, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5085 (ii).
See 'Public Works—Wharfs,' &c.
Grand Falls Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).
Grand Forks Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Grand Manan Telegraph System, Application *re* Leasing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6463 (iv).
Grand Marais Harbour, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 12140 (vii).
Grand Mechins Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
Grand Mere Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
Grandes Piles Dam, Amount voted, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 13059 (vii).
Grand River Wharf, Tenders, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 8382 (v).
Grande Riviere Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.: *See* 'B. No. 151.'
G.T.P. Ry. Co., Guaranteed Bonds: *See* 'B. No. 171.'
GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY:
Accidents to Employees: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 6655, 7447 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr Talbot) 6850 (iv).
——— Investigation by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. R. Smith) 10624 (vi).
Application for Portion of Metlakatla Indian Reserve, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. D. Ross) 1512 (i).
Apptmt. of District Engineer at Kenora: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 895 (i).
Bond Issue, Sale of: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8440 (v).
Classification of District 'B' and 'F,' Inspection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 12051 (vii).
See 'Hodgins.'
GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—*Con.*
Commissioners' Rep., Printing and Distribution: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7 (i).
——— Commission, Total Salaries, Expenses &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 13226 (vii).
Commission issued to Inspectors: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 9716 (v).
Construction, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 37 (i).
——— Estimated Cost, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 10393 (vi).
——— Inclusive of Terminals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9265 (v).
——— Inquiry for Figures (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10916, 11939 (vi).
——— M. to Lay Statement on Table (Mr. Graham) 12049 (vii).
——— Total Cost, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5728 (iii), 9265 (v), 11407 (vi).
——— Statement (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 12238 (vii)
——— Reply to Mr. Borden's Statement (Mr. Graham) 12662 (vii).
Construction Tenders, Total Amounts, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. J. T. Schell) 600 (i).
Contracts, Date, Estimated Cost, Mileage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 6458, 6636 (iv).
Contracts *re* Eastern and Western Sections, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 6234 (iv).
Contracts, Safeguard Clauses in Govt. Contracts: M. for Copies* (Mr. Morin) 2398 (ii).
Eastern Division, Estimated Length, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5563 (iii).
——— Recent Estimate of Cost: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5259 (iii).
Eastern Limit, Mountain Section, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 9265 (v)
Engineers and Assistant Engineers, Names, &c., Date of Apptmt., Salaries, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5802 (iii).
Engineering Staff, Changes *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 509, 681 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonell) 853 (i).
——— Resignation of Mr. Hodgins: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 516 (i)
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 558 (i).
See 'Hodgins.'
Foss, Mr. C. O., Apptmt. on Engineering Staff, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 358 (i).
Grand Falls and Moncton Section, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 9266 (v).
G.T.P., and N.T. Ry., Disputed Questions: Ques (Mr. Barker) 6235 (iv).
Hodgins, Major, Resignation, Apptmt. of Successor: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 358 (i).
——— Retirement of, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 366 (i).

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—*Con.*
Hodgins, Major, Charges *re* Classification, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6844, 6925 (iv).
——Amt. to M. to ref. to Special Com. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7213, 7320 (iv).
—— Statement from Hon. Mr. Parent: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6985; Read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7097 (iv).
—— Investigation *re*, 1st Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. Geoffrion) 8515 (v).
—— M. (Mr. Geoffrion) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 12265; Amt. (Mr. Lennox) Minority Rep., 12291 (vii).
—— Counsel Fees, Payment: M. (Mr. Macdonald) 13578 (vii).
Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 10390 (vi).
La Tuque Branch, Damages by Flooding: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8607 (v).
—— Explanation (Mr. Graham) 8894 (v).
Liquor, Prohibition Zone, Cor., Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 558 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2024
Location, Conference in Montreal *re*: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7809 (iv).
Lyall, Mr. Peter, Contractor for G.T.P. Terminals at Winnipeg: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 7991 (iv).
Madawaska Right of Way: Remarks (Mr. Michaud) 12661 (vii).
Marier, Mr. J. E., Emplymt. on G.T.P. Commission: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2162 (ii).
Medical Attendance, O.C. regulating Deductions: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1937 (i).
—— Deductions *re*: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 9473 (v).
Medical Officer Parent, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 8618 (v).
Miles undof construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 165 (i).
Mission Reserve, Conditions of Sale to G.T. P. Ry. Co.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 5256 (iii).
Montreal Branch Line Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13300 (vii).
Mountain Division, Incomplete Ret.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 12223 (vii).
Nationality of Contractors: Discrimination against Canadians: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 7936 (iv).
Payments to Mr. A. Brunet: in Com. of Sup., 10378 (vi).
Policy *re* Police Patrol: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7997 (iv).
Port Arthur Branch Line Subsidy: in Com on Res., 13303 (vii).
Prohibition Zone, Reduction of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 516 (i).

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—*Con.*
Protests *re* Land Acquisitions: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 6640 (iv).
Rails purchased, Name of Manufacturers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 10738, 10790 (vi).
—— Importations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 12775 (vii).
—— corrected answer (Mr. Graham) 13065
Rails for Eastern Division, Purchase of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 9263 (v).
Return: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6288 (iv).
Route, Financial Reasons for Change of Route: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Fielding) 8089 (iv).
Sections B. and F., Amounts paid, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barker) 5211 (iii).
Securities *re* Construction Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 356 (i).
Supplies to Prince Rupert via American Routes: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 9025 (v), 10375 (vi).
Supply Transportation, Award of Contracts *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 2171 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1932 (i).
—— Contractor for District No. 3: Ques. (Mr. White) 1120 (i).
Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 12728 (vii).
Ties purchased from U.S.: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 1443 (i).
Town and Development Co., Location of Lands, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 5087 (iii).
Winnipeg and Moncton Route, Location of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 2386 (ii).
——Number of Miles completed, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 6643 (iv).
—— Tenders *re* Contracts, Signatures, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 935 (i).
G.T. Ry. and C.P.R. Connection at Wingham: Remarks (Mr. P. H. McKenzie) 191 (i).
G. T. Ry., Connection at Brockville: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Taylor) 9 (i).
——Connections at Prescott: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 433 (i).
——Entrance into Toronto, O.Cs., Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Macdonell) 556 (i).
G.T.R. Hotel Site at Ottawa: *See* 'B No. 89.'
G.T.Ry. Hotel: *See* 'Major's Hill.'
'Graphite,' Cost of Publication, Total Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5081 (iii).
See 'Fritz Cirkel,' &c.
Gratuities to Marine *re* Accidents to Seamen: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vii).
Gratuities to Public Works Officials: in Com. of Sup., 5730 (iii).
Gravenhurst Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Wright) in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vii).
Graving Docks, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5731 (iii).

Grazing Lands leased to Brown, Bedingfield & Co.: Ques. (Mr. Crawford) 13062 (vii).
Grazing Lands Reservations, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 3850 (ii).
Grazing Leases, Application of Messrs. Wood, Fleck and Finnie: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 238 (i).
Grazing Leases, Irrevocable for 21 years, Applications for, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 1511 (i).
Grazing and Irrigation Lands reserved by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 3479 (ii).
Grazing Lease of H. Rivière, Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 13060 (vii).
Grazing Ranches, Names and Addresses of Lessees in Townships 12 to 19: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 7210 (iv).
G. B. and Canada Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 12728 (vii).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
G. B. and U. S. Treaties: Papers laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8694 (v).
See 'Anglo-American.'
Greenwood Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Griffith Island, Georgian Bay, Sale of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 1508 (i).
Grosse Isle Quarantine Buildings: in Com. of Sup.,7289 (iv).
Guelph Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 7678 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Guelph-Goderich Mail Service, Arrangements with C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. A. F. Maclaren) 184 (i).
Gunn, Mr. B. B., Decease of: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 431 (i).
Gunnip, Mr. James, Pet. *re* Claims for Injuries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3844 (ii).
Hackett Dock, Purhase of at Amherstburg: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7730 (iv).
Halifax Custom House: in Com. of Sup., 7144 (iv).
—— Name of Contractor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 7211 (iv).
Halifax Dominion Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7140 (iv).
Halifax Garrison, Coal Supply, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 10015 (v).
—— Disbandment of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1208 (i).
—— Discontent *re* Delay of Pay: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5659 (iii).
—— Occupation by Imp. Troops: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1288 (i).
—— Retraction of Remarks of Minister of Finance: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 5784 (iii).
See 'Esquimault.'
Halifax Immigration Buildings, Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7142-3 (iv).
Halifax Immigration Frauds. Dismissal of Mr. Bernstein: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8605 (v).
—— Charges *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9334 (v).
See 'Immigration.'
Halifax, Increased Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5548 (iii), 12227 (vii).
—— Military Buildings (Wellington Barracks): in Com. of Sup., 7143 (iv).
Halifax Platform *re* Conservative Speeches, ref. to in debate on Address (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 47; (Mr. Foster) 66 (i).
Halifax Quarantine Station, Lawlor's Island: in Com. of Sup., 7171 (iv).
Halifax, Signal Dues at: *See* 'B. No. 152.'
Halifax Southwestern Ry. (Tusket Wedge) Subsidy: in Com. of Res., 13296 (vii).
Halliday Bros., Supplies to Lighthouses, Rates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6236 (iv).
Hall's Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11228 (vi).
Hamilton Bank, Pension Fund: *See* 'B. No. 56.'
Hamilton, Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 7692 (iv).
—— Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7696 (iv).
Hamilton Radial Electric Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 25.'
Hamilton Radial Electric B. 25: in Com., *re* Ruling (Mr. Speaker) to ref. back to Com., 3362 (ii).
Haney, M. J., Claims *re* P.E.I. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 12762 (vii).
'Hansard,' Extra Copies, Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 9128 (v).
See 'Debates,' &c.
Harbottle, N. F., Employmt. in Excise Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 7730 (iv).
Harbours and Rivers, Generally, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11693, 12031 (vi).
—— Man.: in Com. of Sup., 5701 (iii).
—— N. B.: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
—— N. B., Members' Remarks checked: (Mr. Deputy Speaker) 11290 (vi).
—— N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 13341 (vii).
—— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
—— P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 13341 (vii).
—— P. E. I., General Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 11292 (vi).
—— Que.: in Com. of Sup., 13349 (vii).
—— Sask. and Alberta: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
See 'Public Works.'
Harlaka Junction Ry. Connection: Remarks (Mr. Morin) 1436 (i), 3317 (ii).
See 'I. C. R.,' &c.
Harriston Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vii).
Harvey Bank Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).

Hawkeye, Mr., Emplymt. as Returning Officer: Remarks (Mr. Avery) in Com. of Sup., 10992 (vi).
Hawkins, Dr. A. C., Instruction *re* Municipal Offices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 3430 (ii)
——Political Interference, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) on M. for Sup., 6647 (iv).
Haycock, Mr. J. L., Interference in Elections: Remarks (Mr U. Wilson) in Com. of Sup., 648 (i).
Hay Shipments to S. Africa, Claims against Dept. of Agriculture: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5791 (iii).
Hay and Straw Embargo by G. B.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4765 (iii).
Heath Point Lighthouse, Contract *re* Building: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 7210 (iv).
—— Purchase of Cement from A. E. Wallberg, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Staples) 4773 (iii).
Higgin's Shore Pier Wharf, Pet. *re* Extension: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 694 (i).
High Commissioner's Office, Increase in Salaries: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 10737 (vi).
Hillsborough Bridge, P.E.I. Ry., Claims of M. J. Haney, Arbitration, &c.: Remarks (Mr J. D. Reid) 1739 (i).
—— O.Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Barker) 1690 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Barker) 3042, 3690 (ii).
Hillsborough Bridge Construction, Land Purchases, &c., Reps., &s.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lefurgey) 2170 (ii).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. Lefurgey) 6160 (iii).
—— Total Expenditure *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1686 (i).
Hillsborough Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii)
—— Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 7188 (iv).
Hindus Deportation from B.C., Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen': Remarks (Mr. Macpherson) 5337 (iii).
Hindus in B.C., Protests against Treatment: Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' (Mr. Foster) 5489 (iii).
—— Tel. *re* Contract Labour: Remarks (Mr Foster) 4407 (iii).
See 'Immigration.'
Hintz, Fred., Location of Homestead: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 6238 (iv).
See 'Homesteads,' &c.
Hodgins, Major: *See* 'G.T.P.'
Hog Cholera in Essex, Number of Animals slaughtered, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 9280 (v).
—— Compensation paid, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 13085 (vii).
Hogg, Mr. W. D., Payments to since 1896, &c.: Ques. (Mr. P. D. McLean) 2081 (ii).
Holland River Dredging, Contract with Lake Simcoe Dredging Co.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2980 (ii).
—— Divisional Engineer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 4767 (iii).
—— Name of Inspector, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3037 (ii).
Holliday, Mr. P., Payments of Additional Living Allowance: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5475 (iii).
Home Guards, N.W.T., Issue of Scrip for Services: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 2161 (ii)
Homestead Application of Mr. John Haddock: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. on B. 181, 11197 (vi).
Homestead Cancellations: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 10090 (v)
Homestead Entries, Declarations, &c., by Mr. R. Cruickshanks: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lake) 698 (i).
Homestead Entries in Man., &c., Total Acreage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 6920 (iv).
Homestead Entries granted for Quarter 10-17-17, W. of 4th Meridian: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 9773 (v).
Homesteaders for Sections 15, 16 and 27, &c., Issue of Patents: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 7503 (iv).
Homestead Entry for s.e. ¼ Section 16-28-1, Issue of Patent, Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 2167 (ii).
Homesteading on Section 18, Extensions *re* Time Allowance: Quese. (Mr. Ames) 8381 (v).
Homestead Entries in Section 27, Cor., Tels., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Staples) 4773 (iii).
—— n.e. ¼ Sec. 28, Permission *re* Grants: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1941 (i).
—— N.W. Quarter Section 35, History of: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4762 (iii).
—— Records of Payments of Sale by Peter Luenson to F. Heintz, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr Porter) 1294 (i).
See 'Hintz.'
Homestead Entry by Mr. Tanguay: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 10087 (v).
Homestead Entries: *See* 'Land Patents.'
Homestead Patents, Settlement Conditions: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10095 (v).
—— Sale of in Township 13, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 7206 (iv).
Honey Imports from 1898-1908, Amount, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8177 (iv).
Hoppins, Mr. Wm., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Wright) 3842 (ii).
Horses and Cattle, Imports to U.S. as Thoroughbreds, Prevention of: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 6000 (iii).
Hough, Campbell & Ferguson, Applications, &c., *re* Coal Mining Lands: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Herron) 698 (i)

Hough, Campbell & Ferguson, Sales of Lands to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 364, 568 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Herron) 3319 (ii).
House of Commons Act (election writ) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 66.'
HOUSE OF COMMONS:
Clerk of Crown in Chancery, Estimates: in Com of Sup., 10508 (vi).
Colchester Electoral District, Ceretificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 680 (i).
Committees sitting concurrently with Hse.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9579 (v).
Debates of the House, Statement *re* Speakers (Mr. Kennedy) 13537 (vii).
Election Petitions, Supreme Court Judgments: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
Electoral Districts, Issue of Writs: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
——— Ottawa and Labelle, Certificates of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 890 (i).
Employees of Parliament, Religion, Nationalities, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Sproule) 5479 (iii).
House of Commons, Accommodation for Members in New Wing: Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 10490 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5728 (iii).
——— Additional Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1486 (i).
——— Civil Service Bill, and Employees of House of Commons: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 13528 (vii).
——— Clerks, Changes, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Owen) 4247 (iii).
——— Employees, Recommendations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Owen) 3899 (ii).
——— Increase of Salaries: in Com. of Sup 13562 (vii).
——— Delays in Mails: Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) 11939 (vi).
——— Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 570 (i)
——— Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 7481 (iv).
——— Delay, &c.: Statement (Mr. Lemieux) 12044 (vi).
——— Salary Increases to Sessional Clerks: in Sup., Conc., 13578 (vii).
——— Ventilation and Cooling: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 10978, 11009 (vi), 13340 (vii).
House of Commons and Senate, Cost, &c., Outside of Indemnities: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4760 (iii).
Huron Electoral Division, Vacancy: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 890 (i).
———Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2541 (ii).
Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7 (i).
HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*
Internal Economy Commission, Minutes: M. for Copies* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2795 (ii).
Legislation, Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10507 (vi).
Library of Parlt. Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 312 (i).
——— Joint Rep.: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 6 (i).
——— Montreal Directory: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 4764 (iii).
——— Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10503 (vi).
Manitoba Voters' Lists, Affidavits *re* Frauds: Read (Mr. Bole) 7942 (iv).
Members, New, Certificates: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
Members and Senators appointed to Offices of Emolument, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 555 (i).
Montmagny Electoral District, Vacancy: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 9263 (v).
Nicolet Electoral District, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1283
Order, Ques. of, Discussions *re*, Bourinot quoted. &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4103 (ii)
——— Appeal to Speaker from Chairman's Ruling (Mr. Taylor) Agreed to (Y. 84; N. 1) 4188 (ii).
Parliamentary Documents, Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 609 (i).
Peace Union, Parliamentary, Meeting at Ottawa: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 13581 (vii).
Printing of Parlt., Joint Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 312 (i).
Private Bills Com., Extension of Time: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 891 (i).
Private Bills Fees, Discrepancy between Senate and H. of C.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10122 (v).
Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen. Sec.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 13580 (vii).
Public Accounts Com., Meetings and Adjournments: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1439 (i).
——— Meetings of: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 945 (i).
Public Accounts Com., Meetings concurrently with Sittings of Hse.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9504 (v).
——— Production of Original Documents: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 1383 (i), 4495 (iii).
Quebec Tercentenary, Joint Meeting of Members and Senators: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 6061 (iii).
Restaurant of H. of C. and Senate: M. (Mr. Pugsley) for Joint Com., 13224 (vii).
——— 1st Rep.: Presented (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 13510 (vii).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*
Returning Officers, Apptmnt. of: Remarks (Mr. Telford) in Com. of Sup., 10992 (vi).
Returns, Questions, &c., ordered by House, Time to complete, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crawford) 4242 (iii).
Revised Statutes, French Version, Date of Completion: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 357 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 6983 (iv).
Rules of the House, Amendments to: Prop. Res. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 2984 (ii).
Rules *re* Hours of Adjournment: Prop. Res. (Mr. A. A. Wright) 584 (i).
Saturday Sittings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 11501 (vi).
Senate, Cost of outside of Indemnities: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 5087 (iii).
——— Days of Sitting, Cost for 1895 and 1906-7, of Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1114 (i).
Sergeant-at-Arms Estimates: in Com. of Sup., 10503 (vi).
South Huron, By-Election, Amounts paid Returning Officer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 9270 (v), 11935 (vi).
Speaker's Expenses, Comparison, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 1016 (i).
——— Pianos rented, &c., for Speakers' Rooms: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 563 (i).
Speech from the Throne: Read (Mr. Speaker) 3 (i).
——— Reply (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1584 (i).
Stanstead By-Election Papers, Destruction of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8087 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) on M. for Sup., 8839 (v).
——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com. on Priv. and Elections, 8887 (v).
Vacancies in Electoral Districts: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
Vacancy in Stanstead, Issue of Writ: Notification (Mr. Spaker) 569 (i).
Voters' Lists, Manitoba: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 10793 (vi).
——— Manitoba Polling Divisions by Judges: Remarks (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 13139 (vii).
——— Provincial: in Com. of Sup., 10508 (vi).
Votes and Proceedings, Correction in Names of Clerks (Mr. Burrows) 13066 (vii).
Watson, Mr., K.C., Apptmt. as Counsel *re* West Elgin Election Frauds: Remarks (Mr. Northrup) 6848 (iv).
Wednesday Evening Sittings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 11232 (vi).
York Electoral District: Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1018 (i).
Howard's Cape Wharf, Pet. *re*, &c.: Ques (Mr. Lefurgey) 11702 (vi).
Hudson Bay Co., Original Land Register of Lord Selkirk's Estate, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 4403 (iii).
Hudson Bay Patrol System: in Com. of Sup., 3985 (ii), 4747 (iii).
Hudson Bay Railway, Govt. Construction: M. (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 6291 (iv).
——— Proposition *re* Construction by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5789 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Borden) on Financial Review, 13467 (vii).
——— Surveys, Locations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12764 (vii).
See 'Railways.'
Hudson, Que., Dredging, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4587 (iii).
Hull Customs Imports, Amount for 1906-8: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 11703 (vi).
Hull Post Office, Total Revenue for 1906, 1908: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 11704 (vi).
Humboldt Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8582 (v).
Hunter, Henry C., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1292 (i), 3236 (ii).
Hunter, J. B., Apptmt. as Dep. Min. of Public Works: in Com. of Sup., 1452 (i).
Hunting, Killing of Persons, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 93.'
'Hurona-Mongolian' Collision, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 358 (i).
Huron Electoral Division, Vacancy: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 890 (i).
——— Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2541 (ii).
Hydrographic Surveys, Amounts expended, &c: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1128 (i).
——— River St. Lawrence and Gulf: in Com. of Sup., 13169 (vii).
Hyman, Hon. C. S., Date of Resignation, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 166 (i).
Ice-breakers for Govt. Service: in Com. of Sup., 2941, 2949 (ii).
Ice-breaker for Northumberland Straits: in Com. of Sup., 1885 (i).
——— Progress *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 1734 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 2944 (ii).
See 'Marine,' &c.
Immigration: *See* 'Chinese,' &c.
Immigration Act (concealed weapons) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 65.'
Immigration Act Amt: *See* 'B. No. 135.'
IMMIGRATION:
Agents in G. B. and France: in Com. of Sup., 9840 (v).
——— Names, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 2169 (ii).
——— Reps. received from, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. U. Wilson) 557 (i).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*

Agents, Special, Salaries, Names, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 2398 (ii).

Agents in East Elgin, Number employed: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 692 (i).

—— Italy. Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 4584 (iii).

—— Kent County, Ont., on M. for Sup. (Mr. Clements) 3172 (ii).

—— payments to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 514 (i).

Agents appointed in Ontario, Names, Number, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Clements) 1129 (i).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Clements) 3041 (ii).

Agents, Names, Addresses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 180 (i).

—— Names of those paid Commissions to in Europe, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 3844 (ii).

Agents in N.B., Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 843 (i).

Agents, Special Prizes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 3484 (ii).

Agents in U.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9964 (v).

Asiatic Immigration into B.C.: *See* 'Japanese.'

Belgian Immigrants, Number and Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 176 (i).

Bonuses, Abolition of: Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6663, 6945, 6989 (iv).

—— Notice of Motion (Mr. Monk) 4769 (iii), 6288 (iv).

Bonuses, Abolition of: on prop. Res. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1295 (i), 3300 (ii).

—— Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) *re* Discussion of former Speech, 1298; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 1299 (i).

—— Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1287 (i).

—— Increase to Agents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3429 (ii).

Bonuses. Par. in 'Canadian Gazette': Remarks (Mr. Robitaille) 7453 (iv).

B.C., Immigration, O.C. *re*: Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 9890 (v).

British Subjects, Regulations *re*, Deportations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 9772 (v).

Buildings, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11008 (vi).

Chapman, Mr. F. O., Emplymt. in Immigration Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 9964 (v).

Chinese Immigration into B.C., O.Cs., Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 554 (i).

Chinese Immigration, Decision of N.S. Supreme Court *re* Evasion of Poll Tax: Ques. (Mr. Macpherson) 513 (i).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*

Colonization Societies, Quebec, Amounts paid to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 684 (i).

Detention Hospitals, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 5081 (iii).

Dodds, Mr. W., Information *re* Immigration Frauds at Halifax: Ques. (Mr. Finlayson) 5655 (iii).

See 'Halifax.'

Doukhobours bonused as Immigrants: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 9952 (v).

—— Homesteads cancelled, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9957 (v).

—— Ques. of Priv. *re* (Mr. S. Hughes) 7321 (iv).

—— Religious Fanatics: Par. in Press (Mr. J. D. Reid) 12161 (vii).

Doyle, Mr. P., Immigration Agent, Superannuation of: Ques. (Mr. Oliver) 6923 (iv).

Dunne, M. C., Agent, Number of Immigrants located by him in Lennox and Addington County: M. for Ret.* (Mr. U. Wilson) 555 (i).

Expenditure from March, 1907-8: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 5080 (iii).

Expenditure *re* Maintenance of Immigrants: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 5084 (iii).

French Immigration Agents, Names, Facilities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 176 (i).

French Immigrants, Number and Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 176 (i).

Gimli Galicians, Relief to (Mr. Oliver) Rep. of Mr. Walker read: in Com. of Sup., 9979 (v).

Halifax Immigration Frauds, Par in Press: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 4834 (iii).

—— Charges *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9334 (v).

—— Dismissal of Mr. Bernstein: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8605 (v).

—— Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5567 (iii).

—— Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6465 (iv).

—— Rep. of Mr. Robertson: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9127 (v).

—— Restitution *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L Borden) 5659 (iii).

—— Statement *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L Borden) 4963 (iii).

Halifax Immigration Buildings, Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7142-3 (iv).

Hindus in B.C., Protests against Treatment: Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' (Mr Foster) 5488 (iii).

—— Deportation from B.C., Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen': Remarks (Mr. Macpherson) 5337 (iii).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*
Hindus, Tel. *re* Contract Labour: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4407 (iii).
Immigrants, Amounts paid for Maintenance, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Schaffner) 5476 (iii).
—— Bulgarians, Stranded in Toronto: Tel. read (Mr. Macdonell) 185 (i).
Immigrants at Chatham, Deportation of Five Families: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 6922 (iv).
—— Names and Causes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 5796 (iii).
Immigrants deported, Expenditure *re* Transportation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 5980 (iii).
—— Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 177 (i).
Immigrants Destitute, Stranded in Toronto: Remarks *re* Question (Mr. Macdonell) 242 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 429 (i).
Immigrants distributed in West Kent, Certificates of Farmers, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Clements) 1513 (i).
Immigrants from Europe, entering U.S., List furnished to Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 5082 (iii).
Immigrant Inspection on Ships, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 1289 (i).
Immigrants landed in Canada June, 1907, Number deported, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3339 (ii).
Immigrants, Number entering Canada, Bonuses paid on, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5256 (iii).
—— Number settled in Canada in 1905-6-7, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Paquet) 697 (i).
—— Reported by SS. 'Montreal,' Bonuses paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 6921 (iv).
—— Stranded at St. Thomas, Deportation of: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 567 (i).
—— Total Number entering Canada for ten Months, Deportations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Brabazon) 240 (i).
Immigration Act Amt., O.C. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 7500 (iv).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 8171, 8607, 8696 (v).
Immigration Act, B.C., Natal Act, Disallowance of: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 567 (i).
Immigration, Circular issued to Immigrants *re* Fraudulent Powers: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 606 (i).
—— Co-operation with N.B. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 621 (i).
—— Deportations: in Com. of Sup., 9882 (v).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*
Immigration from England, Statements of Mr. O. Smith, &c.: Par. in Montreal 'Gazette' (Mr. Sproule) 5491 (iii).
Immigration Forms, Number returned by Farmers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 3847 (ii).
Immigration from France and Belgium, Premiums paid to Clerical and Lay Agents: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6922 (iv).
Immigration, General Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 5751 (iii).
Immigration Hall, East Selkirk, Furniture, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 6402 (iv).
Immigration and Commercial Agencies Rets.: Inquiry for (Mr. U. Wilson) 1108 (i).
Immigration Literature: in Com. of Sup., 9948 (v).
—— Contingencies, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9948 (v).
Immigration, O.Cs. and Circulars issued *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. U. Wilson) 2171 (ii).
—— Regulations, O.C. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 11018 (vi).
Immigration from U.S., Total Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 5082 (iii).
Japanese Immigration: *See* main heading.
La Societe Canadienne d'Immigration, &c., Montreal, Pet. *re* Assistance: Ques. (Mr Monk) 4244 (iii).
—— M. for Copies* (Mr. Monk) 4773 (iii).
London Immigration, Central Board, Moneys paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 2545 (ii).
McDonald, Albert G., Commission paid *re* Immigrants: Ques. (Mr. Alcorn) 8617 (v).
—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Alcorn) 4773 (iii).
Miller, Agent, Number of Immigrants located by him in Lennox and Addington: M. for Ret.* (Mr. U. Wilson) 555 (i).
Oriental Immigration, B.C., Legal Expenses *re* Commission: in Com. of Sup., 13156 (vii).
Passages to Canada, Number rejected by SS. Companies: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5468 (iii).
Quebec Immigrant Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7432 (iv).
—— Hospital: in Com. of Sup., 7432 (iv).
Relief to Settlers: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 9983 (v).
Salvation Army Immigrants, Letter from Dr. Nadeau: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7094 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9973 (v).
—— Stmnt. of Genl. Booth: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 2390 (ii).
Temperance Colonization Society, Land Grants to, Terms of Settlement, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonell) 4774 (iii).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*
Teulon Immigration Sheds, Number cared for: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 892 (i).
U. S. Labourers: in Com. of Sup., 13169 (vii).
U.S., Total Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 5082 (iii)
Victoria Immigration Building: in Com. of Sup., 10874 (vi).
Waugh, James S., Distribution of Immigrants, Cor., &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Gordon) 1690 (i).
—— Refund to Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 4765 (iii).
Waugh and Perrin, Agents, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 514 (i).
Winnipeg Immigration Building: in Com. of Sup., 8573 (v).
Imperial Conference, 1907, Expenditure by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 511 (i).
—— Travelling Expenses of Ministers, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1513 (i).
See 'Colonial.'
Imperial Institute: in Com. of Sup., 10623 (vi).
Imperial Pulp Co., Denial *re* Managing Directorship: Par. in Montreal 'Star': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Sifton) 3578 (ii).
Imperial Treaties, Status of Canada *re* Negotiations &c.: Ques. (Mr. Thompson) 1939 (i)
Imports and Exports ending Sept. 30th and Oct. 30th, 1907: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 350 (i).
—— Values from June to Dec., 1907: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1112 (i).
Imports from France, Value for Five Years, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1124 (i).
Imports for Home Consumption, Values for 1907-8: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 13063 (vii).
Independence of Parlt. Act, Violation of *re* R. Stewart, M.P. for Ottawa: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 5941 (iii).
Independent Bank Audit, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Bickerdike) 11232 (vi).
Indiantown and Blackville Branch Ry., Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12258 (vii).
INDIANS:
Blood Indian Reserve, Lease to McEwan Cattle Co.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 12739 (vii).
Clearwater Lake, Halfbreeds' Rights: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 175 (i).
Crooked Lake Indian Reserve, Sale of: Remarks (Mr. Lake) 10916 (vi).
—— Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 634 (i).
Destitute Indians, Relief, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5762 (iii).
Dokis Indian Land Sale, Commission to Mr. P. Ryan: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 12732 (vii).
Dokis Indian Reserve, Consent from Chief, *re* Sale of Timber: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 8175 (iv).
INDIANS—*Con.*
Dokis Indian Reserve, Name of Govt. Agent: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5084 (iii).
—— Notice of Sale, Names of Newspapers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 7500 (iv).
—— Protests *re* Sale: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 10918 (vi).
—— Total Expenditure *re* Surrender: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 10512 (vi).
Dokis Indians, Surrender of Timber, O.Cs., Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5087 (iii).
—— Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3849 (ii).
—— Sale of Timber: Remarks (Mr. Perley) on M. for Sup., 7801 (iv).
Indian Affairs: in Com. of Sup., 623 (i).
—— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Oliver) 7 (i).
—— Extravagant Management of: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Armstrong) 11022 (vi).
—— Generally, Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5762 (iii).
Lands in Algoma, Sale of, 13095; Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 13122; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 101) 13138 (vii).
—— Tel. from Mr. Sifton read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 13416 (vii).
—— Ques. of Priv. *re* Mr. Sifton's Telegram, 13528 (vii).
Lands in Algoma, Withdrawal from Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 2396 (ii).
Lands in B.C., Provincial Rights: Remarks (Mr. Macpherson) in Com. of Sup., 627 (i).
Lands and Islands owned by Indians, Sale of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5078 (iii).
Lands at New Westminster, Sale of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3037, 3839 (ii).
Land Sales in N.W. Indian Reserves, Applications, Advertisements, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lake) 2170 (ii).
Lands, Number of Acres sold since 1896, Total Receipts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4586 (iii).
Land Sales: in Com. of Sup., 12729 (vii).
Man. and Sask. Indians, Investigation of Mrs. Paget and Miss Ferguson, Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. W. Wright) 6919 (iv)
Metlakatla and Songhees Indian Reserves, Legal Opinions of Justice Dept.: M. for Copies (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5477 (iii).
—— Inquiry for Ret (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2381 (ii).
Muskoday Reserves, Negotiations *re* Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5082 (iii).
N. B., Agents Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 13170 (vii).
—— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 12736 (vii).
—— School Inspector: in Com. of Sup., 13170 (vii).

INDIANS—*Con.*
Pasqua Indian Reserve, Sale of: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 12729, 12737 (vii).
Piegan Indian Reserve, Shipping and Weighing of Cattle: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 632 (i).
Rama Indian Fund, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 8610 (v).
St. Mary's Indian Reserve: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 634 (i).
St. Peter's Reserve Title, Extinguishment of, Issue of Patents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1932 (i).
—— Instruction to Agents *re* Rights of Purchasers: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2217 (ii).
—— Pet. *re* Election of Chief and Councillors: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 7990 (iv).
Schools. Dr. Bryce's Report: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 623 (i).
Sioux Indians: in Com. of Sup., 5762 (iii).
Six Nation Indians. Negotiations *re*, Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lake) 6242 (iv).
—— Refusal of Inspection of Memorials, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 6239 (iv).
Swan Lake Reserve, Acquisition of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 693 (i).
—— Sale of: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 12729 (vii).
—— Settlement, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 633 (i).
Yeomans, Agent. Complaints by John Franklin, &c., Letters *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Knowles) 1513 (i).
Ingonish Lightkeeper, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 8618 (v).
Inland Revenue Act (excise duties, &c.) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 143.'
INLAND REVENUE:
Corby Distillery, Deficits in Spirit Production: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 12410 (vii).
Excise, Provisional Allowance to Inland Revenue Officers: in Com. of Sup., 817 (i).
Gooderham & Worts Distillery, Deficit in Spirit Production: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 12411 (vii).
Inland Revenue Act, Violations: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4964 (iii).
Inland Revenue, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Templeman) 6 (i).
—— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 645 (i).
Mackenzie, Mr. Jas. H., Emplymt. in Toronto Inland Revenue Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 5797 (iii).
Port Hope Inland Revenue Office, Apptmts. of Collector: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 895 (i).
Seizures, 1906-7, in Cornwall, Toronto, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 3846 (ii).
INLAND REVENUE—*Con.*
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barr) 3851 (ii).
—— Seizures in Cornwall, &c., Names of Officers, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barr) 4247 (iii).
Tobacco Duties, Total Amount for 1903: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 13064 (vii).
Tobacco Manufacturers in Mar. Provs., Amounts of Fines, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 363 (i).
Tobacco Manufacturers in P.E.I., Violation of Inland Revenue Act: Cor. read (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 9237 (v).
—— on M. for Com. of Sup., (Mr. A. A. McLean) 9514 (v).
Tobacco. Protection to Canadian Industry, Pets., &c., *re* Amt. to Inland Revenue Act: M. for Copies (Mr. Dubeau) 899 (i).
Tobacco Seizures, at Charlottetown, Penalties, &c., Cor. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2982 (ii).
Inspection and Sale Act: *See* 'B. No. 64.'
—— (dairy products, &c.) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 148.'
—— (grain) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 203.'
—— (oat standards) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 114.'
Inspection of Staples: in Com. of Sup., 12264 (vii).
Inspection of Steamboats: *See* 'Canada Shipping Bills.'
Inspectors of Food Products, Number, Apptmts.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 352 (i).
Institute of Architects of Can.: See 'B. No. 88.'
See 'Architects.'
Insurance Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 42.'
Insurance Bill, Discussion *re*: Personal Explanation *re* Par. in Montreal 'Star' (Mr. Foster) 1860 (i).
—— Introduction of: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9272 (v).
—— Discussion *re* (Mr. Foster) 1107 (i).
—— Introduction of: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7099 (iv), 8386 (v).
Insurance Commission, Exhibits of Commercial Travellers' Mutual Benefit Society, Originals asked for (Mr. Macdonell) 7988 (iv).
—— Evidence, Sale of for Private Profit: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 6059 (iii).
—— and Political Campaign Literature: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Foster) 10792 (vi).
—— Rep.: Ques. of Priv. *re* Stmnt. of Sir Frederick Borden, 9337; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 9352, 9461 (v).
—— Total Expenditure, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 232 (i).
Insurance Companies' Deposits, Total Amount, Securities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 241 (i).
Insurance, Supt. of: in Com. of Sup., 12160 (vii).

Insurance, Supt.'s Salary: *See* 'B. No. 200.'
Intercolonial Conference in London, Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 13225 (vii).
——— Expenses of Ministers: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 13511 (vii).
See 'Colonial.'
I.C.R. Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 27.'
I.C.R. and P.E.I. Rys., Pension Fund: *See* 'B. No. 117.'
INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY:
Accidents, Letter *re*: Read (Mr. S. Hughes) 6985 (iv).
Advertising for Supplies, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 10186 (v).
Amherst Station Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12233 (vii).
Amqui Station, Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10012 (v).
——— Vote *re* Construction, Amount Expended: Ques. (Mr Monk) 12774 (vii).
Answer to Questions: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) 13415 (vii).
Antigonish Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
Audit System: Remarks (Mr. Osler) in Com. of Sup., 10214 (v).
Book-Keeping System, Correction of Par. in St. John 'Daily Telegraph': (Mr. Graham) 5260 (iii).
Bridge Strengthening: in Com. of Sup., 12259 (vii).
Campbellton Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12258 (vii).
Cars sent to U.S., Delay, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 10222 (v).
Cars in Service on Sundays: M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6240 (iv).
Chatham, N.B., Ry. Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 12757 (vii).
Circular *re* Delay in Payment of Salaries: Read (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10126 (v).
——— Par. in St. John Press: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Fowler) 10016 (v).
Claims Agent, E. H. Allen, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 3480 (ii).
Claims for Damages by A. W. Belyea: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 9472 (v).
Claims for Damages to Property or Personal Injury, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Graham) 6002 (iii).
Claims for Damages, Settlement of: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5793 (iii), 7196 (iv).
Claims Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 10176 (v).
Cold Storage Cars for Dairy Produce, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1688 (i).
Collection of Revenues: in Com. of Sup., 5693 (iii).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
Compensation *re* Horses killed at Truro: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) in Com. of Sup., 13174 (vii).
Concrete Pipes, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6640 (iv).
Dartmouth Branch Line Ry., Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13290 (vii).
Delays to 'Maritime Express': Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 8614 (v).
Deterioration of Service: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 10147 (v).
Double Tracking: in Com. of Sup., 12236, 12250 (vii).
Earnings and Expenses: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 13510 (vii).
Employees, Apptmts. in N.B. during Jan. and Feb., 1908, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5793 (iii).
——— Circular from Genl. Mgr. *re* Municipal Politics: Read (Mr. Sproule) 2304 (ii).
——— Circular *re* Municipal Elections: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 2884; on M. for Sup., 2890 (ii).
——— Employees and Municipal Elections: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 2309 (ii).
——— Increased Wages, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2931 (ii).
——— Provident Fund Act, Names on List: ues. (Mr. Gauvreau) 4582 (iii).
——— and Quebec Provincial Elections: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9777 (v).
——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 10126 (v).
Extension to Great Lakes, Prop. Res. (Mr. Emmerson) 2435 (ii).
Extension Policy, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 73 (i).
Fredericton Ry. Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12758 (vii).
Freight Rate Discrimination against Fredericton, N.B., Cor., &c.: M. for Copy (Mr. Crocket) 2558 (ii).
Gross Earnings for 1908: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 13225 (vii).
Halifax Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5548 (iii), 12227 (vii).
——— Civic Elections in Halifax, Interference of Employees: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6845 (iv).
Halifax to Sydney Division, Transfer: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 12773 (vii).
Hanlon's Crossing Accident, Investigation *re*: M. for Paper* (Mr. Sinclair) 5800 (iii).
Hard Pine Tenders, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 3233 (ii).
Harlaka Junction Ry. Connections: Remarks (Mr. Morin) 434, 1436 (i), 3317 (ii).
See 'Que. Central.'

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
Ice Supply Contract: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 5259 (iii), 7446 (iv).
Increased Accommodations: in Com. of Sup., 12259 (vii).
I.C.R. and P.E.I. Ry., Change of Name, &c.: on M. for Sup. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 6243 (iv).
Lac Saumon Station, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 12652 (vii).
Legal Costs to Mr. MacIlreith: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 5553 (iii).
Legal Services: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 10190 (v).
Locomotives: in Com. of Sup., 10149 (v).
Locomotive and Car Shops, Machinery: in Com. of Sup., 12257 (vii).
Moncton, Additional Branch Line: in Com. of Sup., 12760 (vii).
Moncton Car Shops, Contractor, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1509 (i).
——— Car and Locomotive Shops: in Com. of Sup., 12250 (vii).
——— Lease, &c., O.Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Barker) 1690 (i).
——— Payments to Mr. E. A. Wallberg: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 8892 (v).
——— Tenders *re* Leasing: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5800 (iii).
Motor Cars, Tests *re* Operation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 565 (i).
Mulgrave Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
N.B. Elections and I.C.R. Employees: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3317 (ii).
Newcastle Station, Inspector of Works: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 13511 (vii).
New Glasgow Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 12230 (vii).
North Sydney Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
Notices printed in French and English: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7936 (iv).
Number of Men employed in N.B., for Jan., Feb., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Daniel) 6241 (iv).
'Ocean Limited,' Date of Beginning and Ending of Running, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Forget) 6051 (iii).
Officials, A. T. LeBlanc, &c., Accounts, Vouchers, &c., for Travelling Expenses, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Boyce) 2982 (ii).
O'Shaughnessy, Mr. John, Emplymt. on: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11498 (vi).
——— Issue of Pass: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11936 (vi).
Oxford and Pictou Branch, Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 10733 (vii).
Painsec Junction and Pointe du Chene: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 10157 (v).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
Passes issued to Mr. P. S. Archibald: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 2387 (ii).
Petit Rocher Spur Line: in Com. of Sup., 12759 (vii).
Pictou Branch, Answer to Question: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) 12661 (vii).
Pictou to Copper Crown Co., Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 10733 (vi).
Pictou Engine House, Contract *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1683 (i).
——— Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5558 (iii), 12230 (vii).
——— Station, Concrete Sidewalk, Total Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 10789 (vi).
Piping: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 10195 (v).
Private Car for Mr. Schreiber, Supplies: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 10186 (v).
Quebec Central Ry. Connections: Remarks (Mr. Morin) 189 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Morin) in Com. of Sup., 10179 (v).
Quilty, H. A., Examination *re* Train Despatcher: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 13225 (vii).
Rails, &c., Number of Tons of: M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6240 (iv).
Rails purchased from Algoma Steel Co., Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 9269 (v).
Railway Surveys, Colchester County, Subsidies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2980 (ii).
——— Corrected Answer (Mr. Graham) 5046 (iii).
Rates, Increase in Winter to P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5995 (iii).
Receipts and Expenditures: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 10514 (vi).
Revenue from Terminals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 5471 (iii).
Ricard, Mr., Emplymt.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11498 (vi).
Riviere du Loup Station, Improvement *re* Platforms: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 5468 (iii).
——— Station Master, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 7445 (iv).
Rolling Stock: in Com. of Sup., 5549 (iii), 12257 (vii).
——— Purchase, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6240 (iv).
——— Statement *re* Rolling Stock: in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Graham) 5697 (iii).
Running of Official Cars on Limited Trains, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Forget) 5474 (iii).
St. Cyrille Ry. Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 12756 (vii).
St. John Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 12257 (vii).
Ste. Monique Gates, Number to be made: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11936 (vi)

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
Ste. Rosalie Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5558 (iii), 12259 (vii).
Sackville Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12235 (vii).
Springhill, Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 12233 (vii).
Station, Asphalt Platforms, Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 5466 (iii).
Stationery Supplies: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 10181 (v).
Stellarton Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 12230 (vii).
Stellarton to Pictou, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 10734 (vi).
Stewart, Mr. James A., Emplymt. of: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 9712 (v).
—— Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 10151 (v).
Sunday Cars, Instructions *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 10734 (vi).
Supplies: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 10188 (v).
Sydney, Increased Accommodation: in Com., of Sup., 12229 (vii).
Sydney to Sydney Mines Branch Ry., Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 7201 (iv).
Sydney Mines Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 12759 (vii).
—— Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
Talbot, Mr. Evariste, Emplymt. of: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6400 (iv).
Tatamagouche, Delay of Trains, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1292 (i).
Ties delivered, Changes *re* Inspection: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 12052 (vii).
Trains breaking down, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6240 (iv).
—— Explanations *re* Delays, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6242 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10159 (v).
Transportation Question, Statement, on M. for Sup., 4420 (iii).
Trois Pistoles Station, Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 12652 (vii).
Truro, Buildings, Name of Tenderers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 6233 (iv).
—— Engine House, Contract to Rhodes & Co.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1936 (i).
—— Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 12231 (vii).
—— Sewerage Frontage: M. for Cor.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5800 (iii).
—— Station, Unsanitary Condition, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 7211 (iv).
William, Thos., Emplymt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 2388 (iii).

INTERIOR:
Clearwater Lake, Squatters' Rights to Lands: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9995 (v).
Cypress Hill Homestead Lands, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 9991 (v).
Interior, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Oliver) 7 (i).
—— Deptl, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 616 (i), 9693 (v).
Riding Mountain Reserve, Applications for Homesteads: Letter from Mr. Seaman read (Mr. W. J. Roche) 9992 (v).
Roberts, Mr. J. M., Promotion *re* Interior Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 9693 (v).
Rocky Mountain Park: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) in Com. of Sup., 9991 (v).
Seed Grain purchased, Quantity, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 8185 (iv).
Squatters' Claims in Alberta: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 9996 (v).
Swamp Lands in Man.: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 10105 (v).
See 'Immigration,' 'Indians,' &c.
Internal Economy Board of H. of C., Minutes: M. for Copies* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2795 (ii).
—— Mess. from His Ex.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7 (i).
International Boundary Line: Representations *re* Buildings on: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 356 (i).
—— Correction of Answer (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 519 (i).
International Commission, Red River of the North: in Com. of Sup., 11118 (vi).
International Ry., N.B., Directors, Amount of Stocks, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 4246 (iii).
International Tunnel, Windsor, Customs Duty *re* Construction Material: Ques. (Mr. McLaren) 3840 (ii).
See 'Detroit.'
Interprovincial Bridge Co., N.B., Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13308 (vii).
Interprovl. Ry. Bridge Co. of N.B.: *See* 'B. No. 76.'
Inverness County, Ry. Accommodation: in Com. of Sup. (Mr. McLennan) 12233 (vii).
Inverness Harbour, Purchase of McIsaac's Pond: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5792 (iii).
Inverness Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7172 (iv).
—— Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5997 (iii).
Iron and Steel Bounties, Amounts paid from 1903 to 1907: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 4244 (iii).

Irrigation Act: *See* 'B. No. 10, 99.'
Irrigation in West, Investigation *re* Measurements: Remarks (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) in Com. of Sup., 9989 (v).
Jamestown Exhibition, Canadian Exhibits, Permission *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5079 (iii).
Japanese Colony in the West, Application from C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 7196 (iv).
Japanese entering B.C., Passports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macpherson) 4243 (iii).
Japanese Immigration Act, Disallowance of *re* B.C.: Ques. Mr. R. Smith) 6642 (iv).
Japanese Immigration, Announcement of Mr. Lemieux's Mission: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1208 (i).
Japanese Immigration and Natal Act, Cor. with Lt.-Gov. of B.C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. Smith) 2170 (ii).
See 'Dunsmuir.'
Japanese Immigration, Cor. *re* Limitations, &c.: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 94 (i).
—— Debate in Japanese Diet, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4737 (iii).
—— from U.S., Deportations, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 3900 (ii).
—— Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 947 (i).
Japanese and Oriental Immigrants in B.C., Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 692 (i).
—— O.Cs., Cor., Papers, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. R. L. Borden) 854 (i).
—— Restriction of: Prop. Res. (Mr. R. Smith) 699; (Mr. Macpherson) 719; (Mr. Sloan) 726; (Mr. D. Ross) 732; (Mr. Kennedy) 748 (i).
—— M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Copies of O.Cs., &c., 854 (i).
—— Parliamentary Control of (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2025; Amt. to Com. of Sup., 2043; Neg. (Y. 45: N. 100) 2158 (ii).
Japanese in B.C., Ques. of Priv. and Political Pamphlets: (Mr. Lemieux) 12659 (vii).
Japanese Immigration, Recent Eentries into B.C.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 3751 (ii).
—— ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 32; (Mr. Foster) 77; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 58 (i).
—— Rep. of Mr. King laid on Table (Mr. Lemieux) 1550 (i).
—— Restriction, B.C. Legislation: on M. for Sup. (Mr. D. Ross) 1744 (i).
—— Result of Mission: Statement (Mr. Lemieux) 1585 (i).
—— Riots, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 5783 (iii).
—— Statement of Postmaster General: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1208, 1424 (i).
—— Syndicate *re* Purchasing of Land in Alberta, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2162 (ii).
Japanese Trade with Canada, Total Amount for 1905-6-7: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 897 (i).
Japanese Treaty, Incomplete Ret.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1928 (i).
See 'Anglo-Japanese,'
Jesus River Dredging, Payments to Mr. Morgan: Ques. (Mr. Desjardins) 6980 (iv).
Johnston, Mr. W. J., Extra Remuneration, Leave of Absence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5201 (iii).
Joliette Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
Joly, Sir Henry, Lt.-Gov. of B.C., Cor., &c., sent to by Govt.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 554 (i).
Judges' Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 206.'
Judges in Quebec Prov., Insufficient Number, Pets. from Bar, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 842 (i).
Judges' Salaries, Application *re* Payments: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 11018 (vi).
Judges of Supreme Court, Quebec, Apptmt. on Commissions: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 357 (i).
Juniper Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
JUSTICE:
Accountants, Payments to by Dept. of Justice: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3233 (ii).
Ancoin vs. The King, Cor. *re* Suit in Supreme Court, N.S.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McLennan) 558 (i).
Appeal Court, B.C., Salaries, &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Aylesworth) 8185 (iv).
Blunden, Frederick, Trial and Conviction, Cor. *re*: M. for Copy (Mr. Ward) 3466 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Ward) 5211 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Ward) in Com. of Sup., 12902 (vii).
Chinese and Japanese Riots, B.C., Legal Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 13155 (vii).
Cimon, Hon. Mr. Justice, Apptmt. to Quebec District: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2978 (ii).
—— Residence in District: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2218 (ii).
—— Jurisdiction of Justice Dept. *re* Residence: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2545 (ii).
Convict Labour, Control of, Sale of Articles, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 238 (i).
Drysdale, Hon. Justice, Date of Acceptance of Office: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 4768 (iii).
—— Date of Communication *re* Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5084 (iii).
—— O.Cs., &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. Taylor) 5086 (iii).
Essex County Junior Judge, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1939 (i).
Exchequer Court, Printing Reports, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5508 (iii).

JUSTICE—*Con.*
Exchequer Court, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5505 (iii).
Forbes, Mr. Justice, Professional Status, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2390, 3840 (ii).
—— Cor., &c.: M. (Mr. Taylor) for Copies*, 899 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Taylor) 1860
Fraser, Mr. A. W., Emplymt. as Counsel *re* Sussex St. Property Purchase: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 3478 (ii).
—— Payments to for Legal Services: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 2979 (ii).
Gillis, Release from Penitentiary: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 510 (i).
Hogg, Mr. W. D., Payments to since 1896, &c.: Ques. (Mr. P. D. McLean) 2981 (ii).
Judges in Quebec Prov., Insufficient Number, Pets. from Bar, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 842 (i).
Judges of Supreme Court, Quebec, Apptmt. on Commissions: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 357 (i).
See 'Quebec.'
Judges Salaries, Applications *re* Payments: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 11018 (vi).
Justice, Administration of: in Com. of Sup., 12917 (vii).
—— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Bureau) 185 (i).
—— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5505 (iii), 10396 (vi).
Legal Agents in Mar. Provs., Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4768 (iii).
—— P.E.I., Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4764 (iii).
MacIlreith, Mr. R. T., Payments to for Legal Services, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 695 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 11220 (vi).
—— Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 7174 (iv).
Magee, Hon. Mr. Justice, Delay in delivering Judgments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2594 (ii).
Ouimet, Hon. J. A., Retirement of, O.C. *re*: M. for Copy (Mr. Lanctot) 557 (i).
Pardoning Power *re* Criminals, Releases since 1896, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2822 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 9579 (v).
—— Explanation (Mr. Aylesworth) 13081 (vii).
Penitentiaries: in Com. of Sup., 12265 (vii).
—— B.C., Land Purchases: in Com. of Sup., 12918 (vii).
—— Generally, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5509 (iii).

JUSTICE—*Con.*
Quebec Judges, Apptmt. to Superior Court: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 11825 (vi).
—— Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) on M. for Sup., 12190 (vii).
—— Apptmt. of Additional Judge: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1288 (i).
St. Louis, Mr. H., Emplymt. by Justice Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1347 (i).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary: in Com. of Sup., 12918 (vii).
—— Holidays for Officers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Léonard) 2791 (ii).
—— Meat Contracts: Remarks (Mr. Léonard) in Com. of Sup., 5519 (iii).
—— Officers and Municipal Elections: Ques. (Mr. Léonard) 2791 (ii).
—— Warden Beauchamp, Interference in Elections, Charges *re* (Mr. Léonard) in Com. of Sup., 5538 (iii).
Sudbury County Court Judge, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 12413 (vii).
Supreme Court Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 12917 (vii).
Juvenile Delinquents: *See* B. No. 190.'
Kamloops and Yellowhead Pass Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 39.'
Kananaski Falls Water Power, Granting of Rights: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3036 (ii).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3850 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5491 (iii), 6464 (iv).
Keewatin, Synod of the Diocese of: *See* 'B. No. 179.'
Keewatin Timber and Pulp Lands, Disposal of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 13587 (vii).
Kentville Rifle Range, Ref. to in debate on Budget (Sir Frederick Borden) 5290 (iii).
Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13287 (vii).
Kincardine Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7698 (iv).
'King Edward' Dredge, Emplymt. in Lunenburg Harbour: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 13063 (vii).
Kingston, Artillery Park: in Com. of Sup., 7701 (iv).
Kingston, Gun Shed: in Com. of Sup., 7700 (iv).
Kingston, Military Buildings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10907 (vi).
—— Military Hospital: in Com. of Sup., 7702 (iv).
—— withdrawal of vote: in Com. of Sup., 7814 (iv).
—— Military Magazine: in Com. of Sup., 10907 (vi).
See 'Militia,' &c.
Knowlton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7290 (iv), 13329 (vii).
Koenig, Capt., Duties, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 11699 (vi).

Kun, Agnes Ballum, Exercise of Clemency by Justice Dept.: Res. of Town Council Sydney: Read (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9334 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9580, 9710 (v).
Labour, Deptl. Rep: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 841 (i).
——— (Japanese Investigation) Rep.: Presented (Mr. Lemieux) 1583 (i).
———Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 12159 (vii).
Labour Disputes Bill, Applications, &c., *re* Settlement: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. Smith) 605 (i).
'Labour Gazette,' Cost of Printing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6407 (iv).
'Labour Gazette': in Com. of Sup., 12261 (vii).
Labour, Hours on Public Works: *See* 'B. No. 97.'
Labour Organization *re* Ry. Employees, Par. in Halifax 'Herald': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 8289 (v).
Labour, Unemployed, Protection to: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 10735 (vi).
Lacas, Mr., Payments to, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 640 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 979 (i).
——— Statement (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. of Sup., 1035 (i).
Lachine Canal, Basin Walls: in Com. of Sup., 12226 (vii).
——— Compensation to Richards *re* Horse: in Com. of Sup., 13174 (vii).
——— Lock Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 5672 (iii).
——— Slope Walls, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5663 (iii).
——— Staff: in Com. of Sup., 5696 (iii).
Lachine Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 12097 (vii).
Lachute, Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7293 (iv), 13329 (vii).
La Compagnie de Publication du Canada, Amount paid by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5082 (iii).
Lacoste, Sir Alexandre, Amount of Pension, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 1934 (i).
Lac Saumon Station, I.C.R., Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 12652 (vii).
'Lady Evelyn,' Date and Place of Wintering, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7936 (iv).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
'Lady of the Lake,' Str., Purchase by Govt., Staff, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 3434 (ii).
——— Crew during Winter: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 6403 (iv).
Ladysmith Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10866 (vi), 13338 (vii).
Ladysmith Wharf, B.C., Cost of: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8176 (iv).
Lafferty, Thos., Payment *re* Removal of Snag in St. John River: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8379 (v).
'La Gazette d'Arthabaska,' Postal Privilege *re*: Ques. (Mr. L. Lavergne) 6058 (iii).
Lake Ainslie Boat Channel: in Com. of Sup., 11228 (vi).
Lake Aylmer Wharf at Garthby: in Com. of Sup., 12032 (vi).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal: *See* 'B. No. 185.'
Lake Dauphin, Lowering Lake: in Com. of Sup., 12141 (vii).
Lakefield Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Lake François Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Morin) in Com. of Sup., 12138 (vii).
Lake Megantic Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12032 (vi).
Lake Megantic Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7294 (iv).
Lake Megantic Public Works, Total Cost to Date, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 11299 (vi).
Lake St. Francis Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Lake St. John Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Lake St. Peter, Piers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4752 (iii).
Lakeville Harbour Opening: Conc., 13568 (vii).
Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* at R.M.C., on M. for Sup. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1019 (i).
Lands applied for by Mr. Aylwin, under Irrigation Regulations: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 7209 (iv).
Lands, Dom.: *See* 'B. No. 181.'
Land Entries of T. J. Oliver and Fred. Hintz, Cancellation of, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 3235 (ii).
Land Grants to Rys. in Man. and N.W. Ters., Areas reserved on July 1st, 1896: Ques. (Mr. Crawford) 13512 (vii).
——— Selection and Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 4766 (iii).
Lands in Sections 2, 10, 14, 22 and 24, Disposal of: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5083 (iii).
Lands leased by Govt. in Section 11, Twp. 8, Original Grantees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3234 (ii).
Land Patents, Entry of Dates, Applications, Inspections, &c., of Quarter Section 16, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3432 (ii).
Land Patent for E. ½ S. E. ¼ Section 2, Issue of: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 2169 (ii).
——— S. E. ¼ Sec. 2, Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Herron) 2171 (ii).
Land Patents, Section 8, Twp. 53, &c., Occupation of Present Owner, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3430 (ii).
——— Sections 10 and 17, Applicants *re*: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 9475 (v).
——— Sections 36, &c., Issue of: Ques (Mr. Lake) 3481 (ii).

Land Sales in N.W. Indian Reserves, Applications, Advertisements, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lake) 2170 (ii)
Land Sales in N.W., Purchasers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 3835 (ii)
Lands set Apart for Settlement since 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sproule), 2796 (ii).
Land Subsidies to Rys., Areas granted from 1892-6: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 8613 (v).
See 'Railways,' &c.
Lands, Surveys of: *See* 'B. No. 9.'
Land Titles Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 113 and 168.'
Lands withdrawn for Settlement or Colonization Purposes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 2393 (ii).
Langevin Block Basement, Number of Employees, &c: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3483 (ii).
See 'Public Works, Ottawa.'
La Societe Canadienne d'Immigration, &c., Montreal, Pet *re* Assistance: Ques. (Mr. Monk), 4244 (iii).
—— Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Monk) 4773 (iii).
Lavaltrie, Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Lead Bounties: *See* 'B. No. 191.'
Lead Production by Lead Producers, Stmnt. *re* Remarks (Mr. Foster) 11407, 11705 (vi).
Leamington Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7705, 7815 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Leech, Mr. R. A. E., Apptmt. of: Notice of Motion (Mr. W. J. Roche) 3477 (ii).
Lee-Enfield Rifle, Accident at Rockliffe Range: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes), 10014 (v).
—— Number purchased, Dates, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 6644 (iv).
Legal Agents in Mar. Provinces, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sandfield) 4768 (iii).
—— P.E.I., Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4764 (iii).
Legislation, House of Commons, Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10507 (vi).
Lennox Island Wharf, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 8444 (v).
Leonardsville Wharf, Contract *re*: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
—— Report *re* Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6463 (iv).
Les Eboulements Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
'Le Soleil,' Par. *re* Voting of French Members: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Bergeron) 7992 (iv).
—— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7993 (iv).
Lesser Slave Lake Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 5719 (iii).
—— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Lethbridge Armoury: in Com. of Sup, 13336 (vii).
Letter Carriers, Boots, Uniforms, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8872 (v).
—— Hours of Service, Pay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 7728 (iv).
Level Ry. Crossings: *See* 'B. No. 3.'
Levis Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Talbot) in Com. of Sup., 10899 (vi).
Levis Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7294 (iv).
Lewis, N.W.M. Policeman, Murder of, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., (Mr. Herron) 8867 (v).
Liability of Ry. Employees: *See* 'B. No. 212.'
Libel Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 161.'
Library of Parlt., Joint Rep.: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 6 (i).
—— Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 312 (i).
—— Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10503 (vi).
Life-Boats in B. C., Purchase of from U. S.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 683 (i).
Life-Saving Stations and Awards: in Com. of Sup., 2972 (ii).
Life-Saving Stations, Establishment of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 3186 (ii).
Lighthouses, Agencies, Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5039 (iii).
Lighting Buoys on Rideau Canal, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 9476 (v).
See 'Canals—Rideau.'
Lighthouse and Coast Service: in Com. of Sup., 4755, 5039, 5773 (iii), 12262, 13323 (vii).
Lighthouse-Keepers on Pacific Coast, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 1934 (i).
Lighthouses in Nicolet River, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3837 (ii).
Lighthouses in Quebec, Classifications, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 172 (i).
—— Rep. of Inspectors, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Gauvreau) 697 (i).
Lighthouse Service on St. Lawrence, Steamers chartered, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11299 (vi).
Light-Keepers Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 4755, 5039 (iii), 13323 (vii).
Lightship Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5039 (iii).
Lime Kiln Crossing, Charter of Capt. Hackett's Tug, Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7729 (iv).
Lime Kiln Crossing Lightship: in Com. of Sup., 13323 (vii).
Lindsay Armoury: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 10888 (vi).
See 'Militia.'
Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 34.'
Listowel Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vii).

Literature, &c., distributed through Mails: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 9095 (v).
Literary Aid Fund, Establishment of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 1286 (i).
Lithographing and Printing, Expenditure by Govt. outside of Canada: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1506 (i).
Little Current Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Little Sands Wharf, Repairs, &c., Cor. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin), 2397 (ii).
Live Stock Industry: in Com. of Sup., 12894 (vii).
Live Stock, N.B., Figures *re* Census, Methods of Obtaining, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot), 1506 (i)
Livingstone, Wm. G., Sale of Sections 22, 28 and 32, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 9475 (v).
Loan og 1874, Commission for Renewal: Ques. (Mr. Foster), 11501 (vi).
Loan of Aug., 1907, Names of Banks where Discounted: Ques. .Mr. Foster) 564 (i).
Loans to Govt. Outstanding, Rates of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 235 (i).
Loans negotiated in London, Conditions *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 12654 (vii).
Loans and Overdrafts, &c.: Personal Explanation (Mr. Foster), 13582 (vii).
Loans and Overdrafs : *See* 'Dom. Loans,' 'Finance.'
Loans, Temporary or Advances, Rate of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 12654 (vii).
Loans, Temporary, by Govt., Names of Lenders, Rates of Interest, &c.: M. for Ret.* Mr. Monk) 554 (i).
——— Total Amount, Rate of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 314 (i).
——— since Oct., 1906, Rates of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 314 (i).
Lobster Fish Factory, License to E. H. McLennan, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2983 (ii).
Lobster Fishing Fines, Names and Amounts: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey), 10256 (v).
Lobster Fishing Licenses, Refusals in Northumberland Co.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 9472 (v).
——— Licenses in Savage Harbour, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin), 4404 (iii).
Lobster Fishing in Lunenburg &c., Complaints *re* Undersized, &c.: (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2792 (ii).
——— Overseers, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 2793 (ii).
Lobster Fishing and Packing Licenses, Granting in P.E.I.: M. for Cor. (Mr. A. Martin) 5475 (iii).
Lobster Fisheries, Pet. from Fishermen's Union of N.S. *re* Regulations: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean), 6644 (iv).
Lobster Fishing at Pictou: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12772 (vii).
Lobster Fisheries, P.E.I., Pets. *re* Issue of Licenses: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2388 (ii)
Lobster Fishing in St. John, N.B., Legal Size, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 10257 (v).
Lockerby & McCombe, Amounts *re* Extra Harbour Dues: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 11935 (vi).
Locomotive and Car Shops, Moncton: in Com. fo Com of Sup., 12257 (vii).
Loggieville, Dredging, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 9472 (v).
London and Lancashire Guarantee and Accident Co.: *See* 'B. No. 129.'
London Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 10094 (vi).
——— Military Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7705 (iv).
See 'Militia.'
Londonderry and Bass River Mail Service, Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2980 (ii).
Longueuil Public Building: in Com of Sup., 7394 (iv).
Lord's Day Act, Violations at Ottawa *re* Horse Racing: Remarks (Mr. Elson) 3753 (ii).
'Lord Kitchener,' Tug Boat, Payments *re* Services: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 7198 (iv).
Lorneville Breakwater Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Lotbinière Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Louisburg Bait Freezer, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4406 (iii).
Louisburg Harbour, N.S., Amount of Harbour Dues, 1906: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 7503 (iv).
——— Harbour Master, Remuneration, &c. : Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3428 (ii).
Louisburg Marine Hospital, Condition of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4401 (iii).
Lovell, Mr. H., Decease of: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 230 (i).
Lower Newcastle Wharf on Miramichi River: in Com. of Sup., 11695 (vi).
Lumber Combine Investigation, Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 2977 (ii).
Lumber Duties from U. S., on M. for Sup. (Mr. S. Hughes) 9504 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 10259 (v).
See 'Pulp.'
Lumber manufactured in N. W. Provs., Royalty Payable, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3835 (ii).
Lunenburg Public Building, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13326 (vii).
Lyall, Mr. Peter, Contractor for G. T. P. Terminals at Winnipeg: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 7991 (iv).
——— Storage of Refuse of Montreal Harbour Property: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 11936 (vi).

MacIlreith, Mr., Legal Agent for Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 12220 (vi).
——— Ques. (Mr. Foster) 695 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 7174 (iv).
Mackenzie, Mr. Jas. H., Emplymt. in Toronto Inland Revenue Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 5797 (iii).
Mackenzie, Mr. Wm., Par. in 'Globe' *re* Apptmt.: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 6985 (iv).
Mackinnon Post Office, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 10516 (vi).
Macleod, Cardston and Montana Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 22.'
Macleod Post Office, Report *re* Accommodation: Remarks (Mr Herron) in Com of Sup, 9110 (v)
McDonald, Albert G., Commission paid *re* Immigrants: Ques. (Mr. Alcorn) 8617 (v).
McDonald, Archibald, Dismissal from Whim Road, P. O.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. Martin) 5087 (iii).
McDougall, Rev. John, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 688 (i).
McGee, Hon. T. D'Arcy, Monument *re*: Remarks (Mr. T. Chisholm) 6288 (iv).
McGregor's Creek, Bank Protection: in Com. of Sup., 12103 (vii).
McGuire, Hon. Thos., Superannuation of: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 10514 (vi).
McInnes, Hon. W. B., Emplymt. in the Yukon, Total Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5794 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. White) 6061 (iii).
McKenzie, Mr. K. W., Apptmt. as Dom. Lands Agent at Edmonton: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 6981 (iv).
McLeod, Alex., Dismissal from Valleyfield, P.E.I., Post Office: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5087 (iii)
McLeod, Roderick, Date of Homestead Entry: Ques (Mr. Lake) 6401 (iv).
McPherson's Cove, Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11229, 11292 (vi).
Madawaska River Extension Dyke: in Com. of Sup., 11696 (vi), 13344 (vii).
Magdalen Islands Breakwater and Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Magee, Hon. Justice, Delay in delivering Judgments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2594 (ii).
Magnetawan River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Magog Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7306 (iv), 13329 (vii).
Mails from Canada to Europe, Quantity arrived: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 12653 (vii).
Mail Matter delayed in Transmission by C. P. R. Accident: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) 9724 (v).
Mail Matter, Fraudulent Weighing, Inspection *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4827 (iii).
——— lost in C. P. R. Accident at Kenora, Rep. *re*: (Mr. Lake) 9281 (v).
——— Mutilated in Transmission, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2214 (ii).
Mail Service to Atlantic Steamers, Cost per Annum: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5656 (iii).
Mail Service in B. C., Improvements *re*: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 3754 (ii).
Mail Service beteen Darnley and Kensington, P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4828 (iii).
Mail Service, Irregularity of in Argenteuil County: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 9119 (v).
Mail Service in N. B. and N. S., Number of Post Offices, Postal Revenue, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Crocket) 852 (i).
Mail Service, Soulanges County, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9277 (v).
Mail Service by Steamers via Coteau Landing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9277 (v).
Mail Steamer, Purchase of: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4827 (iii).
Mail Subsidy to France: *See* 'B. No. 145.'
Mail Subsidies to Steamships, Total Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 689 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions: in Com. of Sup., 12262 (vii).
Mail Tenders at Rimouski, Complaints *re* 'Rhoda': Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 5799 (iii).
Major's Hill Park and G. T. R. Hotel Site: *See* 'B. No. 89.'
Major's Hill Park and G. T. R. Hotel: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1425 (i).
Major's Hill Park: in Com. of Sup., 11015 (vi).
Malbay (Gaspé) Boat Shelter: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).
Manchester, Dr., Misappropriation of Moneys belonging to Mr. Walter Dick: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11936 (vi).
Man., Additional Judges: *See* 'B. No. 206.'
Man. Boundaries, Bill *re* Extension: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1741 (i).
——— Consent of Legislature, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 936 (i)
——— Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2882 (ii), 11706 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) 6222, 7506 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Papers, Memorials, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Schaffner) 852 (i).
——— Prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12776 (vii).
Manitoba Election Frauds, Investigation Com., ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. W. J. Roche), 495 (i).
Man. Grain Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 188.'
Man. Lands owned by Govt., Number of Acres, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1288 (i).

Man. Lands, Section 32, Town Site, Applications *re* Public Buildings: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1348 (i).
Man. and Northwestern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 26.'
Manitoba Voters' Lists, Affidavits *re* Frauds: Read (Mr. Bole) 7942 (iv).
——— Polling Divisions by Judges: Remarks (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 13139 (vii).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 10793 (vi).
Manitoba Voters' Lists: *See* 'Dom. Elections Act.'
Manitoba and North Shore Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 137.'
Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13289 (vii).
——— Reps. *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 893 (i).
Manning & Macdonald's Claims *re* Soulanges Canals: in Com. of Sup., 5668 (iii).
Maple Creek Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 8600 (v), 13337 (vii).
Maple Syrup and Sugar Adulteration, Penalties *re* Violations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 6639 (iv).
Maps, Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12260 (vii).
Marconi Co. and Commercial Press Business, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 512 (i).
Marconi Station, Glace Bay, Interruptions *re* Service: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2161 (ii).
Marconi System: in Com. of Sup., 12143 (vii).
——— Regulation of Rates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 174 (i).
See 'Wireless.'
Marcoun, Mr., Commission *re* Settlement of Claims: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1122 (i).
Marier, Mr. J. E., Emplymt. on G.T.P. Commission: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2162 (ii).
Marieville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7306 (iv).
Margaree Shear Dam: in Com. of Sup., 11229 (vi).
MARINE:
Aids to Navigation, Construction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5040 (iii).
——— Construction of Lighthouses: in Com. of Sup., 5773 (iii).
'Arctic' Str., Amounts expended for Repairs, Supplies, &c., from June, 1904 to June, 1907: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 184 (i).
——— History of Cruise in Northern Waters: in Com. of Sup., 4009 (ii).
Bellechasse Islet Lighthouse Keeper, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 4830 (iii).
Brier Island Fog Alarm, Installation of, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 9473 (v). *See* 'Marine Signals.'
Burlington Channel Lighthouse, Damages to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 5467 (iii).
MARINE—*Con.*
Cassels, Mr. Justice, Acceptance *re* Investigation of Marine Dept.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6059 (iii).
——— Statement *re* Conditions of Investigation of Marine Dept.: Remarks on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn. Hse., 6143 (iii).
——— Investigation *re* Marine Dept.: Papers laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6464 (iv).
——— Absence of Mr. Watson: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 10918 (vi).
——— Apptmnt. of Ass't Judge in Exchequer Court: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11311 (vi).
——— Apptmt. of Counsel: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6845 (iv).
——— Apptmt. of Counsel for Commission: on M. for Sup. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7322 (iv).
——— Apptmt. of Mr. Perron as Counsel: Remarks (Mr. Northrup) 6926 (iv).
——— Counsel Fees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8837 (v).
——— Delay in Investigation, &c., C. S. Report, &c.: M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 8445 (v).
——— Delay *re*, on M. for Sup. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9725 (v).
——— Distribution of Evidence: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10789 (vi).
——— Evidence *re*: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 11203 (vi).
——— remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8516 (v).
——— Evidence presented day by day to House: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8203 (v).
——— Evidence, Printing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 11301 (vi).
——— Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 13169 (vii).
——— Letter of Instructions to Mr. Watson laid on the Table (Mr. Aylesworth) 7621 (iv).
——— Method of Procedure: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10741 (vi).
——— Officers under Suspension: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6846 (iv).
——— Mr. Perron's Duties: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 10743 (vi).
——— Postponment of by Judge Cassels: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8385 (v).
——— Proceedings in Public, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7321 (iv).
——— Rep. of Judge Cassels: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10915 (vi).
See 'Mar. and Fish.,' &c.
'Champlain,' Str., Use in Quebec for Political Purposes: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9126, 9280, 9342, 9460 (v).

MARINE—*Con.*
Fish Island Lighthouse, Name of Present Keeper: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 6058 (iii).
Gananoque and Burnt Island Lights, Buoys, &c., Apptmt. of Keeper: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 8383 (v).
Govt. Steamers, Amounts paid for Provisions, &c., for Three Years: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1512 (i).
——— Captains' Residences, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Stanfield) 3241 (ii).
——— and Ice-breakers, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5763 (iii).
——— Maintenance and Supplies (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1049 (i).
——— Number of purchased, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 10731 (vi).
——— Pay of Officers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10736 (vi).
——— Trips of Mr. Cowie, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5467 (iii).
Gratuities *re* Accidents to Seamen: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vii).
Heath Point Lighthouse, Contract *re* Building: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 7210 (iv).
Ingonish Light-keeper, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 8618 (v).
Life-boats in B.C., Purchase of from U.S.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 683 (i).
Lighthouse Agencies, Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5039 (iii).
Lighthouses, Classification, &c., Rep. of Inspectors, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Gauvreau) 697 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service: in Com. of Sup., 12262, 13323 (vii).
——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 4755 (iii).
Lighthouse-keepers on Pacific Coast, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 1934 (i).
Light-keepers Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 4755, 5039 (iii), 13323 (vii).
Lighthouses, Maintenance and Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 5039 (iii).
Lighthouses in Nicolet River, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3837 (ii).
Lighthouses in Quebec, Classifications, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 172 (i).
Lightship Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5039 (iii).
Louisburg Harbour, N. S., Amount of Harbour Dues, 1906: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 7503 (iv).
Louisburg Marine Hospital, Condition of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4401 (iii).
Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Book-keeping, Reorganization: in Com. of Sup., 3988 (ii).
——— O.Cs., Cor. *re* Change of System: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 852 (i).
——— Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 510 (i).

MARINE—*Con.*
Marine and Fisheries, Book-keeping, Papers laid on Table (Mr. Brodeur) 4223 (iii).
Marine and Fisheries Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 4747 (iii).
——— Acting Deputy Minister: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 11939 (vi).
——— Defalcations of Mr. Roy: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 10741 (vi).
——— Dep. Min., Ass't.: in Com. of Sup., 12915 (vii).
——— Dep. Minister, Resignation of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7938, 7995, 8088: Letter of Dep. Min. Read (Mr. Brodeur) 8088 (iv).
——— Deptl. Investigation by Minister: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6526 (iv).
——— remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 6636 (iv).
——— Deptl., Misconduct of Official: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) 6633 (iv).
——— Deptl. Officers under Suspension, Dates of Aptmt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 6982 (iv).
——— Deptl. Officials, Suspension of: Announcement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6003 (iii).
——— Minister's Travelling Expenses, Refunds, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8889 (v).
——— Purchase of Supplies for 1892-1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Johnston) 6241 (iv).
——— Returns: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 2883 (ii).
——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1033 (i).
——— contingencies, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 976 (i).
——— Steamers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1885 (i).
Marine and Fisheries Warehouse, Sussex St.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 13062 (vii).
Marine Signalling at Briar Island, Change of System: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 9266 (v).
See 'Briar.'
Masters' and Mates' Examination: in Com. of Sup., 2969 (ii).
Merwin, Geo. T., Payments to by Marine Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 11701 (vi).
'Montcalm,' Str., Amount expended *re* Supplies, &c.: in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Foster) 1886 (i).
——— Collission with C.P.R. Str., Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 8086 (iv).
——— Investigation re: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8171, 9715 (iv), 10121 (v).
——— Purchase Price, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 8441 (v).
——— Services as Ice-breaker: Remarks (Mr. Paquet) in Com. of Sup., 2941 (ii).
Negro Point Submarine Signal, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5202 (iii).

MARINE—*Con.*
Prescott Light Station, Presentation to Dr. W. C. Brown: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 983 (i).
Red Ensign Flying from Merchant Vessels, Authority for: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 12775 (vii).
St. Louis, Mr. H., Payments to by Marine Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 979 (i).
Shipping Statistics *re* Tons Registered: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 2790 (ii).
Sorel Property for Marine Dept., Purchase, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4751 (iii).
Toronto Harbour Life-Saving Station, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 4586 (iii).
'Vigilant,' Cruiser, Investigation *re* Collision: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 682 (i).
Westport, N.S., Installation of Marine Alarms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9274 (v).
Mar. Provs., Harbours and Rivers, Creosoted Timber: in Com. of Sup., 12028 (vi).
Markey Fishing Leases, Copy of Ret. laid on Table (Mr. Brodeur) 11404 (vi).
Markham Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7709 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Maskinonge River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12037 (vi).
Massey-Harris Co., Rebate of Duty, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 8441 (v).
Masters and Mates Examination: in Com. of Sup., 2969 (ii).
Masters' and Mates' Act Amt. B. No. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on order for 2°: Remarks 583 (i). *See* 'B. No. 2.'
Matane Breakwater and Landing Pier: in Com of Sup., 12034 (vi).
Matane River Fishing, Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 5775 (iii).
Matchedash Bay, Dredging at Fesserton, Amt. expended: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 566 (i).
Mattawa Postmaster, Place of Residence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. White) 7179 (iv).
Meaford Harbour: *See* 'B. No. 158.'
Meaford Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12103 (vii).
Meat and Canned Foods Act: *See* 'B. No. 149.'
Meat and Canned Foods Act Enforcement: in Com. of Sup., 12893 (vii).
——— Inspectors, Number of Apptmts.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 352 (i).
——— Inspectors, Number, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 172 (i).
Meat and Food Inspection Act, Names and Number of Establishments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 1505 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sproule) 1690 (i).
Meat Inspection Act and Packing Houses, Cor., Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Armstrong) 4589 (iii).
Meat Inspection Regulations, Speech of Mr. Fisher at Chatham: ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Clements) 196 (i).
Meat Inspection Act, Violations: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Clements) 3042 (ii).
Medicine Hat Buildings, Contract *re* Heating System: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 10791 (vi).
Medicine Hat Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8601 (v).
Megantic Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
Members appointed to Offices, &c., ref. to in debate on Address (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 46 (i).
Members introduced 3, 680 (i), 2542 (ii).
Members and Senators appointed to Offices of Emoulment, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 555 (i).
Menzies, Mr. James, Emplymt. in Geodetic Survey, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 1349 (i).
Merwin, Geo. T., Payments to by Marine Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 11701 (vi).
Mess. from His Ex., Franco-Canadian Treaty: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 6 (i).
——— (Suppl. Estimates, 1908): Read (Mr. Speaker) 12503 (vii).
See 'Estimates,' &c.
Mess Pork, Quantity imported from U. S.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5650 (iii).
Metal Shingle and Siding Co., Patents of: *See* 'B. No. 207.'
Methyated Spirits, Supplies to Manufacturers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 820 (i).
Metlakatla and Songhees Indian Reserves, Legal Opinions of Justice Dept.: M. for Copies (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5477 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2381 (ii).
Michipicoten Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Middle River, Shear Dam Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11229 (vi).
Midland Dredging Co., Statement *re* Mr. McMullen: (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 5714 (iii).
Midland Harbour Dredging, Tenders, Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3239 (ii), 8893 (v).
Midland and Tiffin, Dredging, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3428 (ii).
——— Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12103 (vii).
Midland, Tiffin and Victoria Harbour Dredging, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8181 (iv).
'Midland Times,' Truro, Amounts paid for Advertisements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3235 (ii).

Midland Towing and Wrecking Co., Contract *re*, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bennett) 3241 (ii).
Milford, Haven, N.S. Wharf, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 13060 (vii).

MILITIA :
Allowances, Arrears of: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 9273 (v).
Annual Drill: in Com. of Sup., 5662, 5732 (iii); 10286 (v).
Antigonish Armoury, Leasing, &c., Letters, Tel., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. W. Chisholm) 1131 (i).
Armouries, Construction of: in Com. of Sup., 10886 (vi).
Arsenal, Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 7434 (iv); 12154 (vii).
Belleville Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 7455 (iv).
——— Negotiations for Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1509 (i).
——— Payments to Mr. J. Hurley, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1737 (i).
Blankets purchased by Militia and Indian Depts., Amount, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 4584 (iii).
——— Return *re*: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 5914 (iii), 6465 (iv).
Boot Contract, Attack *re*: Ques. of Priv. (Sir Frederick Borden) 10739 (vi)
Brampton Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 10888 (vi).
Brandon Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 8517 (v), 10953, 10974 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 10891 (vi).
British Pensioners, Notice from Imp. Govt. of Deductions: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 7501 (iv).
Camp in Eastern Townships, proposed Arrangements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3842 (ii).
Camps, Holding of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9779, 9835 (v).
Cavalry Brigade, Eastern Townships, Camp at Quebec, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 9273 (v).
Customs Dues: in Com. of Sup., 5662 (iii), 12155 (vii).
Drill Halls, Number constructed since 1896, Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 177 (i)
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 556 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Worthington) 4834 (iii), 6222 (iv).
Eastman Rifle Match, Accident, &c., Inquiry *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1125 (i).
Esquimalt Naval Station, Maintenance of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1117 (i).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Esquimalt Naval Station, Cor., &c. *re* Maintenance: M. for Copies (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1128 (i).
——— Transfer to Canada: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 1293 (i).
Esquimalt and Halifax Garrisons, Equipment, of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 1293 *See* 'Naval.'
Fortifications, Construction of, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 6646 (iv).
Fredericton Military Building: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).
Gananoque Drill Shed: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 10894 (vi).
Garrison Artillery, B.C., 5th Regiment, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5792 (iii).
Garrison Commons, Toronto, Date of Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 353 (i).
Generals, Apptmts. of Names and Qualifications: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 5086 (iii).
Goderich Military Camp, Target Practices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bristol) 9712 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. MacLaren) 9779 (v).
Gratuities: in Com. of Sup., 13177 (vii).
Guelph Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 7678 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Halifax Garrison, Coal Supply, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 10015 (v).
——— Disbandment of, &c: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1208 (i).
——— Discontent *re* Delay of Pay: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5659 (iii).
——— Occupation by Imp. Troops: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1288 (i).
——— Retraction of Remarks of Min. of Fin.: Remarks (Mr .Taylor) 5784 (iii).
Halifax, Military Buildings (Wellington Barracks): in Com. of Sup., 7143 (iv).
Halifax Militia Supplies, Tenders, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 6405 (iv).
Hamilton Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 7692 (iv).
Home Guards, N.W.T., Issue of Scrip for Services: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 2161 (ii).
Joliette Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
Kentville Rifle Range, Ref. to in debate on Budget (Sir Frederick Borden) 5290 (iii).
Kingston, Artillery Park: in Com. of Sup., 7701 (iv).
——— Gun Shed: in Com. of Sup., 7700 (iv).
——— Military Buildings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10907 (vi).
——— Military Hospital: in Com. of Sup., 7702 (iv).
——— Military Magazine: in Com. of Sup., 10907 (vi).
Lee-Enfield Rifle, Accident at Rockliffe Ranges: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 10014 (v).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Lee-Enfield Rifles, Number purchased, Dates, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 6644 (iv).
Lethbridge Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
Lévis Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Talbot) in Com. of Sup., 10899 (vi).
Lindsay Armoury: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 10888 (vi).
——— Date of Construction: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1111 (i).
London, Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 10894 (vi).
——— Military Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7705 (iv).
Militia: in Com. of Sup., 5662 (iii).
——— Pay and Allowance: in Com. of Sup., 12147 (vii).
——— Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 611 (i), 8871 (v), 12147 (vii).
——— Supplies, Provisions, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5662 (iii).
Militia, Board of Officers, Rep. *re* Pay and Allowance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2165 (ii).
Militia Dept., and Civil Service Commissioner's Report; Stmnt. (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. of Sup., 12505 (vii).
——— Quebec, Hours for Work of Masons, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 10790 (vi).
——— Report: Presented (Sir Frederick Borden) 4494 (iii).
——— Threats *re* Officials: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 13584 (vii).
Militia,—Memorandum of General Lake: M. to lay on Table (Sir Frederick Borden) 12770 (vii).
——— Pay, Arrears, &c., Reasons, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 8442 (v).
Militia Promotions, Names and Records, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 352 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 559 (i).
Militia Schools, Garrisons, &c., Amounts paid for Provisions, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1512 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 3042 (ii).
Milltown and St. Stephen's Drill Sheds: Remarks (Mr. Ganong) in Com. of Sup., 10897 (vi).
Minnedosa Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 10889 (vi).
Moir, Private, Shooting at Wolseley Barracks: Remarks (Mr. Beattie) 7322 (iv)
Moncton Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).
Montreal Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 7407 (iv).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Montreal Military Stores: in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).
Naval Defences, Contribution by Canada to Imp. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1118 (i).
Naval Instruction, Drilling of Canadian Seamen, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1119 (i).
Naval Schools, *re* Cruisers: in Com. of Sup., 3222 (ii).
Naval Stations in Canada, Arrangements with G. B., *re* Maintenance: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1117 (i).
——— List of Places: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 3153 (ii).
Niagara Camp., Transportation of Troops, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 2163 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) 9779 (v).
Niagara Falls, Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Niagara Land Sale, 13540 (vii).
Oakville Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 10887 (vi).
Pembroke Armoury: Remarks (Mr. White) in Com. of Sup., 10901 (vi).
Permanent Corps, Commission *re* Pay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1292 (i).
Petawawa Camp, Arrangements *re* Training of Troops: Ques. (Mr. White) 5791 (iii).
Peterborough Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Picton Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Alcorn) in Com. of Sup., 10899 (vi).
Plains of Abraham, Number of Acres leased to Ross Rifle Co.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1348 (i).
Port Arthur Armoury: in Com of Sup., 13332 (vii).
——— Properties: in Com. of Sup., 12148 (vii).
——— Provisions and Supplies: in Com. of Sup., 12150 (vii).
Quebec, Citadel Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 7430 (iv).
——— Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 7431 (iv).
Quebec Tercentenary, Attendance of Rural Corps: Letter read (Mr. Blain) 8694 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 10292 (v).
——— Attendance of Veterans: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7448, 7998 (iv), 8695 (v).
——— Food Supply: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 13176 (vii).
——— Mobilization of Militia, Abandonment of: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 8851 (v).
——— Number of Troops to be sent, &c.: Rearks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10259 (v).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Quebec Tercentenary, Protests from Regiments *re* Attendance: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 7992 (iv).
—— Rep. of Commission: Remarks (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7449 (iv).
—— Transportation of Troops: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 8377, 8384; City Corps, &c.: Remarks, 8386 (v).
Rankin, Col., Resignation of: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 11405 (vi).
Rations, Cost per Day, &c.: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).
Rifle and Artillery Association Grants: in Com. of Sup., 12152 (vii).
Rifles purchased from other Companies than Ross Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1123 (i).
Rifles purchased by Govt. since 1896, Number, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 5654
Rifle Ranges, Charlottetown,, Purchase Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 6233 (iv).
Ross Rifle, Accident at Rockliffe Range, Report *re*: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 11494 (vi).
—— Advances to Co. *re* Contracts, Cor. with Bank of Montreal: M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 4773 (iii).
—— Arsenal, Cor. with Ross Rifle Co. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 7991 (iv).
—— Bayonets purchased for, &c., Contracts, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 5476 (iii).
—— Bayonets, Adoption of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5786 (iii).
—— Bayonets, Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 6235, 8176 (iv).
—— Bayonets, Date of Contract, O. C., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paterson) 8442 (v).
—— Bayonets, Provisions *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3483 (ii).
—— Bonus, Loans, Services of the Govt., Employees, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 559 (i).
—— Consignment to N. W. Mounted Police, Manufacture, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5259 (iii).
—— Contract Price, Inspection of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 8174 (iv).
—— Contracts *re* Supply of Rifles, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 557 (i).
—— Correction of Mr. S. Hughes' Speech: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bergeron) 9126 (v).
—— Cor. with Imp. Govt. *re* Defects: M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 5210 (iii).
—— Disposition of Manufactured Rifles, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3237 (ii).
—— Evidence before Pub. Accounts Rep. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Worthington) 5914 (iii).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Ross Rifle, &c., Extension of Cove Field Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 4401 (iii).
—— Factory, Pet. *re* Establishment on Plains of Abraham: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 3903 (ii).
—— Inefficiency and Extravagance of Militia Dept.: Amt. (Mr. Worthington) on M. for Sup., 8902-8953; Neg. (Y. 18; N. 55) 9090
—— Inter-changeable parts with Lee-Enfield Rifles, Cor. with Imp. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3898 (ii).
—— Negotiations with Vickers Maxim Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 178 (i).
—— Number reported unfit for Use: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3841 (ii).
—— Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' *re* Accident at Rockliffe Ranges: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 10515 (vi).
—— Payments to since Jan. 1, 1908: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 7209 (iv).
—— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. S. Hughes) *re* Mr. Bergeron's Denial of Stmnt., 9126, 9330 (v).
—— Rep. of British War Office *re* Cor., Disappearance from Library of H. of C.: Ques. of Priv. (Sir Fred. Borden) 4961 (iii).
—— Rep. of Col. Gaudet, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 9713 (v).
—— Rep. from Military Associations, &c., *re* Efficiency: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 557 (i).
—— Reports from Public Accounts Com., Delay, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5728 (iii).
—— Rifles delivered per Contract, Cost per Rifle: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8180 (iv).
—— Rifles, Number ordered, Payments, Total Number delivered, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 168 (i).
—— Ross Rifle Contract: in Com. of Sup., 13542 (vii).
—— Sealed Pattern, Discovery of: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3237 (ii).
—— Services of Govt. Officials, Names, Rank, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 365 (i).
—— Number reported unfit for Use: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3841 (ii).
—— Target Practice, Suspensions by N.W. M. Police: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3847 (ii).
—— Tests in England, Reps., &c.: Ques. of Priv. (Sir Frederick Borden) 8167 (iv).
—— Total Number in Use in Canada by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5786 (iii).
Royal Canadian Dragoons, St. John, Tenders *re* Supplie: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 5788 (iii).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Royal Military College: in Com. of Sup., 7702 (iv), 10907 (vi), 12152, 13177 (vii).
Lancaster, Cadet, Investigation *re* at R.M.C.; on M. for Sup. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1019 (i).
St. Hyacinthe, Drill Hall: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 10890 (vi).
——— 84th Regiment, Amount of Pay still Due: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 844 (i).
St. John Fusiliers, 62nd Regiment, Payments *re* Annual Drill, Delays, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 847 (i).
St. John, Military Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7186 (iv).
——— Military Stables: in Com. of Sup., 7440 (iv).
Sabourin, Maj., Cor. with Lt. Col. Malette and Dept.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Bergeron) 3434 (ii).
Sarnia Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Sherbrooke Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 7439 (iv).
Sherbrooke Militia Corps, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 9273 (v).
S. A. Veterans, Land Grants, to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 563 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Herron) on M. for Sup., 11205 (vi).
——— Land Scrip for Volunteers, &c.: Ques. Mr. S. Hughes) 1110 (i).
——— Medals for 3rd Contingent, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1110 (i).
Stoney Creek Battlefield Monument: in Com. of Sup., 13177 (vii).
Stores and Arms for Rural Battalions, Care of: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Lalor) 5736 (iii).
Stores, Inspection of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8181 (iv)
Strathcona Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Strathroy Armoury: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 10886 (vi).
Sub-Target Company, Number ordered, Dates of Order, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 171 (i).
——— Papers referred to Com. of Last Session: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 945 (i).
——— Ref. to Public Accounts Com.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 312 (i).
Sussex Military Camp: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 9836 (v).
Sutherland Rifle Sights, Number, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 569 (i).
——— Contracts, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Worthington) 5476 (iii).
——— Contract *re* Additional Number: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5257 (iii).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Sutherland Rifle Sights, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5206 (iii).
Thirteenth Hussars, General Service Medal: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 13533 (vii).
Toronto Barracks, Approval of Plans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 7203 (iv)
Truro Armoury, Estimate for Heating and Electric Wiring: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3429 (ii).
Uniforms and Customs Refunds: Remarks (Mr. Worthington) in Com. of Sup., 9567 (v).
Valleyfield Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 7687 (iv), 10892 (vi).
Valleyfield Regiment, Organization of, Cor., &c., *re*: M. for Copy* (Mr. Bergeron) 3434 (ii).
Vickers Maxim Co., Purchases from by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 356 (i).
Warlike and other Military Stores: in Com. of Sup., 12149 (vii).
Western Rifle Associations, Pet. *re* Govt. Grant: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 5743 (iii).
Winnipeg, Military Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
——— Military Building: in Com. of Sup., 10969 (vi).
——— Military Hospital: in Com. of Sup., 10955 (vi).
Woodstock Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Carvell) in Com. of Sup., 10899 (vi).
Milk Adulteration: *See* 'B. No. 64..
Mill Settlement and Newcastle Creek Post Offices, Establishment of, Pets., Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Wilmot) 2982 (ii).
Milltown and St. Stephen's Drill Sheds: Remarks (Mr. Ganong) in Com. of Sup., 10897 (vi).
Mines, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 646 (i).
Mines and Geological Survey: in Com. of Sup., 12260 (vii).
Mining Regulations published in 'Yukon World and Official Gazette': M. for Copies* (Mr. Lennox) 5801 (iii).
Mining Rights in Sections 17, 20, 21, &c., Applications, Leases, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Perley) 3851 (ii).
——— Sections 20, 28 and 32, Original Grantees, Transfers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 3238 (ii).
Mining, Surface or Timber Rights, on Section 8, Applications, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Ames) 3850 (ii).
Ministers' Travelling Expenses from March, 1907: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 562 (i).
See 'Travelling,' &c.
Ministers' Widows' and Orphans' Fund of the Presbyterian Church: *See* 'B. No. 23.'

Minnedosa Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 10889 (vi).
Mint Building, Imperfect Ventilation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 3036 (ii).
——— Date of Operation, Values of Coinage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11296 (vi).
——— Issue of Gold Coins: Ques. (Mr. Thompson) 2593 (ii).
——— Sums expended, Apptmnts., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 232 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 557 (i).
——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Foster) 938 (i).
——— Papers laid on Table, 941 (i).
Mint: *See* 'Public Buildings, Ottawa.'
Miscou Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Mission Reserve, Conditions of Sale to G.T. P. Ry. Co.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 5256 (iii).
Mitchell Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Moberley, Mr. H. J., Payments to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3848 (ii).
Moir, Private, Shooting at Wolseley Barracks: Remarks (Mr. Beattie) 7322 (iv).
Moncton Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).
Moncton Car Shops, Lease, &c., O.Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Barker) 1690 (i).
Moncton Car and Locomotive Shops: in Com. of Sup., 12250 (vii).
——— Payments to E. A. Wallberg: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 8892 (v).
Moncton-Truro, Additional Line: in Com. of Sup., 12760 (vii).
Moncton Wharf Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 11696 (vi).
Money-Lenders, Operating in Public Buildings, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Delisle) 1738 (i).
'Montague' Dredge, Amounts paid for Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 182 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 8172 (iv).
Montague Moore, &c., Patents of: *See* 'B. No. 61.'
'Montcalm,' Str., Amount expended *re* Supplies, &c.: in Com. of Sup., (Mr. Foster) 1886 (i).
——— Collision with C.P.R. Str., Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 8086 (iv).
——— Investigation *re* Accident: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8171 (iv), 9715 (v).
——— Rep. *re* Accident: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10121 (v).
'Montcalm,' Str., Purchase Price, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 8441 (v).
——— Services as Ice-breaker: Remarks (Mr. Paquet) in Com. of Sup., 2941 (ii).
Montmagny and Cap St. Ignace Wharfs, Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1288 (i).
Montmagny Electoral District, Vacancy: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 9263 (v).
Montmagny Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).
Montmorency Falls, Retaining Walls, Length, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 12410 (vii).
Montreal Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 7407 (iv).
Montreal Circuit Judges, Increase of Salary: Remarks (Mr. Gervais) in Com. on B. 206, 12552 (vii).
Montreal Directory, in Library of House: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 4764 (iii).
Montreal Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 7423 (iv).
——— Valuations, Reps., Cor., Expenditure, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 698 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 3319 (ii).
Montreal Excise Officers, Increase of Salaries: Remarks (Mr. Gervais) in Com. of Sup., 817 (i).
Montreal 'Gazette,' Building, Amount paid for, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3900 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commission, Amount of Expenditure *re* Cleaning, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 8888 (v).
——— Cement Contract, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 7199, 7499 (iv).
Montreal Harbour, Expenditure *re* Docks and Elevators: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Schaffner) 2170 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1683 (i).
Montreal Liquor Licenses, Attack of Hon. Mr. Scott: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Gervais) 4064; Ques. of Order (Mr. Fisher) 4065; Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 4066; Appeal from Dep. Speaker to Speaker, 4071; Ruling, Agreed to (Y. 59; N. 23) 4071 (ii).
Montreal Military Stores: in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).
Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 47.'
Montreal Pneumatic Postal Station: in Com. of Sup., 5703 (iii).
Montreal Post Office Addition, Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6922 (iv).
——— Settlement of Strike: Remarks (Mr. Verville) 8608 (v).
Montreal Post Office, Clerks, Pay, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 9112 (v).
——— Defalcations, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 7197 (iv).
——— Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 7410 (iv).
Montreal Postal Service, Irregularities of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 9274 (v).
Montreal Postal Station B: in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).
——— Station C: in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv).
Montreal and Quebec Ports, Expenditure for the last Fifty Years, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 3482 (ii).
Montreal 'Star,' Advertisements in, &c.: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 7479 (iv).

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Abolition of Tolls, &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3436; Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3442; Agreed to (Y. 108; N. 53) 3464 (ii)
——— Amounts collected and expended, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 1688 (i).
——— Bonds, Payment of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2979 (ii).
——— Claim of Govt., &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3465 (ii).
——— Indebtedness, Payments, Audit, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1931 (i).
——— Rep. of Aud. Gen. J. Fraser: M. for Copy* (Mr. Monk) 2983 (ii).
See 'Toll Gates.'
Monuments to Sir L. H. Lafontaine and Robt. Baldwin: in Com. of Sup., 11118 (vi).
Monuments to McGee and Brown: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 13352 (vii).
Moose Jaw Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vii).
Moosejaw-Lacombe Branch, C.P.R., Extension, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Knowles) to Com. of Sup., 7654 (iv).
Moose Jaw Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
Moose Mountain Buffalo Herd: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 10102 (v).
Morning Sittings and Wednesday Evenings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9477; Amt. (Mr. Lake) 9494 (v).
Mortgages as Securities by Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 204.'
Motions, Unopposed: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8839 (v).
——— Business of the Hse.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8896 (v).
Mount Forest Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vii).
Mulgrave Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
Murray Canal, Bridgemen's Houses: in Com. of Sup., 12226 (vii).
Murray Harbour Branch Ry., Improved Service, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 6239 (iv).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. A. Martin) 10123 (v).
Museum: *See* 'Public Works—Ottawa.'
Muskoday Indian Reserves, Negotiations *re* Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5082 (iii).
Mutual Reserve Life Insurance Co., Govt. Deposit, &c.: Ques.: (Mr. Gauvreau) 3485 (ii).
National Battlefields at Quebec: *See* 'B. Nos. 111 & 219.'
See 'Battlefields.'
National Transcontinental Ry.: *See* 'G.T.P.'
Naturalization Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 130.'
See 'Can. Naturalization.'
Naval Defences, Contribution by Canada to Imp. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1118 (i).
Naval Instructions, Drilling of Canadian Seamen, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1119 (i).
Naval Schools *re* Cruisers: in Com. of Sup., 3222 (ii).
Naval Schools, Establishment of, List of Places: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 3153 (ii).
——— Arrangements with G.B. *re* Maintenance: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1117 (i).
Neepawa Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8536 (v), 13335 (vii).
Negro Point Submarine Signal, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5202 (iii).
'Neptune,' Cruise in Hudson Bay, on Order for Reps.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 850 (i).
N.B. Coal and Ry. Co.'s Claim against Ry. Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 9714 (v).
——— Claims *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 9270 (v).
N.B. Cold Storage Bait Co., Ministerial Connections *re*: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Foster) 9283; Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 9415 (v).
See 'Cold Storage.'
N.B. Cold Storage Plants, Bonuses by Govt., Ques. (Mr. Porter) 9272 (v).
N.B. Credit, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1937 (i).
N.B. Elections and Govt. Employees: Telegram read (Mr. Foster) 3229 (ii).
——— I.C.R. Employees: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3317 (ii).
N.B. Elections, Interference of Govt. Officials: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3579 (ii).
——— Mr. Pugsley's Political Connection, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 7130 (iv).
N.B. Inland Waters Wharfs, Construction Policy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 5465 (iii).
N.B. Post Offices, Closing of: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 9110 (v).
N.B. Post Office Inspectors: in Com. of Sup., 13153 (vii).
N.B. Provincial Elections, Interference by Dom. Govt.: M. (Mr. Foster) to Adjn., 3657 (ii).
N.B. Ry. Mail Service, Vacancy, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 9107 (v).
N.B. Southern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 53.'
New Glasgow Increased Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12230 (vii).
New Glasgow Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11257 (vi).
New London Breakwater Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 11292 (vi).
Newmarket Canal, Extension to Devil's Elbow: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 10306 (vi).
——— Reps., Surveys, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10315 (vi).
See 'Canals—Trent.'

New Mills Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13345 (vii).
Newspapers in Alberta, Amounts paid to by Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Herron) 1690 (i).
Newspapers, Amounts paid for Advertising, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 509 (i).
Newspaper Mail Regulations, Complaints *re* Delivery: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 11298 (vi).
Newspapers, Payments to from 1904 to 1908: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 1511 (i).
——— Postal Arrangements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6460 (iv).
——— Rates, List of Publications: M. for Copy* (Mr. Cockshutt) 1295 (i).
See 'Public Works—Advertising,' 'Tenders,' &c.
New York Central Ry., Discrimination by Ry. Commission: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 10328 (vi).
Niagara Falls Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Niagara Falls, Rep. of Dr. Spencer, Cost, Criticism, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 6054 (iii).
Niagara Grand Island Bridge Co.: *See* 'B. No. 48.'
Niagara Land Purchase: in Com. of Sup., 13540 (vii).
Niagara Military Camp: Remarks (Mr. Lencaster) 9779 (v).
——— Transportation of Troops, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 2163 (ii).
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 82.'
Nicolet County, Govt. Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Turcotte) 12775 (vii).
Nicolet Electoral District, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1283 (i).
Nicolet Harbour Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).
Nicolet Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7428 (iv).
Nicolet Post Office, Completion of, Postmaster's Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11498 (vi).
——— Contract and Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3838 (ii).
——— Emplymt. of Mr. S. Rivard: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11702 (vi).
Nicolet River Dredging, Emplymt. of Narcisse Jutras: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11936 (vi).
——— Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3840 (ii), 4588 (iii).
——— Protection Walls, Repairs, Expenditure *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 4588 (iii).
——— Wharf, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3478 (ii).
Nipigon Ry. (Branch Lines) Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13288 (vii).
Nipissing Central Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 170.'
Nixon, Jos., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 12390 (vii).
Noble, Mr. James, Conviction *re* Fishery Regulations: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5650 (iii).
See 'Georgian Bay.'
Nolan, Wm. Howard, Issue of Land Patents to: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 8182 (iv).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Amounts paid and Claims, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 167 (i).
——— Financial Relations with Govt.: Remarks on M. for Sup., 770 (i).
——— Ref. to Mr. Blair's Letter *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2392 (ii).
North Bay P. O. Inspectors: in Com. of Sup., 13152 (vii).
North Bay Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7712, 7810 (iv), 13332 (vii).
North East Harbour Wharf, Total Length: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 11019 (vi).
North Empire Fire Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 7.'
Northern Crown Bank of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 156.'
Northern Empire Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 86.'
North Grove Post Office, Letters, Pets. *re* Establishment: M. for Copies* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4773 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5490 (iii).
North Sydney Improvements, I.C. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
Northwest Gold Dredging Co., Leases assigned, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 11702 (vi).
N.W.M. Police, Compensations *re* Injuries: in Com. of Sup., 8870 (v).
——— Pensions: in Com. of Sup., 8870 (v).
——— Salaries and Pay of Force: in Com. of Sup., 8862 (v).
Northwestern Pacific Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 54.'
N.W.T. Act (jurisdiction) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 210.'
N.W.T. Govt., Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 10116 (v).
N.W.T. School Grants: in Com. of Sup., 11117 (v).
Notre Dame de Portage Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).
——— Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6400 (iv).
N.S. Prisons, &c., Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 166.'
Oakville Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 10887 (vi).
Oaths of Office: See 'B. No. 1.'
Oats, Standards of: *See* 'B. No. 114.'
Observatories: in Com. of Sup., 12262 (vii).
Observatory: *See* 'Astronomical.'
Obstructions in Navigable Streams, Removal of: in Com. of Sup., 3156, 3211 (ii).
Obstruction *re* Supply, Charges by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Owen) on M. for Sup., 9894 (v).
——— on M. (Mr. Fowler) to Com. of Sup., 10016 (v).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) 10023; (Mr. Speaker) 10024 (v).

Obstruction *re* Supply, Ques. of Order, (Mr. Foster) on Ques. of Order (Mr. Ross) 10024: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 10031 (v).
Obstruction Tactics, Discussion of: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Foster) 9220 (v).
Ocean and River Service: in Com. of Sup., 1033 (i), 2941, 2949, 3147, 3195 (ii), 5763 (iii).
Ocean SS. Subsidies: *See* 'B. No. 145.'
Occidental Fire Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 131.'
Official Cars, Number and Maintenance: Remarks (Mr. Ward) in Com. of Sup., 10330 (vi).
Office Specialty Co., and Eclipse Mfg. Co., Amounts paid to: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 4244 (iii).
Office Specialty Co., Quantity of Goods supplied to Govt.: Ques. (Br. Bennett) 3039 (ii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bennett) 3242 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Bennett) 3581 (ii), 5785 (iii).
Oil Borings, Geological Survey: in Com. of Sup., 13162 (vii).
Old Age Pensions: *See* 'B. No. 120.'
Old Age Pensions: M. for Sel. Com. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2786 (ii).
——— M. (Mr. Pringle) for Sel. Com., 2398 (ii).
——— M. (Mr. Fielding) to wthdrw., 3654 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 7722 (iv).
Old Age Pensions Com., Progress *re*: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 12660 (vii).
Old Man's River: in Com. of Sup., 12142 (vii).
Olympic Games Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 13167 (vii).
Ont., Judges of: *See* 'B. No. 206.'
Ontario North, Division of Prov.: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 8294 (v).
Opium, Amount received *re* Customs Duties, Pet. from B.C. *re* Prohibition: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 8614 (v).
Opium, Prohibition of: *See* 'B. No. 205.'
Orangemen and Quebec Provincial Elections, Speech of Hon. Mr. Brodeur at Montreal: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 10123 (v).
Orange Order and Quebec Prov.: Remarks (Mr. Talbot) in Com. of Sup., 10355 (vi).
Orangeville Post Office Repairs: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 7482 (iv).
Order Paper, Differences between English and French Editions: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 6740, 6850 (iv).
——— Printing in French: Remarks (Mr. A. Lavergne) 5407 (iii).
Order, Ques. of, Discussions *re*, 'Bourinot' quoted, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4103 (ii).
——— Appeal to Speaker from Mr. Chairman's Ruling (Mr. Taylor) Agreed to (Y. 84; N. 1) 4188 (ii).
Ordnance Lands, Sale of: *See* 'B. No. 218.'
Oriental Immigration, B.C., Legal Expenses *re* Commission: in Com. of Sup., 13156 (vii).
Original Documents and Returns: *See* 'Documents.'
Oromocto Shoals, Contract *re* Dredging: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11496 (vi).
O'Shaughnessy, Mr. John, Emplymt. on I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11498 (vi).
——— Emplymt. *re* Nicolet Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11702 (vi).
——— Issue of Pass on I.C.R. Express: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11936 (vi).
Otonabee Power Co., Amount of Payment *re* Horse Power: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5471, 5656 (iii).
——— Incorrect Answer: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 5566 (iii).
Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 74.'
Ottawa Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).
——— Archives Fittings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5700 (iii).
——— Elevator Attendants: in Com. of Sup., 11011 (vi).
——— Heating, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11009 (vi), 13340 (vii).
——— Improvements, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5707 (iii).
——— Lighting, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11011 (vi).
——— Renewing Skylights: in Com. of Sup., 7816 (iv).
——— Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5706 (iii), 10983 (vi).
——— Repairs, Furniture, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10981 (vi).
——— Sussex Street: in Com. of Sup., 5701 (iii), 13478 (vii).
——— Telephones: in Com. of Sup., 11012 (vi). *See* 'Public Works—Ottawa.'
Ottawa Grounds, Circular of C. S. Ass'cn: Read (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 11012 (vi).
Ottawa Improvement Commission, Amount expended to Jan. 1st, 1908: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11499 (vi).
Ottawa Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 5705 (iii).
——— Completion of Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Wright) 3842 (ii).
Ouelle River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12037 (vi).
Ouimet, Hon. J. A., Retirement of: Ques. (Mr. Lanctot) 516 (i).
——— O.C. *re*: M. for Copy (Mr. Lanctot) 557 (i).
Owen Sound and Meaford Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 83.'

Owen Sound to Meaford Ry. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13287 (vii).
Owen Sound Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7817 (iv).
——— Inspector, Apptmt. of Mr. Foster, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3039 (ii).
——— Contract *re* Extension: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3039 (ii).
——— Sub-letting of Contract by Leslie: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3039 (ii).
Owen Sound Dredging, Inspector Telford, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3038 (ii).
Owen Sound Dredging Co., Payments to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2792 (ii).
Owen Sound Strike, Settlement of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8606 (v).
Oyster Pond Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11258 (vi).
Pacaud, Benjamin, Apptmt. to Customs at Windsor: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 5200 (iii).
Pacific and Atlantic Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 138.'
Pacific Coast Fire Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 40.'
Painsec Junction and Pointe du Chene, I.C.R.: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 10157 (v).
Pakenham Mail Bags, Throwing off of Train: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1425 (i).
Pardoning Power *re* Criminals, Releases since 1896, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2822 (ii).
See 'Blunden.'
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 9579 (v).
——— Explanation (Mr. Aylesworth) 13081 (vii).
Parker's Cove Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11258 (vi).
Park Hill Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Park Reservations: in Com. of Sup., 5755 (iii).
Parliamentary Documents, Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 609 (i).
Parliament, Opening: Mess. from His Ex.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
Parrsborough Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11259 (vi).
Parrsborough Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 13327 (vii).
Partridge Island Stores, Emplymt. of Ferry Service, Rate, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1120 (i).
Pasqua Indian Reserve, Sale of: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 12729, 12737 (vii).
Passages of Immigrants to Canada, Number rejected by SS. Companies: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5468 (iii).
Passenger Ticket Act: *See* 'B. No. 90.'
Passes on Steamers to Members, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 106.'
Patent Medicines: *See* 'B. No. 146.'
Patent Medicines, Committee of Inquiry *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3899 (ii).
Patent Medicines, Govt. Intention *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 356 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 608 (i), 2594 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) *re* Apptmt. to Special Com., 10689 (vi).
Patent of Eugene Francois Giraud: *See* 'B. No. 52.'
Patent of Frederick C. Rehm, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 110.'
Patents of General Chemical Co.: *See* 'B No. 174.'
Patents of Goodwin Car Co.: *See* 'B. No. 60.
Patents of Metal Shingle and Siding Co.: *See* 'B. No. 207.'
Patents of Montague Moore, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 61.'
Patents of the Sutherland Rifle Sight Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 63.'
Patent of Wm. B. Smith: *See* 'B. No. 198.'
Patents of the Windsor Pump and Foundry Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 72.'
'Patent Record': in Com. of Sup., 672 (i).
Patterson, J. W., Govt. Lands in B.C., Sale to: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6002 (iii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6241 (iv).
Patronage *re* Civil Service: M. (Mr. Foster, to Drop, 6243 (iv).
See 'Civil Service System.'
Paulding, Ada Katurah Stewart, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 176.'
Peace River Exploratory Surveys, Rep.: Presented (Mr. Oliver) 3834 (ii).
Peace River Timber Limits, Cor., &c., *re* Granting: M. for Copies (Mr. S. Hughes) 3851 (ii).
Peace River Valley and Land Co., Cancelling of Grants: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 11018 (vi).
——— Homesteads leased, sold, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. S. Hughes) 1295 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2769 (ii), 6010 (iii).
——— M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to Com. of Sup., 10403 (vi).
——— Survey of Lands: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 9996 (v).
——— Terms and Regulations *re* Sale, &c., Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1111 (i).
Peace Union, Parliamentary, Meeting at Ottawa: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 13581 (vii).
Peat for Fuel Deposits, Development of in Canada: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 515 (i).
Peat Industry, Emplymt. of Mr. Erik Nystrom, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Desjardins) 1122 (i).
Pelagic Sealing in North Pacific Ocean, Seizure of Schr. 'Carlotta G. Cox': on M. for Sup. (Mr. Sloan), 3934 (ii).
——— Notice of Motion (Mr. Sloan) 3156 (ii).

Pelican Lake Channel, Opening of: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1940 (i).
Pembroke Armoury: Remarks (Mr. White) in Com. of Sup., 10901 (vi).
Penitentiaries: in Com. of Sup., 5509 (iii), 12265 (vii).
Penitentiaries B.C., Land Purchases: in Com. of Sup., 12918 (vii).
Pension Fund of I.C.R. & P.E.I. Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 117.'
Pepin, J. A., Emplymt. at Windsor Customs: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7201 (iv).
Perdue, Mr. M. B., Apptmt. as Inspector, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 173 (i).
Personal Explanation *re* Land Deals (Mr. Turriff) 1927 (i).
Petawawa Camp, Arrangements *re* Training of Troops: Ques. (Mr. White) 5791 (iii).
Petawawa Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12133 (vii).
—— Ques. (Mr. White) 685 (i).
Peterborough Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Peterborough Steamboat Landing: in Com. of Sup., 12133 (vii).
Petite Decharge, Lac St. Jean, Removal of Rock: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).
Petition: M. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Present, 1682 (i).
Petit Rocher Breakwater, Contracts, O.Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Taylor) 1294 (i).
—— Incomplete Return: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 5723 (iii), 9716 (v).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. Taylor) 6464, 7107 (iv).
—— Papers laid on Table (Mr. Pugsley) 10402 (vi).
Petit Rocher Spur Line, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12759 (vii).
'Petrel,' Str., Supplies, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 7937 (iv).
—— M. for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 7937 (iv).
Petroleum Bounties: *See* 'B. No. 199.'
Phœnix Assurance Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 167.'
'Phœnix,' Saskatoon, Number ordered, Payment to: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 6920 (iv).
Pianos rented for Speaker's Rooms: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 563 (i).
Piche Point (Lake Temiscaming) Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12035 (vi).
Picton Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Alcorn) in Com. of Sup., 10899 (vi).
Pictou Engine House, I.C.R., Contract *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1683 (i).
Pictou Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5558 (iii), 12230 (vii).
Pictou Post Office Building, Concrete Sidewalk. Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 10518 (vi).
Piegan Indian Reserve, Shipping and Weighing of Cattle: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 632 (i).
Piggeries at Experimental Farm: Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 12895 (vii).
Pilotage and Pensions: in Com. of Sup., 5046 (iii), 13324 (vii).
Pinette Harbour, P.E.I., Pets. *re* Dredging: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 685 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 9474 (v).
Pisquid Post Office, Removal of, Cor., Tels., Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 4588 (iii).
Plains of Abraham, Battle of: *See* 'Nos. 111 & 219.'
Plains of Abraham, Number of Acres leased to Ross Rifle Co.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1348 (i).
See 'Militia—Ross Rifle.'
Playgreen Lake, Conditions *re* Lease, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 6403 (iv).
Plessissville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7430 (iv), 13330 (vii).
Pointe aux Trembles Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12035 (vi).
Pointe-aux-Trembles Wharf, Contract of Messrs. Dusseault & Pageau, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8838 (v).
—— Date of Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9267 (v).
—— Tenders, Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1734 (i), 2394 (ii).
Point Edward Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 5713 (iii).
Point Pelee Lightship: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vii).
Point Prim Wharf, P.E.I., Completion of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3898 (ii).
Point St. Charles, Postal Station: in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv), 13330 (vii).
Poirierville Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 11260 (vi).
Pontiac Central Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 155.'
Pork, Fresh, Quantity imported for Home Consumption: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 5650 (iii).
Portage la Prairie, Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
Port Arthur Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Port Arthur and Fort William Dredging, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8617 (v).
Port Arthur Harbour, Dredging Contracts, Securities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 697 (i).
Port Arthur and Fort William Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12144 (vii).
See 'Dredging.'
Port Arthur Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7825 (iv).
Port Bruce Harbour, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 2389 (ii).
Port Burwell Harbour, Contracts, Payments, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Marshall) 556 (i).

Port Burwell Harbour, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12135 (vii).
Port Colborne Elevator and Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12146, 12211 (vii).
Port Colborne Elevator, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4245 (iii).
Port Colborne, Total Expenditure *re* Improvements: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4403 (ii).
Port Credit Harbour, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 10513 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 12101 (vii).
Port Dufferin Dredging, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 4828 (iii).
Porte au Pique Mail Contracts, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3232 (ii).
Porter's Lake, Boat Channel: in Com. of Sup., 11260 (vi).
Port Hastings Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11265 (vi).
Port Hillford Breakwater, Protection: in Com. of Sup., 11267 (vi).
Port Hood Harbour, Closing Northern Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 11268 (vi).
——— Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10255 (v).
Port Hood Fishery Officer, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10254 (v).
Port Hope, Inland Revenue Office, Apptmts. of Collector: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 895 (i).
Port Hope Pier Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12135 (vii).
Port Joli West, Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11279 (vi).
Port Maitland Piers, Amount of Mr. Battle's Tender: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 690 (i).
——— Apptmt. of W. W. Krick as Inspector: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 6919 (iv).
Port Maitland Entrance Pier, Renewal: in Com. of Sup., 5673 (iii).
——— Tenders, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lalor) 1294 (i).
Port Medway and Medway Station Mail Service, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11300 (vi).
Port Mulgrave, N.S., Preventing Boats landing Cargoes: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9274 (v).
Port Royal (Madame Island) Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11278 (vi).
Port St. Francois Wharf, Construction, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3423 (ii).
Port South Bar, C.B., Vessels entered for Customs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9271 (v).
Port Stanley Breakwater, Contractors, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 239 (i).
Port Stanley Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12136 (vii).
Portuguese Cove Breakwater Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11279 (vi).
Port Vernon Bridge, P.E.I., Completion of Work, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 4404 (iii).
Postage Stamps, Designs for Quebec Tercentenary, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7934 (iv).
See 'Post Office.'
Postal Arrangements between Canada and U.S., Re-arrangement of: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 3040 (ii).
——— Statement (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for Sup., 3159 (ii).
——— M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 3885 (ii).
Postal Note Business, Commissions, Expenditure *re* Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 9279 (v).
Postal Rates on Letters at Confederation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 8175 (iv).
Postal Rates on N.S. Weekly Newspapers, Tel. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 3484 (ii).
Postal Regulations *re* Weekly Newspapers, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5901 (iii).
Postal Revenue *re* One-Cent Rate on Letters Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 8381 (v).
Postal Service, Complaints *re* Inadequacy: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 352 (i).
——— Deficiency, &c., Complaints *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 559 (i).
——— Delays, &c., Complaints *re* Ret.: on M. for Com. of Sup., (Mr. Armstrong) 7257 (iv).
Postal Service, H. of C., Delay in delivering: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 570 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 7481 (iv).
Postal Service, Improvements in, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8891 (v).
——— Ret.: Inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 4832 (iii).
Postal Stamps, Printing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 9111 (v).
——— Special Issue *re* Tuberculosis: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 9115 (v).
Posters, Prohibition of Indecent Bills, Enforcement of Tariff Regulations: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 6461 (iv).
Postmasters' Assessment, Amount collected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 6458 (iv).
Post Office Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 162.'
POST OFFICE:
Annapolis and Digby Mail Service, Amounts paid: Ques. (Mr. Lanctot) 12653 (vii).
Arnprior Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7454 (iv).
Atlantic Steamers Mail Service, Cost per Annum: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5656 (iii).
See 'Mail Service,' &c.
Belleville Post Office, Excessive Postage: Remarks (Mr. Porter) 7933 (iv).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Bell Rapids P. O., Establishment of: Remarks (Mr. Porter) 8883 (v).

Bonanza Post Office Theft, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1291 (i).

Bonn Post Office, Application *re* Establishment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 10516 (vi).

Brampton Post Office, Repairs, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 7480 (iv).

Brass, Mr. Albert, Postmaster at Rusagnoris, Charges *re* Political Activity: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 6642 (iv).

Brewster and Park Hill Mail Route, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6404 (iv).

Calgary, P. O. and Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 8578 (v).

Chambly Canton, Complaints *re* Postmaster: Ques. (Mr.Leonard) 5653 (iii).

Copper Cliff Postmaster, Charges *re*: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 658 (i).

Denis, Mr. Gaspard, Postmaster at St. Michel des Saints, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 9474 (v).

Digby to Westport Mail Contract, Name of Contractor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7203 (iv).

Drop Letter One-Cent Rate: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 3158 (ii).

Egvpte and St. Ephrem d'Upton, Mail Contract, Renewal of: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5257 (iii).

Farnell, Gordon, Contractor for Halifax Mails: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7731 (iv).

Farnham Post Office, Vote *re* Improvement: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6399 (iv).

Glencoe Post Office, Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 3846 (ii).

Guelph-Goderich Mail Service, Arrangements with C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. A. F. MacLaren) 184 (i).

Hamilton Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7696 (iv).

Hull Post Office, Total Revenue for 1906, 1908: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 11704 (vi).

'La Gazette d'Arthabaska.' Postal Privileges *re*: Ques. (Mr. L. Lavergne) 6058 (iii).

Letter Carriers, Boots, Uniforms, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8872 (v).

——— Hours of Service, Pay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 7728 (iv).

Literature, &c., distributed through Mails: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 9095 (v).

Londonderry and Bass River Mail Service, Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2980

Mackinnon Post Office, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 10516 (vi).

Macleod Post Office, Report *re* Accommodation: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 9110 (v).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

McDonald, Archibald, Dismissal from Whim Road P. O.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. Martin) 5087 (iii).

McLeod, Alex., Dismissal from Valleyfield, P.E.I. Post Office: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5087 (iii).

Mails from Canada to Europe, Quantity arrived: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 12653 (vii).

Mail Matter lost in C.P.R. Accident at Kenora, Rep. *re*: (Mr. Lake) 9281 (v).

——— Mail Matter delayed in Transmission by C.P.R. Accident: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) 9724 (v).

Mail Matter, Fraudulent Weighing, Inspection *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4827 (iii).

Mail Matter mutilated in Transmission, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2214 (ii).

Mail Service in B.C., Improvements *re*: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 3754 (ii)

Mail Service between Darnley and Kensington, P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4828 (iii).

Mail Service, Irregularity of in Argenteuil County: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 9119 (v).

Mail Service in N.B. and N.S., Number of Post Offices, Postal Revenue, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Crocket) 852 (i).

Mail Service, Soulanges County, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9277 (v).

Mail Service by Steamers via Coteau Landing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9277 (v).

Mail Steamer, Purchase of: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4827 (iii).

Mail Subsidies to Steamships, Total Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 689 (i).

Mail Tenders at Rimouski, Complaints *re* 'Rhoda': Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 5799 (iii).

Mattawa Postmaster, Place of Residence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. White) 7199 (iv).

Mill Settlement and Newcastle Creek Post Offices, Establishment of, Pets., Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Wilmot) 2982 (ii).

Montreal Pneumatic Postal Station: in Com. of Sup., 5703 (iii).

Montreal Postal Service, Irregularities of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 9274 (v).

Montreal Postal Station B: in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).

——— Station C: in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv).

Montreal Post Office, Addition, Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6922 (iv).

——— Clerks, Pay, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 9112 (v).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Montreal Post Office, Defalcations, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 7197 (iv).

——— Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 7410 (iv).

N.B. Post Offices, Closing of: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 9110 (v).

——— Inspectors: in Com. of Sup., 13153 (vii).

N.B. Ry. Mail Service, Vacancy, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 9107 (v).

——— Postal Arrangements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6460 (iv).

Newspaper Rates, List of Publications: M. for Copy* (Mr. Cockshutt) 1295 (i).

——— Regulations, Complaints *re* Delivery: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 11298 (vi).

See 'Weekly Newspapers.'

Nicolet Post Office, Completion of, Postmaster's Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11498 (vi).

——— Contract and Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3838 (ii).

——— Emplymt. of Mr. S. Rivard: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11702 (vi).

North Bay P. O. Inspectors: in Com. of Sup., 13152 (vii).

North Grove Post Office, Letters, Pets. *re* Establishment: M. for Copies* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4773 (iii).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5490 (iii).

Orangeville Post Office Repairs: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 7482 (iv).

O'Shaughnessy, Mr. John, Emplymt. *re* Nicolet Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11702 (vi).

Ottawa Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 5705 (iii).

——— Completion of Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Wright) 3842 (ii).

Pakenham Mail Bags, Throwing off of Train: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1425 (i).

Pisquid Post Office, Removal of, Cor., Tels., Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 4588 (iii).

Point St. Charles Postal Station: in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv), 13330 (vii).

Port Medway and Medway Station Mail Service, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11300 (vi).

Porte au Pique Mail Contracts, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3232 (ii).

Postal Arrangements between Canada and U.S., Re-arrangement of: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 3040 (ii).

——— M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 3885 (ii).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 4832 (iii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Postal Arrangements between Can. and U.S.: Re-arrangement of: Statement (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for Sup., 3159 (ii).

Postal Note Business, Commissions, Expenditure *re* Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 9279 (v).

Postal Rates on Letters at Confederation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 8175 (iv).

Postal Revenue *re* One-Cent Rate on Letters: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 8381 (v).

Postal Service, Complaints *re* Inadequacy: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 352 (i).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 559 (i).

——— Improvements in, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8891 (v).

Postmasters' Assessment, Amount collected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 6458 (iv).

Post Office Buildings built since 1904, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 4761 (iii).

Post Office Dept., Clerical Assistance: in Com. of Sup., 8872 (v).

——— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 93 (i).

——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5561 (iii), 8872 (v).

——— Outside Service: in Com. of Sup., 9092 (v), 13152 (vii).

——— Returns, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 6405 (iv).

——— Ret.: Inquiry for (Mr. Crocket) 6288 (iv).

Post Office Inspectors, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13152 (vii).

——— Uniforms, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9092 (v).

Post Office Irregularities in Western Canada: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 8873 (v).

P.E.I., Post Offices in Queens County, Complaints *re* Mail Service: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 355 (i).

——— Delays in Distributing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 9092 (v).

Printing for Postal Service, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5472 (iii).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry., &c., Cost of Mail Service: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1130 (i).

Quebec Terentenary Postage Stamps, French and English Printing: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7935 (iv).

——— Designs for, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7934 (iv).

——— New Series, Issue of: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6397 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. A. Lavergne) 8895 (v).

——— Postage Stamps, Issue of: Ques. (Mr. McColl) 12414 (vii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Ry. Mail Clerk at Edmonton, Expenses *re* Trial: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 9108 (v).

Regina Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 8602 (v).

Rimouski Mail Contracts, Payments to Str. 'Rhoda': Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8176 (iv).

Rivard, Mr. S., Emplymt. on Nicolet Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11702 (v).

Riviere du Loup Postmaster, Resignation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6399 (iv).

Round Bay, N.S., Removal of Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 11297 (vi).

Rural Postmasters, Salary, Increases, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 183 (i).

Ryan, Mr. G. M., Apptmt. of Successor as Ry. Mail Supt.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 7504 (iv).

St, Francois Xavier Post Office, Apptmt. of Postmistress, Pet. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 5797 (iii).

St. Gabriel de Brandon Post Office Savings Bank Opening, Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Monk) 4589 (iii).

——— Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4828 (iii).

St. Henri Post Office Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7439 (iv).

St. Irene des Bains, Apptmt. of Mr. Geo. Girard as Postmaster: Ques. (Mr. Forget) 5795 (iii).

St. John's Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7444 (iv).

St. Mary's Post Office, Construction of: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 12735 (vii).

——— Items *re* Expenditure of $658.03: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 11937 (vi).

——— Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 11019 (vi).

St. Paschal and Kamouraska Mail Contracts, Tenders, Bondsmen, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3236 (ii).

St. Peter's Bay, Mail Contract with H. B. Finlay, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1686 (i).

St. Peter's Bay Post Office, Dismissal of Mrs. Mary Finlay, Letters, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 2170 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1687 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. A. Martin) 2786 (ii).

Sacred Heart Post Office, Establishment of Six Offices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5472 (iii).

Sandwich Post Office Site, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7201 (iv).

Sandy Cove, N.S., Mail Service, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8891 (v).

Savings Banks, Increase of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Forget) 691 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Scotch Hill East, Establishment of Post Office, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2793 (ii).

Southvale, N.S., Removal of Post Office, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4829 (iii).

Stamps, Printing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 9111 (v).

——— Special Issue *re* Tuberculosis: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 9115 (v).

See 'Quebec,' &c.

Suburban Mail Delivery: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3276 (ii).

Thessalon Post Office, Charges *re* Postmaster: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 660 (i).

Toronto Postmaster, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2594 (ii).

Trent Bridge Post Office, Re-Opening of: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 609 (i).

Valleyfield, Clock in Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 7115 (iv).

Valleyfield, P.E.I., Change of Mail Route: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 11297 (vi).

Victoria Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 10883 (vi).

Weekly Newspapers, Postal Rates in N.S., Tel. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 3484 (ii).

Weekly Newspapers, Postal Regulation *re*, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5201 (iii).

Winnipeg Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 8575 (v).

Winter Mail Service: in Com. of Sup., 3216 (ii).

Woodstock, N.B., Mr. C. L. Smith, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2794 (ii).

——— Interference in Eelctions: Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. Crocket) 2886 (ii).

Yukon Mail Service, Complaints *re* (Mr. Thompson) 2022 (ii).

Pound Net Licenses granted in 1905, Cor. with A. E. Dyment, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bennett) 2795 (ii).

Prefontaine, Hon. R., Date of Sailing, Acting Minister of Marine: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 7732 (iv).

Prescott Light Station, Presentation to Dr. W. C. Brown: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 983 (i).

Presbyterian College of Halifax: *See* 'B. No. 154.'

Presbyterian Ministers' Widows and Orphans Fund: *See* 'B. No. 23.'

Preston, W. T. R., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques (Mr. Foster) 360 (i).

Prince Albert Penitentiary Building: in Com. of Sup., 8601 (v).

Prince Albert Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vii).
P.E.I. Fisheries Protection Service, Annual Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 359 (i).
P.E.I. Fishing Bounties, Stmnt. of Payments: M. for Ret.* (Mr. A. Martin) 1295 (i).
P.E.I. and G.B. SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 12264 (vii).
P.E.I. Harbours and Rivers, Expenditures: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 11679 (vi).
P.E.I. Ice-breaker, Contract *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 8444 (v).
——— Date of Signing of Contract: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 10254 (v).
——— Progress *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 365 (i).
P.E.I. Life Saving Station, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 681 (i).
——— Lighthouses, Supplies, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 358 (i).
P.E.I. and Nova Scotia SS. Service, Re-establishing of: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 8383 (v).
P.E.I., Post Offices in Queens County, Complaints *re* Mail Service: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 355 (i).
P.E.I. Public Works, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1686 (i).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2171 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lefurgey) 8696, 9893 (v).
P.E.I. Ry., Alma Station, Pet. *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 6642 (iv).
——— Bear River Station-master's Dwelling, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1737
P.E.I. Branch Lines: *See* 'B. No. 202.'
P.E.I. Ry., Branch Lines, Construction, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. A. Martin) 3242 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on B. 215, 13482 (vii).
P.E.I. Ry., Complaints *re* Excessive Charges, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1123 (i).
——— Construction of Freight Sheds, &c., Specifications, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5086 (iii).
——— Dundas and Avondale Extension, Pet. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 8383 (v).
——— Freight Rates, Delegates from P.E.I., Reps. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 6240 (iv).
——— Harmony-Elmira Branch, Construction: Prop. Res. (Mr. Graham) 12052 (vii).
——— Hillsborough Bridge, Arbitration *re* M. J. Haney's Claims: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) on M. for Sup., 2740 (ii).
——— inquiry for ret. (Mr. Foster) 2882 (ii).
——— remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 7100 (iv).
——— Mail Service, Delays in Distributing &c.: Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com of Sup., 9092 (v).
P.E.I. Ry., Montague Branch. Claims of James Maher, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 3834 (ii).
——— Montague Branch Extension: M. to dsch. Bill (Mr. Graham) 11405 (vi).
——— Murray Harbour Branch, Expenditure and Earnings, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 848 (i).
——— Stanley Bridge Branch, Surveys, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. A. A. McLean) 850 (i).
——— Stanley Bridge Extension, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4829 (iii).
——— Station Agents, Salaries, Pets., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 3236 (ii).
——— Subsidy, Deductions *re* Hillsborough Bridge: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5079 (iii).
——— Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12764 (vii).
——— Tenders *re* News Agency: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 8444 (v).
——— Time-Table, Protest *re* Changes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1123 (i).
——— Train Service between Charlottetown and Murray Harbour: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 568 (i).
P.E.I. Steam Communication with G.B.: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) in Com. of Sup., 13353 (vii).
P.E.I., Terms of Union with Dom., Nonfulfilment of, &c., Memorials, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5801 (iii).
P.E.I., Telegraphic Communication, Com. from Commercial Cable Co. *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 8515 (v).
P.E.I. Tunnel Construction, Reps., &c.: M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Copies, 4589 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lefurgey) 9893 (v).
——— Information *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 562 (i).
P.E.I., Winter Communication, Contract *re* Construction of Steamer: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2546 (ii).
——— Freight carried, Freight Rates, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. A. Martin) 936 (i).
——— Georgetown and Cape George Route, Tests *re*: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) 895 (i).
——— Removal of Steamers from Georgetown Route, Discussion of: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 1109 (i).
——— Withdrawal of Steamer from Georgetown, Discussion: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 1207 (i).
——— M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 1513 (i).
P.E.I. Winter Service, Ice-Breaker Str., Rep. *re* Plans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4583 (iii).
——— Mail Service, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. A. Martin) 1203 (i).

P.E.I., Progress *re* Construction of Ice-breaker: Ques. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 5796 (iii).
—— Winter Communication: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) 4496 (iii).
P.E.I Winter Service, Str. 'Stanley,' Route, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 172 (i).
—— Total Quantity of Freight, Delays, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 843 (i).
Prince Rupert, Customs Collectors, Transfer of Mr. B. R. McDonald: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 6401 (iv).
Printing Bureau, Electric Motor Machines: in Com. of Sup., 7817 (iv).
Printing and Lithographing done outside of Canada, Amounts expended: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1732, 1931 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonell) 2397 (ii).
See 'Lithographing.'
Printing of Parlt., Joint Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 312 (i).
Printing of Parlt., 5th Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. Parmelee) 10915 (vi).
Printing for Postal Service, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5472 (iii).
Printing and Stationary Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 612 (i).
Printing in 'Sun,' &c.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 5661 (iii).
Printing, Supt., Apptmt. of a Frenchman: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 12411 (vii).
Prisons and Reformatories Act *re* N.S.: *See* 'B. No. 166.'
Prisoner, Released: *See* 'Pardoning Power.'
Private Bills Com., Extension of Time: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 891 (i).
Private Bills Fees, Discrepancy between Senate and H. of C.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10122 (v).
Privilege, Ques. of, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen,' *re* Attack on French Canadian Ministers: (Mr. Talbot 4221 (iii).
—— Ques. of *re* Registrar of Grey County (Mr. Telford) 11302 (vi).
Privy Council, Promotions: in Com. of Sup., 12902 (vii).
—— Office, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 610 (i).
Prohibition Vote in Quebec Prov.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 660 (i).
Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen. Sec.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 13580 (vii).
—— Mess. from Senate: Read (Mr. Speaker) 13587 (vii).
—— Speech from Throne, 13590 (vii).
Protection Tariff, ref. to in Debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 74 (i).
Provincial Elections and Federal Ministers' Speeches: Remarks (Mr. Robitaille) 8850 (v).
Provincial Subsidies, Amount paid before and after Adjustment: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 8616 (v).
Provincial Subsidies, Amounts paid under present Agreement and Previously: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 315 (i).
—— Dates of last Payments, &c., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 237 (i).
—— Dates of Payments, Sums owing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 564 (i).
—— Increased Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 173 (i).
—— ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 79; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 61 (i).
Provincial Voters' Lists: in Com. of Sup., 10508 (vi).
See 'Man.,' &c.
Public Accounts Com., Evidence *re* Investigation, Freedom of: Prop. Res. (Mr. Blain) 3070; Neg. (Y. 49; N. 103) 3145 (ii).
—— Ques. of Order (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 3083; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3085 (ii).
Public Accounts Com., Meetings of: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 945 (i).
—— Meetings and Adjournments: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1439 (i).
—— Meetings concurrently with Sittings of Hse.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9504 (v).
—— Production of Original Documents: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 4495 (iii).
Public Accounts Rep. and Aud. Gen.'s Rep.: M. to ref. to Public Accounts Com. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 311 (i).
Public Accounts Com.: M. (Mr. Clarke) to conc. in 3rd Rep., 2159 (ii); M. (Mr. Johnston) to conc., 9890 (v).
—— Production of Original Documents: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 1383 (i).
Public Accounts Com., Sittings concurrently with Hse.: M. (Mr. Finlayson) 9579 (v).
Public Accounts Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 6 (i).
Public Bills and Orders, Govt. Business: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 13493 (vii).
—— Precedence of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3405 (ii).
See 'Business of the House.'
Public Buildings constructed since 1897, Amounts expended, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1130 (i).
—— Policy of Erection, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7189 (iv).
—— Works, Initiated since 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 2170 (ii).
Public Lands Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 181.'
Public Lands of Dom., ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 70 (i).
Public Works Expenditure in Mar. Provs., since 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 555 (i).
Public Works in Harbours and Rivers., Ont., Tenders, Amounts, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bennett) 559 (i).
Public Works, Labour Hours: *See* 'B. No. 97.'

PUBLIC WORKS:
Actonvale Public Building, Total Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 6232 (iv).
Advertisements for Tenders *re* Govt. Works, Supplies, &c.: Amt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) to Com. of Sup., 4702; Neg. (Y. 59; N. 95) (iii).
Annapolis Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11207 (vi).
Anse a la Barbe Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 12028 (vi).
Anse a l'Ilot Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).
Antigonish Public Building: in Com, of Sup., 7110 (iv).
Architects on Public Works, Payments, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7122 (iv).
Arthabaskaville Public Buildin: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
Ashouapmouchouan, Peribonka Training Dykes: in Com. of Sup., 12035 (vi).
Aylmer Drill Shed: Remarks (Mr. Marshall) in Com. of Sup., 10894 (vi).
Baddeck Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11219 (vi).
Baie St. Paul Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).
Barachois Training Pier: in Com. of Sup., 11223, 12029 (vi).
Batiscan River, Dredging Channel: in Com. of Sup., 12036 (vi).
Batiscan Wharf Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).
Battleford Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8576 (v).
Bay St. Lawrence Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).
Beaver Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Beaverton Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12090 (vii).
Becancour, &c., Counties, Dredging at during 1907, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3040 (ii).
Becancour Harbour Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 2392 (ii).
Belle River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12090 (vii).
Belle River Harbour Improvements, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 685 (i).
Belleville Floods, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Porter) 4744 (iii).
Belleville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7678 (iv).
Berthier Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12029 (vi).
Bic Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12030 (vi).
——— Material supplied, Quantity, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 9713 (v).
Big Lorraine Harbour, Dredging Entrance Channel: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Blanche River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12090 (vii).
Blind River Wharf Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12091 (vii).
Bonaventure River Training Pier: in Com. of Sup., 12036 (vi).
Boone, C. S., Co., Amounts paid for Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 4244 (iii).
See 'Dredging,' &c.
Brantford Public Building Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7455 (iv).
Braund, Samuel, Apptmt. as Inspector of Port Maitland Pier: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 5674 (iii).
Breton Cove Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vii).
Bridgewater Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7135 (iv).
Brighton Wharf, Repairs *re*: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 5913 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Owen) in Com. of Sup., 12133, 12138 (vii).
Bronte Harbour, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 5708 (iii).
——— Pier Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 12091 (vii).
Buctouche Channel, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 11679 (vi).
Burlington Channel Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12092 (vii).
Burlington Channel Repairs, Apptmt. of Foreman, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 4403 (iii).
Buildings, Administrative, Erection of: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 10984 (vi).
Buildings, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 10864 (vi). 13338 (vii).
Buildings constructed since 1897, Amounts expended, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1130 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12661 (vii).
——— Papers laid on Table (Mr. Pugsley) 12771 (vii).
Buildings Generally: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).
——— Furniture, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11007 (vi).
——— Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10981 (vi).
——— Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10886 (vi).
Buildings, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 10953 (vi), 13335 (vii).
——— Man. and N.W.T., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8517 (v).
Buildings in Man. and N.W., Amounts paid by Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 698 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Buildings, N.B.: in Com. of Sup 7186 (iv), 13328 (vii).
—— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7110 (iv), 13326 (vii).
—— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7467 (vi), 13331 (vii).
Buildings, Policy of Erection, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7189 (iv).
Buildings and Public Works, Initiated since 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 2170 (ii).
Buildings, P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 7183 (iv).
—— Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
—— Saskatchewan and Alberta: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
Campbellton Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Campbellton Harbour, Gas Buoys, Tender *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 8612 (v).
Campbellton Wharf, Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11685 (vi).
—— Tender *re* Piling Supply, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 8612 (v).
Cap St. Ignace Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12030 (vi).
Cape St. Mary Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).
Caraquet Wharf, Ice-breakers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11685 (vi).
Caribou Island Causeway: in Com. of Sup., 11224 (vi).
Cascumpec Harbour Buoys, Tenders for Placing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 681 (i).
Chapel Point Ferry Wharf, Tenders *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 513 (i).
Charlemagne and Terrebonne Dredging, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 685 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bergeron) 853 (i).
Charlos Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11225 (vi).
Charlotte County Wharf, Pet. *re* Erection: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 5202 (iii).
Chase's Point, N.B., Pet. *re* Wharf: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 7937 (iv).
Chateauguay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12030 (vi).
Chicoutimi Boom, Payments from Pulp Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 8174 (iv).
Chicoutimi Dredging Contract, Tenders *re*: Que. (Mr. Bennett) 7203 (iv).
—— Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup. 12030 (vi).
—— Public Works, Expenditures, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vii).
Chilliwack Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Church Point Wharf, Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 11225 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Chute a Blondeau Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12092 (vii).
Clarke City, Seven Islands: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).
—— Expenditure *re* Public Works: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2394 (ii).
Clerks of Works on Public Buildings: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7119 (iv).
Clifton Breakwater, N.B., Amount of Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 695 (i).
Clifton Wharf Repairs, Extension of Contract: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4831 (iii).
Cobourg Harbour, Amount expended *re* Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 359 (i).
—— Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12095 (vii).
Colborne Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12095 (vii)
Colchester Point, Essex County Pier, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 12652 (vii).
Collingwood Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12096 (vii).
Coteau Landing Wharf, Repairs to, &c.: Ques. (Mr Monk) 9277 (v).
Cow Bay (Port Morien) Breakwater Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 11225 (vi).
Cranbrook Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10864 (vi), 13338 (vii).
Cumberland Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10864 (vi).
Dauphin Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8519 (v).
—— Valuation of Site: Remarks (Mr. Lalor) in Com. of Sup., 10866 (vi).
Dawson City, Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vii).
Deschambault Wharf, Tenders *re*, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5464 (iii).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 5801 (iii).
Digby Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11226 (vi).
Docks, Piers, &c., Constructed at Bayfield, Grand Bend, &c., Cor. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Armstrong) 2397 (ii).
Dorchester Wharf Addition: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Dorval, Dredging at St. Lawrence Yacht Club: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 13060 (vii).
Dover Wharf on Petitcodiac River: in Com. of Sup., 11692 (vi).
Dredging Contracts, Basis of Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9710 (v).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9773, 10259 (v).
—— Midland, &c., Renewals without Tender, O.Cs. *re*: M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 6741 (iv).
—— Payments to Great Lakes Dredging Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1736 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Dredging Contracts, Quebec Harbour: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 7104 (iv).

—— Renewal without Tenders: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 6633 (iv).

See 'Midland,' &c.

Dredging at Fort William, Amount paid to Great Lakes Dredging Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8839 (v).

Dredging at Midland, &c., Advertisements *re* Tenders: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 7195 (iv).

Dredging Works at Nicolet River, &c., Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3896 (ii).

—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 4247 (iii).

Dredging, Ont. and Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).

Dredging in Ontario Harbours, Tenders, Contracts, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 1129 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 9276, 10008 (v).

Dredging Plant (new) for Mar. Provs.: in Com. of Sup., 12142 (vii).

Dredging Plant for St. Lawrence River (lower): in Com. of Sup., 4754 (iii).

Dredging in Quebec Counties in 1907, Tenders, Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3240 (ii).

Dredging in Quebec Province, Claims Pending, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7200 (iv).

Dredging at Rigaud River, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Boyer) 6240 (iv).

Dredging in Vaudreuil County, Supt.'s Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4587 (iii)

East Templeton Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).

Edmonton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 5705 (iii), 8579 (v), 13336 (vii).

Elmwood Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vii).

Emerson Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8534 (v), 13335 (vii).

Escoumains Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).

Estevan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8581 (v), 13336 (vii).

Fairville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).

Father Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).

Fernie Public Building, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 5706 (iii), 10866 (iv).

'Fielding,' Dredge, Number of Days Working, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 7199 (iv).

Garthby Wharf, Inspection by Midraud, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 3844 (ii).

Gatineau Point Bridge, Sums contributed by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 355 (i).

Georgetown Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7182 (iv).

Glace Bay, Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11228 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Glace Bay, Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7139 (iv).

Glencoe Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7486 (iv), 13331 (vii).

Gobeil, Mr., Dep. Min. of Public Works, Retirement, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1452 (i).

Goderich Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).

Goderich Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12101 (vii).

—— Claims of Smeeth & McGillicuddy: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).

Godfroi River Wharf, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3423 (ii).

Gore's Landing Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12101 (vii).

Grand Bend Pier, Final Estimate of Chief Engineer Lafleur: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8892 (v).

—— Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5085 (iii).

See 'Wharfs.'

Grand Falls Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).

Grand Forks Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).

Grand Marais Harbour, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 12140 (vii).

Grand Mechins Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).

Grand Mere Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).

Grandes Piles Dam, Amount voted, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 13059 (vii).

Grande Riviere Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12031 (vi).

Grand River Wharf, Tenders, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 8382 (v).

Graving Docks, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5731 (iii).

Greenwood Public Building: in Com. of Sup. 13338 (vii).

Halifax, Dominion Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7140 (v).

Hall's Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11228 (vi).

Hamilton, Public Works Employees at, Delay in Payment: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10015, 10119 (v).

Harbours and Rivers, Generally, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11693, 12031 (vi).

—— Man.: in Com. of Sup., 5701 (iii).

—— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).

—— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 13341 (vii).

—— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 133350 (vii).

Harbours and Rivers, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 13341 (vii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Harbours and Rivers, P.E.I., General Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 11292 (vi).
Harbours and Rivers, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 13349 (vii).
—— Sask. and Alberta: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Harriston Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vii).
Harvey Bank Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Higgin's Shore Pier Wharf, Pet. *re* Extension: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 694 (i).
Hillsborough Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vii).
Holland River Dredging, Contract with Lake Simcoe Dredging Co.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2980 (ii).
—— Divisional Engineer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 4767 (iii).
—— Name of Inspector, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3037 (ii).
Howard's Cape Wharf, Pet. *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 11702 (vi).
Hudson, Dredging, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4587 (iii).
Humboldt Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8582 (v).
Hunter, J. B., Apptmt. as Dep. Min. of Public Works: in Com. of Sup., 1452 (i).
Inverness Harbour, Purchase of McIsaac's Pond: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5792 (iii).
Inverness Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7172 (iv).
—— Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5997 (iii).
Jesus River Dredging, Payments to Mr. Morgan: Ques. (Mr. Desjardins) 6980 (iv).
Juniper Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Kincardine Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7698 (iv).
'King Edward' Dredge, Emplymt. in Lunenburg Harbour: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 13063 (vii).
Knowlton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
Lachine Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 12097 (vii).
Lachute Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
'Lady of the Lake,' Str., purchased by Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 3434 (ii).
Ladysmith Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10866 (vi), 13338 (vii).
Ladysmith Wharf, B.C., Cost of: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8176 (iv).
Lake Ainslie Boat Channel: in Com. of Sup., 11228 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Lake Aylmer, Wharf at Garthby: in Com. of Sup., 12032 (vi).
Lake Dauphin, Lowering Lake: in Com. of Sup., 12141 (vii).
Lakefield Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Lake Francois Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Morin) in Com. of Sup., 12138 (vii).
Lake Megantic Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12032 (vi).
Lake Megantic Public Works, Total Cost to Date, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 11299 (vi).
Lake St. Francis Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Lake St. John Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Lake St. Peter Piers: in Com. of Sup., 4752 (iii).
Lakeville Harbour Opening: in Conc., 13568 (vii).
Lavaltrie Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi)
Leamington Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7705, 7815 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Lennox Island Wharf, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 8444 (v).
Leonardsville Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
—— Report *re* Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6463 (iv).
Les Eboulements Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Lesser Slave Lake, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 5719 (iii).
—— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Listowel Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vii).
Little Current Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Little Sands Wharf, Repairs, &c., Cor. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 2397 (ii).
Loggieville, Dredging, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 9472 (v).
Longueuil Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7304 (iv).
Lorneville Breakwater Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).
Lotbinière Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).
Lower Newcastle Wharf on Miramichi River: in Com. of Sup., 11695 (vi).
Lunenburg Public Building Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13326 (vii).
McGregor's Creek, Bank Protection: in Com. of Sup., 12103 (vii).
McPherson's Cove Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11229, 11292 (vi).
Madawaska River, Extension Dyke: in Com. of Sup., 11696 (vi), 13344 (vii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Magdalen Islands, Breakwater and Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12033 (vi).

Magnetawan River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).

Magog Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7306 (iv), 13329 (vii).

Malbay (Gaspé) Boat Shelter: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).

Maple Creek, Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8600 (v), 13337 (vii).

Margaree Shear Dam: in Com. of Sup., 11229 (vi).

Marieville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7306 (iv).

Mar. Provs. Harbours and Rivers, Creosoted Timber: in Com. of Sup., 12028 (vi).

Markham Public Building: in Com of Sup., 7709 (iv), 13331 (vii).

Maskinonge River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12037 (vi).

Matane Breakwater and Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).

Matchedash Bay, Dredging at Fesserton, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 566 (i).

Meaford Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12103 (vii).

Medicine Hat Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8601 (v).

——Contract *re* Heating System: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 10791 (vi).

Megantic Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).

Michipicoton Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).

Middle River, Shear Dam Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11229 (vi).

Midland Harbour, Tenders for Dredging: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3239 (ii), 8893 (v).

Midland and Tiffin Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12103 (vii).

——Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3428 (ii).

Midland, Tiffin and Victoria Harbour Dredging, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8181 (iv).

Milford Haven, N.S. Wharf, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 13060 (vii).

Miscou Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 13344 (vii).

Mitchell Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).

Moncton Wharf Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 11696 (vi).

'Montague' Dredge, Amounts paid for Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 182 (i).

——Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 8172 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Montmagny and Cap St. Ignace Wharfs, Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1288 (i).

Montmagny Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).

Montmorency Falls, Retaining Walls, Length, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 12410 (vii).

Montreal Harbour and St. Lawrence River, Dredging and Elevator Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1683 (i).

Montreal and Quebec Ports, Expenditure for the last fifty Years, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 3482 (ii).

Moose Jaw Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vii).

——Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).

Mount Forest Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vii).

Neepawa Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8536 (v), 13335 (vii).

N.B. Inland Water Wharf, Construction Policy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 5465 (iii).

New Glasgow Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 11257 (vi).

New London Breakwater Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 11292 (vi).

New Mills Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13345 (vii).

Nicolet County, Govt. Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Turcotte) 12775 (vii).

Nicolet Harbour Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).

Nicolet Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7428 (iv).

Nicolet River Dredging, Emplymt. of Narcisse Jutras: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11936 (vi).

——Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3840 (ii), 4588 (iii).

Nicolet River Protection Walls, Repairs, Expenditure *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 4588 (iii).

Nicolet River Wharf, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3478 (ii).

North Bay, Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7712, 7810 (iv), 13332 (vii).

North East Harbour Wharf, Total Length: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 11019 (vi).

Notre Dame de Portage Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).

——Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6400 (iv).

Old Man's River: in Com. of Sup., 12142 (vii).

Oromocto Shoals, Contract *re* Dredging: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11496 (vi).

Ottawa Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Ottawa Buildings, Archives Fitting, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5700 (iii).
——— Canadian Building, Rental, Space, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5207 (iii).
——— Corry Building, Total Rental per Annum, Taxes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 11938 (vi).
——— Eastern Block Extension: in Com. of Sup., 1504 (i).
——— Elevator Attendants: in Com. of Sup., 11011 (vi).
——— Experimental Farm Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vii).
——— Heating, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11009 (vi), 13340 (vii).
——— Improvements, Repairs, &c.: in Com of Sup., 5707 (iii).
——— Langevin Block Basement, Number of Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3483 (ii).
——— Lighting, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11011 (vi).
——— Mackenzie Avenue: in Com. of Sup., 1505 (i).
——— Major's Hill Park: in Com. of Sup., 11015 (vi).
——— Mint, in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i).
——— Mint Building, Imperfect Ventilation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 3036 (ii).
——— Renewing Skylights: in Com. of Sup., 7816 (iv).
——— Rentals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5706 (iii), 10983 (vi).
——— list read (Mr. Pugsley) 10998 (vi).
——— Repairs, Furniture, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10981 (vi).
——— Rideau Hall, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11005 (vi).
——— Rideau Hall Improvements, Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5467 (iii).
——— Sussex Street Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 5701 (iii), 13478 (vii).
——— Sussex Street Property Purchase, Payments to Jos. Riopelle: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3844 (ii)
——— Telephones: in Com. of Sup., 11012 (vi).
——— Victoria Memorial Museum: in Com. of Sup., 1489 (i), 13477 (vii).
——— progress *re* construction: Remarks (Mr. Blain) on conc., 13568 (vii).
——— Western Block Extension, Total Cost, Area, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 512 (i).
Ouelle River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12037 (vi).
Owen Sound Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7817 (iv).
——— Contract *re* Extension: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3039 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Owen Sound Public Building, Sub-letting of Contract by Leslie: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3039 (ii).
Owen Sound Building Inspector, Apptmt. of Mr. Foster, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3039 (ii).
Owen Sound Dredging Co., Payments to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2792 (ii).
Oyster Pond Breakwater Extension: in Com of Sup., 11258 (vi).
Parker's Cove Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11258 (vi).
Park Hill Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Parrsborough Harbour Improvements: in Com., of Sup., 11259 (vi).
——— Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup, 13327 (vii).
Pelican Lake Channel, Opening of: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1940 (i).
Petawawa Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12133 (vii).
——— Ques. (Mr. White) 685 (i).
Petite Descharge, Lac St. Jean, Removal of Rock: in Com. of Sup., 12034 (vi).
Petit Rocher Breakwater, Contracts, O.Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Taylor) 1294 (i).
——— Incomplete Return: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 5723 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Taylor) 6464 (iv).
——— Papers laid on Table (Mr. Pugsley) 10402 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 7107 (iv).
——— Stmnt. as to Missing Letters: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 9716 (v).
Piche Point (Lake Temiscaming) Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12035 (vi).
Pictou Post Office Building, Concrete Sidewalk, Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 10518 (vi).
Pinette Harbour, P.E.I., Pets. *re* Dredging: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 685 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 9474 (v).
Plessisville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7430 (iv), 13330 (vii).
Point Edward Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 5713 (iii).
Point Prim Wharf, P.E.I., Completion of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3898 (ii).
Pointe aux Trembles Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12035 (vi).
——— Contract of Messrs. Dusseault & Pageau, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8838 (v).
——— Date of Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9267 (v).
——— Number of Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1734 (i), 2394 (ii).
Poirierville Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 11260 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Portage la Prairie Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
Port Arthur and Fort William, Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12144 (vii).
——— Dredging, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8617 (v).
Port Arthur Harbour, Dredging Contracts, Securities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 697 (i).
Port Arthur Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7825 (iv).
Port Burwell, Harbour Improvement: in Com .of Sup., 12135 (vii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 2389 (ii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Marshall) 556 (i).
Port Colborne Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12146 (vii).
Port Credit Harbour, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 10513 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 12101 (vii).
Port Dufferin Dredging, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 4828 (iii).
Porter's Lake Boat Channel: in Com. of Sup., 11260 (vi)
Port Hastings Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11265 (vi).
Port Hilford Breakwater, Protection: in Com. of Sup., 11267 (vi).
Port Hood Harbour, Closing Northern Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 11268 (vi).
——— Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10255 (v).
Port Hope Pier, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12135 (vii).
Port Joli West, Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11279 (vi).
Port Maitland Piers, Tenders, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Lalor) 1294 (i).
——— Amount of Mr. Battle's Tender: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 690 (i).
——— Apptmt. of W. W. Krick as Inspector: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 6919 (iv).
——— Entrance Pier, Renewal: in Com. of Sup., 5673 (iii).
Port Royal (Madame Island) Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11278 (vi).
Port St. François Wharf, Construction, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3423 (ii).
Port Stanley Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12136 (vii).
——— Breakwater, Contractors, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 239 (i).
Portuguese Cove Breakwater Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11279 (vi).
Port Vernon Bridge, P.E.I., Completion of Work, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 4404 (iii).
Post Offices, Fittings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11007 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Prince Albert, Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vii).
——— Penitentiary Building: in Com. of Sup., 8601 (v).
P.E.I. Public Works, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1686 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lefurgey) 9893 (v).
Public Works Dept., Architectural Branch, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11096 (vi).
——— Clerical and Temporary Clerks: in Com. of Sup., 11099 (vi).
——— Ass't Dep. Minister, Apptmt. of: in Com. of Sup., 5698 (iii).
——— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Pugsley) 7 (i).
——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 638 (i), 12917 (vii).
——— Engineering Branch, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11093 (vi).
——— Estimates, Discussion *re*: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) 5661 (iii).
——— Estimates, Discussion *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5730 (iii).
——— Gratuities to Public Works Officials: in Com. of Sup., 5730 (iii).
——— New Appointments: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 13061 (vii).
——— Ret.: on Inquiry for (Mr. Pugsley) 6223 (iv).
——— Technical Books of Reference: in Com. of Sup., 11100 (vi).
——— Telegraph Branch, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11097 (vi).
——— Unprovided Items: in Com. of Sup., 11119 (vi).
Public Works, Estimated Cost, Extravagant Expenditure, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 7145 (iv).
Public Works Expenditures: Amt. (Mr. Perley) to Com. of Sup., 4868, 4886; Neg. (Y. 43, N. 99) 4959 (iii).
Public Works Expenditure in Mar. Provs., since 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 555 (i).
Public Works in Harbours and Rivers, Ont., Tenders, Amounts, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bennett) 559 (i).
Pugwash Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11279 (vi).
Quebec County, Expenditures by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 3847 (ii).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Robitaille) 3853 (ii).
Quebec Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 7432 (iv).
Quebec Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12144 (vii).
——— Specifications, Stmnt. of Expenditure, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lennox) 5802 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Quebec Port, Sums expended for Improvements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 176 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Paquet) 697 (i).
Quesnel Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10867 (vi).
Rainy River, Long Sault Rapids: in Com. of Sup., 12136 (vii).
Raquette River Dredging, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4587 (ii).
——— Correction of Answer (Mr. Pugsley) 5658 (iii).
Red Head Wharf, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 11019 (vi).
Renfrew Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7825 (iv).
Revelstoke Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vii).
Richelieu River Ice Piers, St. John: in Com. of Sup., 12037 (vi).
Richibucto, Extension of Piers: in Com. of Sup., 11698 (vi).
——— Wharf, Length, Purchase Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 12412 (vii).
Rimouski County Public Works, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10013 (v).
Rimouski Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12035 (vi).
Rivière a la Graisse Dredging, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 686 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bergeron) 853 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Bergeron) 3689 (ii).
Rivière du Lievre, Lock and Dam: in Com. of Sup., 12037 (vi).
Rivière du Loup Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 6462 (iv).
Rivière du Loup Post Office, Improvement to Grounds: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6399 (iv).
Rivière du Loup Wharf, Total Expenditure *re* Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 6462 (iv).
Rivière du Loup (Fraserville) Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12036 (vi).
Roberval, Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
Roche's Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12136 (vii).
Rondeau Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Rossport Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Round Hill Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11282 (vi).
Ruscombe River Works, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1122 (i).
Rustico Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11293 (vi).
St. Alphonse (de Bagotville) Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

St. Andrew's Rapids, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5701 (iii), 12011 (vi), 12145 (vii).
St. Anicet Wharf, Apptmt. of Mr. Dupuis, Revenues, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3230 (ii).
——— Expenditure and Collections, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1935 (i).
——— Expenditure by Public Works Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3479 (ii).
Ste. Anne de Monts Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).
St. Boniface Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8566 (v).
——— Contract Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 4246 (iii).
——— Purchase of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5999 (iii).
St. Francis River, Ice Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12040 (vi).
——— Melbourne Pier, Rock Removal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 6918 (iv).
——— Piers at Richmond, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 6641, 6918 (iv).
St. Francois Island of Orleans: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Fulgence Pier, Signatures on Paymaster's List: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1115 (i).
——— Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bergeron) 1130 (i).
St. Hyacinthe Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7440 (iv).
St. Ignace de Loyola Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Jacques River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).
St. Jean des Chaillons Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Jean, Island of Orleans Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. John, Dom. Buildings, Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7186 (iv).
——— Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
St. John Harbour Improvements, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 5708 (iii), 12011 (vi).
——— Contracts with Dom. Dredging Co.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11700 (vi).
——— Dredging Contracts, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11496 (vi).
St. John River, Removal of Snags, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 3477 (ii).
——— Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 13345 (vii).
——— Tidal Waters Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 12000 (vi).
——— Tributaries: in Com. of Sup., 11698 (vi).
——— Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 13345 (vii).
St. Joseph's Wharf, Ont., Tenders, &c., *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8890 (v).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
St. Laurent Wharf: Expenditure *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 895, 1121 (i).
St. Laurent Wharf, Island of Orleans: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Louis River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12040 (vi).
St. Mary's Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7826 (iv).
St. Mary's River, Kaministiquia, Port Arthur, &c., Dredging Contracts, Expenditure *re*, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 853 (i).
St. Maurice, Dam at Grande Piles: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).
St. Omer Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Pierre les Becquets Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Rochs Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7433 (iv).
St. Simeon Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Thérèse Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
Saguenay River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12040 (vi).
——— Purchase of Coal: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 8380 (v).
——— 'Storm King,' Tug, Emplymt. of: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 8381 (v).
Sarnia Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7829 (iv).
Saskatoon Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8602 (v), 13337 (vii).
Sault Ste. Marie Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Scotch Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11290 (vi).
Scotch Town Wharf, Application: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 7202 (iv).
Seaforth Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Seal Cove Dredging, Rep. *re* Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6463 (iv).
Selkirk Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8547 (v).
Seven Islands, Public Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2394 (ii).
Severn River, Improvement of Waterway: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Shawenegan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
Shelburne Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7173 (iv).
Shellmouth River Bridge: in Com. of Sup., 12143 (vii).
Sherbrooke Public Building, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Shippegan Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12027 (vi).
Simcoe Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7830 (iv), 13333 (vii).
'Sir Wilfrid Laurier,' Dredge, Completion, Cost of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5207 (iii).
Skinner's Cove, Pier Protection: in Com. of Sup., 11290 (vi).
——— Boat Channel, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 10012 (v).
Slides and Booms Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 11071 (vi).
Snag Boat, Red River, Construction of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 567 (i).
Sorel, Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
Souris Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13341 (vii).
——— Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1685 (i).
Souris Harbour Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1939 (i).
Souris Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
Souris Wharf, Permission to Build, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 7728 (iv).
Southampton Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Spanish River Dredging, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4764 (iii).
Spillumcheen River Bank Protection: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Spry Bay Wharf, Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2391 (ii).
Stanley Island Wharf and Pier, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5720 (iii).
Strathcona Horse, Barracks, Stables, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10975 (vi).
Strathcona Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Sudbury Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).
Summerside Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13343 (vii).
Surveys, Slides and Booms: in Com. of Sup., 11071 (vi).
Sydney Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11230 (vi).
Taché, J. C., Apptmt. in Public Works Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 8180 (iv).
Tancook Island Breakwater :in Com. of Sup., 11230 (vi).
Tatamagouche Bay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11290 (vi).
Tatamagouche Dredging, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 11701 (vi).
Temiskaming Wharf, Montreal River: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Thames River Wharf, Damages to: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 7506 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Thompson River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Three Rivers, Deep Water Coal Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13349 (vii).
——— Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
——— Dredging, Tenders *re* Owen Sound Dredging Co.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8892 (v).
Tiffin Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5709 (iii), 13351 (vii).
Tignish Breakwater, P.E.I.: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 11679 (vi).
——— Pet. *re* Extension: Ques. (Mr. Leurgey) 682 (i).
——— Repairs: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 3229 (iii)
Tilbury Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vii).
Tilsonburg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).
Tobermory Harbour Booms: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Toney River Boat Harbour, Amount of Contract, Extras, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9711 (v).
Toronto Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Toronto (eastern gap) Harbour, Amount of Dredging, &.: Ques. (Mr. Madonell) 354 (i).
——— Contract, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 10014 (v).
——— Date of Murray & Cleveland's Contract, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1507 (i).
——— M. for Copies* (Mr. Macdonell) 2397 (ii).
Toronto (western gap) Harbour, Construction of Entrance: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 354, 518, (i), 4587 (iii).
——— Delay in Contract: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 5915 (iii).
Toronto Island Tunnel, Deputation *re* Construction by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 5564 (iii).
Tracadie Harbour Breakwater, Pet. *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5472 (iii).
Tracadie Lazaretto, Laundry, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7187 (iv).
Tracadie Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 13349 (vii).
Uxbridge Public Building: Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).
Vancouver, Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vii).
——— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10868 (vi).
Varennes Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Vaudreuil County, Dredging, Supt.'s Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4587 (iii).
Vernon Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10870 (vi), 13339 (vii).
Vernon River Bridge, P.E.I., Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5471 (iii).
Victoria Beach Piers, Amounts expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 237 (i).
Victoria Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Victoria Harbour, Tenders for Dredging: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8803 (v).
Walkerville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).
Waterloo Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).
Welchpool, N.B., Wharf, Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 7935 (iv).
Welland Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7830 (iv).
Westmount Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
Westville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7179 (iv).
——— Total Amount of Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9474 (v).
Wetaskiwin Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Wharfs and Bridges in Quebec, Construction of: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vii).
Wharfs, Piers, Amount of Revenue collected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 2391 (ii).
Wharfs, Piers and Harbours, Expenditure since 1895: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5078 (iii).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 5476 (iii).
——— Expenditure *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Blain) 5800, 5802 (iii).
Wharfs, Piers, &c., and other Public Works, Expenditure since Jan. 1st, 1897, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1130 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4867 (iii).
Whitby Public Building; in Com. of Sup., 7833 (iv).
White Head Wharf, Report *re* Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6463 (iv).
Wiarton Dredging, Payments to Mr. Bowman: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 6407 (iv).
——— Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 6236 (iv).
Winfield Basin Dredging, Tender, Inspection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 6461 (iv).
William's Head Quarantine Station Building: in Com. of Sup., 10883 (vi).
Winnipegosis Lake Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12141 (vii).
Winnipeg River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12138 (vii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Wolfville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13327 (vii).
Yamaska River Dredging: in Com of Sup., 5708 (iii), 12043 (vi).
Yamaska River Lock: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).
Yarmouth, N.S., Dredging Contracts, Tenders, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11500 (vi).
——— Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11291 (vi).
——— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7180 (iv).
Pugwash Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11279 (vi).
Pulp Wood Exported to U.S., Quantity, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beland) 1511 (i).
Pulp Wood Export Duty: Prop. Res. (Mr. Lewis) 4774 (iii).
See 'Wood.'
Quahaug and Clam Fishing, Contemplated Change: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1940 (i).
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry., &c., Cost of Mail Service: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1130 (i).
——— Last Deficit, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 6459 (iv).
Quarantine Lands, Sask., Sale of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3481 (ii).
Quarantine Public Health: in Com. of Sup., 5504 (iii).
Quarantine Stations: in Com. of Sup., 11008 (vi).
Quarter Sections, 35, 31, 6, &c., Public and Private Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 8176 (iv).
Quebec Battlefields: *See* 'B. Nos 111 and 219.'
Que. Bridge and Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 217.'
Quebec Bridge Accident, Apptmt. of Engineer Hoare: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 8173 (iv).
Quebec Bridge, Bank Claims, &c.: Corrected Information (Mr. Fielding) 6059 (iii)
——— Change of Plans *re* Height: Ques. (Mr Armstrong) 5202 (iii).
——— Construction Materials, Customs Duties collected: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5793 (iii).
——— Cor., Plans, Specifications, O.Cs., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 605 (i).
——— Dom. Govt. Guarantee, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 2394 (ii).
——— Govt. Grants, Investigation *re*: M. for Sel. Com.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2547 (ii).
——— G.T.P., Agreement *re* Rentals: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 13227 (vii).
——— Horse and Vehicle Traffic: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 10739 (vi).
——— Material, Customs Duties collected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5200 (iii).
——— Material on Hand, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1290 (i).
Quebec Bridge, Moneys contributed *re* Finances, Estimated Cost of Completion: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5566 (iii).
——— Names of Jurymen, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 7991 (iv).
Quebec Bridge and Ry. Commission: in Com of Sup., 12769 (vii).
Quebec Bridge, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 30; (Mr. Monk) 535 (i).
——— Report, Distribution of Printed Copies: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5914 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Monk) 10302 (vi).
——— Evidence, &c.: M. (Mr. Maclean) to ref. to Special Com., 10401 (vi).
——— Inquiry for Report (Mr. R. L. Borden) 946, 1739 (i), 3043 (ii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 3043, 4494 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Haggart) 6223 (iv).
——— Report: Presented (Mr. Graham) 4566 (iii), 10915 (vi).
Quebec Bridge, Commission's Report, Printing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6924, 7099, 8171 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Monk) 8608 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Barker) 3901 (ii).
Quebec Bridge, Rep. of Special Com.: M. (Mr. Chisholm) to conc., 13353, Amt. (Mr. Monk) 13363, Neg. (Y. 52; N. 103) 13414 (vii).
Quebec Bridge, Salaries to Officials: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 13517 (viii).
Quebec Bridge Subsidy, Apptmt. of Committee, 8440 (v).
Quebec Canals, Steam Road Rollers: in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).
Quebec, Citadel Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 7430 (iv).
——— Cliff Walls, Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 12148 (vii).
Quebec Conty, Expenditures by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 3847 (ii).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Robitaille) 3853 (ii).
Quebec, Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 7431 (iv).
——— Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 7432 (iv).
Quebec Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12144 (vii).
——— Specifications, Stmnt. of Expenditure, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lennox) 5802 (iii).
Quebec Immigrant Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7432 (iv).
——— Immigrant Hospital: in Com. of Sup., 7432 (iv).
Quebec Judges, Apptmt. to Superior Court: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 11825 (vi), 12190 (vii).
——— Additional Apptmts.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. on B. 206, 13048 (vii).
——— Apptmt. of Additional Judge: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 1288 (i).

Que. and N. B. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 128'
Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13290 (vii).
Quebec and Lake St. John Ry., Branch Lines Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13300 (vii).
Quebec, Montreal and Southern Ry. Co.'s Bridge Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13306 (vii).
Quebec Port Improvements, Expenditure since Confederation, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Paquet) 697 (i).
Quebec Ry. Light and Power Co.: *See* 'B. No. 73.'
Quebec Religious Feuds, Letter of Rev. Mr. Dumesnil to Papal Ablegate, Signed 'P.M. G.': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Lemieux) 11501 (vi).
Quebec Port, Sums expended for Improvements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 176 (i).
Quebec Reviews, Expenditure: in Com. of Sup. 13176 (vii).
Quebec Tercentenary, Attendance of Rural Corps: Letter Read (Mr. Blain) 8694 (v).
—— Attendance of Veterans: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7998 (iv), 8695 (v).
—— Battlefields: *See* 'B. Nos. 111 and 129.'
—— Food Supply: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 13176 (vii).
—— Joint Meeting of Members and Senators: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 6061 (iii).
—— Legal Holidays: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7934 (iv).
—— Mobilization of Militia, Abandonment of; Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 8851 (v).
—— Number of Troops to be sent, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10259 (v).
—— Par. in 'Le Canada': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 4669 (iii).
—— Protests from Regiments *re* Attendance: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 7992 (iv).
—— Rep. of Commission: Remarks (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7449 (iv).
—— Rural Corps, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 10292 (v).
—— Transportation of Troops: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 8377, 8384; City Corps, &c. (Mr. S. Hughes) 8386 (v).
Quebec Tercentary Postage Stamps, French and English Printing: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7935 (v).
—— Issue of: Ques. (Mr. McColl) 12414 (vii).
—— Remarks (Mr. A. Lavergne) 8895 (v).
Quebec Tercentenary, Visit of Prince of Wales, Par. in Halifax 'Chronicle': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 5209 (iii).
Quesnel Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10867 (vi).
Questions, Answering of, Ques. of Order (Mr. Monk) 234; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 234 (i).
—— Precedence of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 350 (i).
Ques. of Privilege, Anti-Catholic Article in 'Leader' (Mr. Bergeron) 8604 (v).
—— *re* Doukhobors: (Mr. S. Hughes) 7321
—— Hunter, Mr., and French Canadians (Mr. Robitaille) 8465 (v).
—— Par. in 'La Presse' *re* Vote on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) 2022 (ii).
—— *re* Stmnts of Mr. Conmee (Mr. Boyce) 7995 (iv).
Quilty, H. A., Examination *re* Train Despatcher: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 13225 (vii).
Ry. Act. Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 85 and 100.'
Ry. Act, B. 3: Ques. of Order, ref. to debate in Senate: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 577 (i).
Ry. Act Amt. B. No. 6 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on Order for 2° (remarks) 938 (i).
—— B. No. 27 (Mr. Macdonald) on Order for 2°: Remarks (Mr. Johnston) 5211 (iii).
Ry. Act (construction) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 4.'
—— (demurrage) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 6.'
—— (8-hour day) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 157.'
—— (employees' liability) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 212.'
—— (expropriation) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 30.'
—— (fire damages) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 18.'
—— (level crossings) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 3.'
—— (mileage books) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 90.'
—— (ry. commission) Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 11 & 112.'
—— (ry. commission) Amt. B. No. 118 (Mr. Graham) rsmg. adjn. debate on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to M. for 3° (Mr. Aylesworth) 11590; Amt., Neg. (Y. 36, N. 77) 11600; Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 11602; Amt. (Mr. (Mr. Monk) 11603; Neg. (Y. 36, N. 89) 11608 (vi); Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 11614, 11619; Neg. (Y. 40; N. 74) 11631; Amt. (Mr. Macdonell) 11632 (vi).
—— (securities) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 204.'
—— (telegraphers, &c.) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 118.'
—— (trains on time) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 106.'
—— (wires, &c.) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 43.'
—— (working hours) Amt. B. No. 157 (Mr. R. Smith): Remarks (Mr. Monk) 10120 (v)
Railway Commission, Applications *re* Crossing of Tracks, by Water Mains, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barr) 1294 (i).
—— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Graham) 7 (i).
—— Increase of. *See* 'B. No 112.'
—— Jurisdiction of: *See* 'B. Nos. 11 and 118.'
—— Legal Expenditures: in Com. of Sup., 10362 (vi).
—— Salaries and Maintenance: in Com. of Sup., 10385 (vi).
—— Total Expenditure in Counsel Fees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 10256 (v).
Ry. Mail Clerk at Edmonton, Expenses *re* Trial: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 9108 (v).

Ry. Subsidies: *See* 'B. No. 215.'
Railway Surveys, Colchester County, Subsidies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2980 (ii).
—— Corrected Answer (Mr. Graham) 5046 (iii).
Railway Tracks, Crossing by Water Mains, Applications to Board, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 1109 (i).
Rails purchased from Govt. by N. B. Coal and Ry. Co., Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 9269 (v).
RAILWAYS :
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Subsidies, Reports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 892 (i).
Belleville and North Hastings Ry. and G.T. Ry. Co.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Northrup) 2796 (ii).
Brockville and Ottawa, Ry. Connections. Charges against Ry. Commission: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 1429 (i).
—— M. (Mr. Taylor) to adjn. Hse., 186 (i).
—— Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Taylor) 9 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 432 (i).
See 'G.T.R..' &c.
Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Ontario Ry. Co., Exercise of Powers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Owen) 236 (i).
Canada Eastern Ry., Cattle killed, Compensation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Loggie) in Com. of Sup., 13175 (vii).
Canadian Northern Ry., Rep. of Engineer *re* Erwood and Pas Missions: Remarks (Mr. Lake) 13475 (vii).
C. P. Ry., Compensation *re* Right of Way: in Com. of Sup., 5561 (iii).
—— Land Taxation, Test Cases, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lake) 2170 (ii).
—— Saskatchewan Bridge Subsidy: in Com of Sup., 13305 (vii).
—— Taxation Cases: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lake) 5049 (iii).
Central Ry. of Canada, Charter Grant, Deposit *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 4767 (iii).
Falconer, K., Payments by Ry. Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10211 (v).
Freight Rates, Discrimination *re* City of St. John, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr Crocket) 2397 (ii).
French Language on Ry. Crossings, &c. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 2021 (ii).
Govt. Railways System: *See* 'I.C.R., &c.'
G.T. Ry., Connection at Brockville: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Taylor) 9 (i).
—— Connections at Prescott: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 433 (i).
See 'Brockville,' &c.
G.T. Ry. and C.P.R. Connection at Wingham: Remarks (Mr. P. H. McKenzie) 191 (i).
RAILWAYS—*Con.*
G.T. Ry., Entrance into Toronto, O.Cs., Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Macdonell) 556 (i).
G.T.P. and N.T. Ry., Disputed Questions: (Mr. Barker) 6235 (iv).
Hudson Bay Railway, Construction, &c.: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Knowles) 6291 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. Borden) on Financial Review, 13467 (ii).
—— Proposition *re* Construction by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. W .J. Roche) 5789 (iii).
—— Railway Building to Fort Churchill, &c., Cor., Documents, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Schaffner) 1689 (i).
—— Surveys, Locations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12764 (vii).
Indiantown and Blackville Branch Ry., Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12258 (vii).
International Ry., N.B., Directors, Amount of Stocks, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 4246 (iii).
Inverness County, Ry. Accommodation: in Com. of Sup. (Mr. McLennan) 12233 (vii).
Labour Organizations *re* Ry. Employees, Par. in Halifax 'Herald': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 8289 (v).
Land Grants, Amounts and Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 4766 (iii), 9271 (v).
Land Grants to Rys. in Man. and N. W. Ters., Areas reserved on July 1st, 1896; Ques. (Mr. Crawford) 13512 (vii).
Land Grants in Man., Sask. and Alberta, Total Acreage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 6920 (iv).
Land Grants to Rys. prior to 1896, Total Acreage: Ques. (Mr. W. McIntyre) 8182 (iv).
Land Subsidies to Rys., Areas granted from 1892-06: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 8613 (v).
National Transcontinental: *See* 'G.T.P.'
N.B. Coal and Ry. Co., Balance of Subsidy, Claims *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 9270 (v).
—— Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 9714 (v).
New York Central, Discrimination by Ry. Commission: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 10328 (vi).
Rails purchased from Govt. by N. B. Coal and Ry. Co., Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 9269 (v).
Railway Arbitrations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10329 (vi).
Railway Bridge Subsidies: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. on Res., 13309 (vii).
Ry. Charters and Land Grants, Renewals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 9271 (v).
Railway Connections, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Alcorn) 434 (i).
Railways and Canals, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Graham) 7 (i).
—— Extra Clerks: in Com. of Sup., 10342

RAILWAYS—*Con.*
Railway Estimates, Obstruction in Sup.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10129 (v)
——— Vote for: Remarks (Mr. Graham) 10007 (v).
Railways Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 10341 (vi).
Railways, Litigation Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 10357 (vi).
Railways and Municipalities, Agreements, Penalties *re* Violations: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 6987 (iv).
Railways Statistical Branch: in Com. of Sup., 10328 (vi).
Railway Statistics Report: Presented (Mr. Graham) 1346 (i).
Ry. Subsidies, Applications for, Memorandum: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. on Res., 13304 (vii).
Ry. Subsidies: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12771 (vii).
Toronto and Schomberg Ry. Blockade: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 3901 (ii).
White Pass Ry. Co., (Appeal of Dawson Board of Trade: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 10736 (vi).
Rainy River, Long Sault Rapids: in Com. of Sup., 12136 (vii).
Rama Indian Fund, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 8610 (v).
Ramsland Homestead Entry, Improvements, &c,: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5209 (iii).
Ranchvale Homestead Entries, Receipts, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5258 (iii).
Ranchvale Sub-land Agency, Closing of: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 4829 (iii).
Rankin, Col., Resignation of: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 11405 (vi).
Raquette River Dredging, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4587 (iii).
——— Correction of Answer (Mr. Pugsley) 5658 (iii).
Rattenbury & Co., Purchase of Seed Oats, Assignment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 12392 (vii).
Receiver-General's Office: in Com. of Sup., 12160 (vii).
Red Ensign Flying from Merchant Vessels, Authority for: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 12775 (vii).
Red Head Wharf, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 11019 (vi).
Reformatories Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 166.'
Regina Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 8602 (v).
Rehm, Frederick C., *et al*, Patent of: *See* 'B. No. 110.'
Reinhardt, Mr. Paul, Emplymt. by Public Works Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 10331 (vi).
Reinhardt, Mr., Interference in Quebec Provl. Elections: Cor., &c., read (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 10986 (vi).
See 'Caron.'
Renfrew Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7825 (iv).
Representation from Mar. Provs.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Daniel) 9891 (v).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Fielding) 9892 (v).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pugsley) 9892 (v).
Representation in H. of C. for the Mar. Provinces: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Daniel) 9780 (v).
Restaurant of H. of C. and Senate: M. (Mr. Pugsley) for Joint Com., 13224 (vii).
——— 1st Rep.: Presented (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 13510 (vii).
Restraint of Trade, Conspiracy in: *See* 'B. No. 96.'
Returns delayed: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 13082 (vii).
Returning Officers, Apptmnt. of: Remarks (Mr. Telford) in Com. of Sup., 10992 (vi)
Returns, Detention of by Members: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5048 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 2024 (ii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Bergeron) 13081 (vii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2384 (ii), 6847 (iv).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Boyce) 2384 (ii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 1018 (i), 3318, 2309 (ii), 4223, 4832, 6010 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Lake) 4495 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Macdonell) 569 (i), 2885 (ii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. A. Martin) 5491 (iii), 7722 (iv).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. J. D. Reid) 8516 (v).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Taylor) 2738 (ii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Worthington) 2024 (ii).
Returns ordered, Lost, &c., Placed in Record Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2882 (ii).
Returns, Questions, &c., ordered by House, Time to Complete, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crawford) 4242 (iii).
——— Retention by Members: Ques. of Priv. *re* Par. in Toronto 'Globe' (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4660 (iii).
See 'Documents,' &c.
Returns unopposed: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5914 (iii).
Revelstoke Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vii).
Revised Statutes, Completion of French Edition: Ques. (Mr. Robitaille) 6983 (iv).
——— Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 357 (i).
Rhindress, Dr. Horace, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 6000 (iii), 6232 (iv).
Richard, Mr., Emplymt. on I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11498 (vi).
Richelieu River Ice Piers, St. John's: in Com. of Sup., 12037 (vi).

Richibucto, Extension of Piers: in Com. of Sup., 11698 (vi).
Richibucto Wharf, Length, Purchase Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 12412 (vii).
Rideau Canal, Buoys between Merrickville and Edmond Rapids, Contract *re* Lighting: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 8613 (v).
See 'Canals.'
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12227 (vii).
Rideau Hall Improvements, Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5467 (iii).
——— Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11005 (vi).
Riding Mountain Reserve, Applications for Homesteads: Letter from Mr. Seaman read (Mr. W. J. Roche) 9992 (v).
——— Timber Reserve, Preservation, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) on M. for Sup., 7653 (iv).
——— Squatters' Claims, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 175 (i).
Rifle and Artillery Association Grants: in Com. of Sup., 12152 (vii).
Rifles purchased by Govt. since 1896, Number, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 5654 (iii).
Rifles purchased from other Companies than Ross Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1123 (i).
See 'Ross Rifle.'
Rifle Ranges, Charlottetown, Purchase Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 6233 (iv).
Rimouski County Public Works, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10013 (v).
Rimouski, Dredging, &c., *re* Landing of 'Lady Evelyn': Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7727 (iv).
See 'Post Office.'
Rimouski Mail Contracts, Payments to Str. 'Rhoda': Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8176 (iv).
Rimouski Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12035 (vi).
Rivard, Mr. S., Emplymt. on Nicolet Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 11702 (vi).
Rivière à la Graisse, Dredging, &c., Expenditure, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bergeron) 853 (i).
——— Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 686 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Bergeron) 3689
Rivière du Lievre, Lock and Dam: in Com. of Sup., 12037 (vi).
Rivière du Loup Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 6462 (iv).
Rivière du Loup (Fraservile) Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12036 (vi).
Rivière du Loup, Postmaster, Resignation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6399 (iv).
——— Post Office, Improvement to Grounds: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6399 (iv).
Rivière du Loup Station, Improvement *re* Platforms: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 5468 (iii).
Rivière du Loup Wharf, Total Expenditure *re* Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 6462 (iv).
River St. John, Tributaries: in Com. of Sup., 11698 (vi).
Robbins Irrigation Co., Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 4763 (iii).
——— M. for Papers (Mr. Ames) 5210 (iii).
Roberts, Mr. J. M., Promotion *re* Interior Dept: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 9693 (v).
Roberval Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
Roche's Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12136 (vii).
Rocky Mountain Park: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) in Com. of Sup., 9991 (v).
Rolla L. Crain, Amounts paid to: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Blain) 3435 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Blain) 3239 (ii).
Rolling Stock, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12257 (vii).
Rondeau Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Rossport Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Ross Rifle, Accident at Rockliffe Ranges, Par. in 'Ottawa Citizen' *re*: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 10515 (vi).
——— Accident at Rockliffe Range, Report *re*: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 11494 (vi).
——— Advances *re* Contracts, Cor. with Bank of Montreal: M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 4773 (iii).
Ross Rifle Bayonets, Adoption of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5786 (iii).
——— Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 6235, 8176 (iv).
——— Date of Contract, O.C., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paterson) 8442 (v).
——— provisions *re* &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3483 (ii).
——— M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 5476 (iii).
Ross Rifle, Bonus, Loans, Services of Govt. Employees, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 559 (i).
——— Contract: in Com. of Sup., 13542 (ii).
——— Contract Price, Inspection of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 8174 (iv).
——— Contracts *re* Supply of Rifles, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 557 (i).
——— Consignment to N.W. Mounted Police, Manufacture, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5259 (iii).
——— Cor. with Imp. Govt. *re* Defects: M. for Copy* (Mr. Worthington) 5210 (iii).
——— Delivered per Contract, Cost per Rifle: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8180 (iv).

Ross Rifle, Disposition of Manufactured Rifles, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3237 (ii).
—— Evidence before Pub. Accounts Com., Rep. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Worthington) 5914 (iii).
—— Extension of Cove Field Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 4404 (iii).
—— Factory, Pet. *re* Establishment on Plains of Abraham: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 3903 (ii).
Ross Rifle. Inefficiency and Extravagance of Militia Dept.: Amt. (Mr. Worthington) on M.for Sup., 8902-8953 (v); Neg. (Y. 18; N. 55) 9090 (v).
—— Correction of Mr. S. Hughes' Speech: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bergeron) 9126 (v).
—— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. S. Hughes) *re* Mr. Bergeron's denial of Stmnt., 9330 (v).
Ross Rifle, Inter-changeable parts with Lee-Enfield Rifles, Cor. with Imp. Govt.: Ques, (Mr. Worthington) 3898 (ii).
—— Negotiations with Vickers Maxim Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 178 (i).
—— Number ordered, Payments, Total Number, delivered, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 168 (i).
—— Number reported unfit for Use: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3841 (ii).
—— Payments to since Jan. 1, 1908: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 7209 (iv).
—— Rep. of British War Office *re* Cor., Disappearance from Library of H. of C.: Ques. of Priv. (Sir Fred. Borden) 4961 (iii).
—— Rep. of Col. Gaudet, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 9713 (v).
—— Rep. from Military Associations, &c., *re* Efficiency: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Worthington) 557 (i).
—— Report from Public Accounts, Delay, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5728 (iii).
—— Sealed Pattern, Discovery of: Ques (Mr. Worthington) 3237 (ii).
—— Services of Govt. Officials, Names, Rank, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 365 (i).
—— Target Practice, Suspension by N.W. M. Police: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3847 (ii).
—— Tests in England, Reps., &c.: Ques. of Priv. (Sir Frederick Borden) 8167 (iv).
—— Total Number in Use in Canada by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5786 (iii).
Round Bay, N.S., Removal of Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 11297 (vi).
Round Hill Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11282 (vi).
Royal Canadian Dragoons, St. John, Tenders *re* Supplies: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 5788 (iii).
Royal Commission Return: Inquiry for (Mr Porter) 6288, 7447 (iv).
See 'Commissions'.
Royal Military College Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 7702 (iv), 12152, 13177 (vii).
—— Barracks, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10907 (vi).
—— Investigation into Conduct of Cadet Lancaster: on M. for Sup. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1019 (i).
Royal Mint, Amount of Silver and Gold Coins, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8612 (v).
—— Cor. with Imp. Govt.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Caron) 5210 (iii).
Royal Mint, Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 1451
See 'Public Works, Ottawa.'
Rules of the House, Amendments to: Prop. Res. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 2984 (ii).
Ruscombe River Works, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1122 (i).
Russian Govt. Payments *re* Compensation to B.C. Sealers: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 683 (i).
—— Seizures of Canadian Vessels, Compensation *re*: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 2391 (ii).
Rustico Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11293 (vi).
Ruthenian Catholic Mission, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 69.'
Ryan, Mr. G. M., Appt. of Successor as Ry. Mail Supt.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 7504 (iv).
St. Alphonse (de Bagotville) Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).
St. Andrew's Rapids, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5701 (iii), 12011 (vi), 12145 (vii).
St. Andrew's Rapids, Improvements, Land Grant to Great Falls Power Co.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 238 (i).
St. Anicet and Ste. Barbe Waterway from Lake St. Francis, Letters, Plans, Surveys, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 1690 (i).
St. Anicet Wharf, Apptmt. of Mr. Dupuis, Revenues, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3230 (ii).
—— Expenditure and Collections, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1935 (i).
—— Expenditure by Public Works Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3479 (ii).
Ste. Anne de Monts Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).
Ste. Anne de Sorel Lighthouse, Destruction of Trees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 7731 (iv).
Ste. Barbe Floods, Rep. of Engineer: Remarks (Mr. R. N. Walsh) on M. for Sup., 7808 (iv).
—— Damages *re* Floods: Remarks (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 6987 (iv).
St. Boniface Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8566 (v).
St. Boniface Public Building, Purchase of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 4246, 5999 (iii).

St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 98.'
St. Cyrille Ry. Diversion, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12756 (vii).
St. Francis River Ice Piers: in Com. of Sup., 12040 (vi).
St. Francis River, Melbourne Pier, Rock Removal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 6918 (iv).
St. Francis River, Richmond Pier, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 6641, 6918 (iv).
St. Francois, Island of Orleans: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Francois Xavier Post Office, Apptmt. of Postmistress, Pet. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 5797 (iii).
St. Fulgence Pier, Paymaster's List, Signatures, &c., Apptmt. of Dr. Savard, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bergeron) 1130 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1115 (i).
St. Gabriel de Brandon Post Office, Savings Bank, Recommendation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4828 (iii).
——— M. for Copies* (Mr. Monk) 4589 (iii).
St. Henri Post Office Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7439 (iv).
St. Hyacinthe Drill Hall: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 10890 (vi).
St. Hyacinthe, 84th Regiment, Amount of Pay still Due: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 844 (i).
St. Hyacinthe Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7440 (iv).
St. Ignace de Loyola Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Irenee des Bains, Apptmt. of Mr. Geo. Girard as Postmaster: Ques. (Mr. Forget) 5795 (iii).
St. Jacques River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).
St. Jean des Chaillons Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Jean, Island of Orleans Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. John and Cumberland SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 12263 (vii).
St. John, N.B., Cold Storage Co., Incomplete Ret.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3580 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Foster) 3690 (ii).
——— Names of Stockholders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 1938 (i).
See 'N.B.'
St. John, N.B., Dom. Buildings, Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7186 (iv).
——— Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 13329 (vii).
St. John Fusiliers, 62nd Regiment, Payments *re* Annual Drill, Delays, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 847 (i).
St. John Harbour, Contracts with Dom. Dredging Co.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11700 (vi).
St. John Harbour, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5708 (iii), 12011 (vi).
St. John, Increased Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12257 (vii).
St. John Military Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7186 (iv).
——— Military Stables: in Com. of Sup., 7440 (iv).
St. John Port, Dredging Contracts, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11496 (vi).
——— Quarantine Station, Partridge Island: in Com. of Sup., 5703 (iii).
——— Quarantine, Partridge Island Water Service: in Com. of Sup., 7186 (iv).
——— Steam Sterilizer: in Com. of Sup., 7187 (iv).
St. John River, Removal of Snags, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 3477 (ii).
——— Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 13345 (vii).
——— Tidal Waters Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 12000 (vi).
——— Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 13345 (vii).
St. John's, Que., Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7444 (iv).
St. Joseph's Wharf, Ont., Tenders, &c., *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8890 (v).
St. Laurent Wharf, Expenditure *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 895, 1121 (i).
St. Laurent Wharf, Island of Orleans: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Lawrence Canals, District Office: in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).
St. Lawrence Power Co., and Long Sault Rapids Dam, Cor., Plans, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Gervais) 2996 (ii).
See 'Deep Waterways,' &c.
St. Lawrence River Route, Wrecks and Collisions: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 10739 (vi).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel: in Com. of Sup., 5035 (iii).
St. Louis, H., Emplymt. by Govt., Payments to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1347 (i), 2977 (ii).
——— Payments to by Marine Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 979 (i).
St. Louis River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12040 (vi).
St. Mary's Indian Reserve: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 634 (i).
St. Mary's Post Office, Construction of: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 12735 (vii).
——— Items *re* Expenditure of $658.03: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 11937 (vi).
——— Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 11019 (vi).
St. Mary's Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7826 (iv).

St. Mary's River, Kaministiquia, Port Arthur, &c., Dredging Contracts, Expenditure *re*, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 853 (i).
St. Maurice, Dam at Grand Piles: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).
St. Omer Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Paschal and Kamouraska Mail Contracts, Tenders, Bondsmen, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3236 (ii).
St. Pierre les Becquets Pile Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Peter's Bay, Mail Contract with H. B. Finlay, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1686 (i).
St. Peter's Bay Post Office, Charges against Mrs. Finlay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1687 (i).
——— M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 2170 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. A. Martin) 2786 (ii).
St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Instructions to Agents *re* Rights of Purchasers: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2217 (ii).
——— Pet. *re* Election of Chief and Councillors: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 7990 (iv).
——— Issue of Patents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1932 (i).
St. Rochs Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7438 (iv).
St. Rosalie Improvements, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5558 (iii), 12259 (vii).
St. Simeon Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
St. Therese Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary: in Com. of Sup., 12918 (vii).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Holidays for Officers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 2791 (ii).
——— Meat Contracts: Remarks (Mr. Leonard) in Com. of Sup., 5519 (iii).
——— Officers and Municipal Elections: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 2791 (ii).
——— Warden Beauchamp, Interference in Elections, Charges *re* (Mr. Leonard) in Com. of Sup., 5538 (iii).
Sabourin, Maj., Cor. with Lt. Col. Malette and Dept.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Bergeron) 3434 (ii).
Saccharine Standards, &c., *re* Sugar Manufacture: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 351 (i).
Sackville Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12235 (vii).
Sacred Heart Post Office, Establishment of Six Offices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5472 (iii).
Saguenay Boom and Chicoutimi Pulp Co., Amounts paid Govt. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 183 (i).
See 'Chicoutimi.'
Saguenay River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12040 (vi).
——— Purchase of Coal: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 8380 (v).
——— 'Storm King, Tug, Emplymt. of: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 8381 (v).
Salaries of Judges: *See* 'Judges.'
Salmon Licenses granted in B.C., Exclusive Privileges, Penalties, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5801 (iii).
——— Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 5651 (iii).
——— in B.C.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5652 (iii).
Salmon Fishing Licenses in Gardner's Inlet, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 5652 (iii).
Salmon Fishing Licenses, Number granted, in B.C., Conditions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 5998 (iii).
Salmon Net Fishing in Restigouche River Privileges, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 13518 (vii).
Salvation Army Immigrants, Letter from Dr. Nadeau: Ques. of Priv. (Mr .A. Lavergne) 7094 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9973 (v).
——— Stmnt. of Genl. Booth: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 2390 (ii).
Samovici, A., and H. Bolacan, Applications for Cancellation of Homestead Rights, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr .Lake) 557 (i).
Sand, Cement or Clay Utensils, imported from G.B. in 1904-5-6-7: Ques. (Mr. Demers) 1506 (i).
Sandwich Post Office Site, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7201 (iv).
Sandy Cove, N.S., Mail Service, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8891 (v).
Sarnia Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
——— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7829 (iv).
Saskatchewan and Alta., Assurance Fund: *See* 'B. No. 168.'
Saskatchewan Act, May 23rd, 1906, Constitutionality of, Cor., &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lake) 3435 (ii).
Saskatchewan Power Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 153.'
Saskatchewan Fishing Licenses, Issue of, &.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 351 (i).
Saskatchewan Legislature Acts, Reports *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 6400 (iv).
Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Conditions of Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4761 (iii).
——— Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9280 (v).
——— Land Grants, Patents, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5801 (iii).
——— Sale of Homestead Lands: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9127 (v).

Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Stmnt. Read (Mr. Oliver) 10402 (vi).
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Peace River and Dawson Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 70.'
Saskatoon Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8602 (v), 13337 (vii).
Saturday Sittings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 11501 (vi).
'Sault Express,' Amounts paid to for Advertising, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 696 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 853, 1129 (i).
Sault Ste Marie Canal Construction: in Com. of Sup., 12223 (vii).
Sault Ste. Marie Port, Farm Produce entered, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 898 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie Steel Works, Closing of: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 13470 (vii).
Sault Ste. Marie Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Sauve, Alfred, Rep. of Investigation *re* Charges, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9278 (v).
Sawmill Owners, Applications refused *re* Timber Cutting: M. for Ret.* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 557 (i).
School Lands Exchange: *See* 'B. No. 163.'
School Acts, Saskatchewan, Disallowance of: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6644 (iv).
—— Notice of Discussion (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6647 (iv).
—— M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) to adjn., 6854 (iv).
School, Timber and Coal Lands in Man., &c., Average Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3430 (ii).
Scotch Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11290 (vi).
Scotch Hill East, Post Office, Establishment of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2793 (ii).
Scotch Town Wharf, Application: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 7202 (iv).
Scrip received on Account of Lands, Mines, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3431 (ii).
—— M. for Ret. (Mr. Lake) 3852 (ii).
Seaforth Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vii).
Seal Cove Dredging, Rep. *re* Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6463 (iv).
Sec. of State, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 611 (i).
Section 14, Southeast Quarter, Applications for: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Herron) 5476 (iii).
Section 32, Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 8383 (v).
Securities of Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 204.'
Seed Control Act, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5500 (iii).
Seed Grain in N.W., Distribution to Settlers, Apptmt. of Mr. R. E. A. Leech: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) 3040 (ii).
Seed Grain, Distribution, Duties of Mr. Leech: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) 3158 (ii).
Seed Grain, Buying and Distribution. Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 13420 vii).
—— Charges by Mr. Macdonell, M.P.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Knowles) 1438 (i).
—— Delegation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 1840 (i).
Seed Grain for N.W. Settlers, Extension of Time for Payment: Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2896; Neg. (Y. 58; N. 98) 2937 (ii).
Seed Grain Distribution, Extension to Unorganized Territories: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 5408 (iii).
—— Distribution to Settlers in N.W.: in Com. of Sup., 2771 (ii).
See 'B. No. 96.'
Seed Grain to N.W. Settlers: M. to Adjn. (Mr. Sifton) 1349 (i).
—— O.C. *re* Advances: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 6634 (iv).
—— O.C. amending Regulations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 6981 (iv).
—— Quantity, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 8185 (iv).
—— Ques. (Mr. Lake) 692 (i).
—— Stmnt. *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10121 (v).
Seed Grain Purchases, Apptmt. of Agent in P.E.I.: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) 3690 (ii).
—— Purchases from P.E.I.: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) 3752 (ii).
—— Purchases from P.E.I.: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 3157 (ii).
Seeds Inspection Act: in Com. of Sup., 12891 (vii).
Seed Inspectors, Number of Apptmts.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 352 (i).
Seed Oats purchased in P.E.I., Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 12391 (vii).
—— Incomplete Answer (Mr. Blain) 12551 (vii).
—— Answer to Question: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 12661 (vii).
—— Corrected Answer (Mr. Oliver) 13066 (vii).
Seizures of Schooners, B.C., Compensation by Russian Govt.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 683 (i).
Selkirk Fish Hatchery, Failure of Spawn Supply: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 3240 (ii).
Selkirk, Lord, Land Registers and State Papers, Register 'B' *re* Hudson Bay Co., Custody of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1684 (i).
Selkirk Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 8547 (v).
Semaphores at Interlocking Plant, London, Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 9714 (v).

Semaphores on Railways, Standard Ladder and Posts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 239 (i).
Senate, Cost of outside of Indemnities: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 5087 (iii).
——— Days of Sitting, Cost for 1895 and 1906-7, of Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1114 (i).
Senate Reform: Prop. Res. (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 1513 (i).
——— ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. Foster) 70 (i).
Senate Salaries and Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 10489 (vi).
Sergeant-at-Arms Estimates: in Com. of Sup., 10503 (vi).
Sessional Paper No. 167b, brought down April 26th: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 555 (i).
Sessional Papers and Returns, Number ordered, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Johnston) 2796 (ii).
——— Number presented, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Johnston) 2592 (ii).
See 'Documents,' &c.
Seven Islands, Public Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2394 (ii).
See 'Clarke City.'
Severn River, Improvement of Waterway: in Com .of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Shad Hatchery, Windsor, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. Black) 8894 (v).
Sharbot Lake to Carleton Place, Ry. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13288 (vii).
Shawenegan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
Sheep Quarantine by U.S., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 13064 (vii).
——— Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Christie) 13537 (vii).
Shelburne Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7173 (iv).
Shellmouth River Bridge: in Com. of Sup., 12143 (vii).
Shepley, Mr. G. F., Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1112 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1295 (i)
Sherbrooke Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 7439 (iv).
——— Militia Corps, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 9273 (v).
Sherbrooke Public Building, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
Shipbuilding in Canada: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) 2947 (ii).
Shippegan Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12027 (vi).
Shipping Act: *See* 'B. Nos. 2, 12, 17, 183, 209.'
Shipping at Collieries, System of Loading, &c.: Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) on M. for Com. of Sup., 7732 (iv).
Shipping Companies on Pacific Coast, Amounts of Subsidies: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 6919 (iv).
Shipping Master at Quebec, Apptmnt. of: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 11699 (vi).
Shipping Rings, Combination *re*: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 5915; Cor. read (Mr. Sproule) 5916 (iii).
Shipping Statistics *re* Tons registered: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 2790 (ii) .
Shortt, Prof., Amounts paid *re* Industrial Disputes: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 4765 (iii).
Shuswap and Thompson Rivers Boom Co.: *See* 'B. No. 49.'
Shuswap and Thompson Rivers Boom Co.'s incorp. B. No. 49 (Mr. D. Ross) in Com., 5409; Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 5445; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5460.
Signal Dues at Halifax: *See* 'B. No. 152.'
Signal Service: in Com. of Sup., 5045 (iii).
Simcoe Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7830 (iv), 13333 (vii).
Sioux Indians: in Com. of Sup., 5762 (iii).
'Sir Wilfrid Laurier' Dredge, Completion, Cost of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5207 (iii).
Six Nations Indians, Negotiations *re*, Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lake) 6242 (iv).
——— Refusal of Inspection of Memorials, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 6239 (iv).
Skinner's Cove Boat Channel, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 10012 (v).
Skinner's Cove Pier Protection: in Com. of Sup., 11290 (vi).
Sleeping Car Cos.: *See* 'B. No. 11.'
Slides and Booms Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 11071 (vi).
Smith, O., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 4765 (iii).
Smith, Wm. B., Patent of: *See* 'B. No. 198.'
Smith, Mr. W. Maxwell, Dom .Fruit Inspector, Salary ,&c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 2393 (ii).
——— Cor. *re* Salary: M. for Copies* (Mr. Sproule) 2398 (ii).
——— Occupation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 5085 (iii).
Snag Boats on Red River, Construction and Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 567, 891 (i).
Sorel Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12012 (vi).
Sorel Irregularities, Allegations against Mr Roy: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 8295 (v).
——— Investigation by Mr. Gaudet *re* Irregularities, Rep. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 6988, 7099 (iv).
——— Irregularities, Final Rep.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 10794 (vi).
Sorel Shipyard Pay Lists, Irregularities: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 5408 (iii)

Sorel Shipyard Pay Lists, Papers laid on Table (Mr. Brodeur) 5477 (iii).
—— Rep. of Mr. Gaudet *re* Padding: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 7938 (iv).
—— Rep. of Mr. Gaudet: laid on Table (Mr. Brodeur) 8170 (iv).
Sorel Property for Marine Dept., Purchase, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4751 (iii).
Sorel Public Works, Investigations *re* Pay Rolls, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 4767 (iii).
Soulanges Canal, Claims *re* Accidents, &c.: M. for Reports* (Mr. Boyer) 6239 (iv).
—— Charges against Overseer, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 6407 (iv).
—— Comnr. Boyer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 12413 (vii).
—— Electric Power, Contract with Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10011 (v).
—— Expenditure *re* Investigation: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10513 (vi).
—— Floods, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 10339 (vi).
—— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii)
—— Investigation, Rep. of Mr. Boyer: Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 9890 (v).
—— Rep. of Mr. Boyer: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 10304 (vi).
Soulanges Canal, Manning & Macdonald's Claims: in Com. of Sup., 5668 (iii).
Souris Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13341 (vii).
—— Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1685 (i).
Souris Harbour Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1939 (i).
Souris Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
Souris Ry. Wharf, P.E.I., Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2386 (ii).
—— Permission to Build, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 7728 (iv).
S.A. Volunteers' Lands Grants Bill: Prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 3316 (ii), 11938 (vi).
—— Land Grants to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. M S. McCarthy) 563 (i).
—— Land Grants: Remarks (Mr. Herron) on M. for Sup., 11205 (vi).
—— Land Scrip for Volunteers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1110 (i).
—— Medals for 3rd Contingent, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1110 (i).
—— School Teachers, Recognition of Services by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2791 (ii).
South African Volunteers, Bounty to: *See* 'B. No. 109.'
Southampton Breakwater: in Com of Sup., 12137 (vii).

Southern Alberta Land Co., Application *re* Change of Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 7729 (iv).
South Huron By-Election, Amounts paid Returning Officer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 9270 (v), 11935 (vi).
South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 16.'
Southvale, N.S., Removal of Post Office, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4829 (iii).
Spain, Commander, Expenditure re Wrecks Investigations: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 3150 (ii).
—— Travelling Expenses, Cor. with Aud. Gen.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4405 (iii).
—— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Foster) 4670
—— Papers *re* Travelling Expenses: Laid on Table (Mr. Brodeur) 4825 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1010 (i).
—— Statement (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. of Sup., 1033 (i).
Spanish River Dredging, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4764 (iii).
Speakers' Expenses, House of Commons, Comparison, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 1016 (i).
Speech from the Throne: Read (Mr. Speaker) 3 (i).
—— Reply (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1584 (i).
'Speedy,' Str., Purchase, Service, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 565 (i).
—— Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3844 (ii).
Spillumcheen River Bank Protection: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Spratte, Hattie, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 182.'
Springhill Increased Accommodation: in Com of Sup., 12233 (vii).
Spry Bay Wharf, Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2391 (ii).
Squatters Claims in Alberta: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 9996 (v)
Squatters on Turtle Mountain Forest Reserve: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) 4739 (iii).
Standard Accident and Guarantee Co.: *See* 'B. No. 132.'
Standard Mutual Fire Ins. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 71.'
Standard Plate Glass Ins. Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 41.'
Stanley Island Wharf and Pier, &c.: in Com of Sup., 5720 (iii).
'Stanley,' Passenger Accommodation *re* Staterooms: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 687 (i).
Stanstead By-election Papers, Destruction of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8087 (iv)
—— Disappearance of: Remarks (Mr. R. L Borden) on M. for Sup., 8839 (v).
—— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com. on Priv. and Elections, 8887 (v).

Statistical Branch, Canals: in Com. of Sup., 10317 (vi)
—— List of Officers: Read (Mr. Graham) 10317 (vi)
Steamboat Inspection Act: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 12262 (vii).
—— Rep. presented (Mr. Brodeur) 3896 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 12262 (vii).
Steamboat Inspection: *See* 'Canada Shipping Bills.'
Steamship Subsidies and Subventions, Total Amount paid for Five Years, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 853 (i).
Steel Concrete Co., Payments to by Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 3850 (ii).
Stellarton Increased Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12230 (vii).
Stevenson, Mr. A. W., Chartered Accountant, Amounts paid to by Marine Dept.: Ques. (Mr. White) 3233 (ii).
Stewart, Mr. James, Inspecting Auditor I.C.R., Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 10151 (v).
Stoney Creek Battleford Monument: in Com of Sup., 13177 (vii).
Stoney Lake Damage Claims: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5565 (iii).
Stoney Lake Dock, Construction by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5564, 5649, 5786 (iii).
Strathcona Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Strathcona Horse, Barracks, Stables, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 10975 (vi).
Strathcona Immigration Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Strathcona Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Strathroy Armoury: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 10886 (vi).
Students of Technology: *See* 'Govt. Works.'
Subsidiary High Court of A. O. F.: *See* 'B. No. 62.'
Subsidies to Rys.: *See* 'Ry. Subsidies.'
Subsidies to Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 215.'
Sub-Target Company, Number ordered, Dates of Order, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 171 (i).
—— Papers referred to Com. of Last Session: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 945 (i).
—— Ref. to Public Accounts Com.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 312 (i).
See 'Sutherland Rifle Sight,' &c.
Suburban Mail Delivery: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3276 (ii).
Sudbury County Court Judge, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 12413 (vii).
Sudbury Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).
Sugar Imports for 1908, Total Amount: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 13064 (vii).
Sugar Manufacture, Regulations *re* Saccharine Standards: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 351 (i).
Summerside Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13343 (vii).
Summerside Harbour and Str. 'Stanley': Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) 6160 (iii).
Superannuation and Retirement Acts, Payments under: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 7989 (iv).
Supplies for Govt., Apptmt. of Purchasing Commission: Prop. Res. (Mr. Foster) 5802; Neg. (Y. 44; N. 99) 5880; Amt. (Mr. Fielding) 5826, Agreed to (Y. 93; N. 43) 5879; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Blain) 5847, Neg. (Y. 46; N. 90) 5877 (iii).
Supply Bills: *See* 'B. Nos. 94, 136, 186.'
Supply—Changes in Procedure, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1884 (i).
—— Conc.: M. (Mr. Fielding) 5499, 5915 (iii).
—— M. for Com. (Mr. Fielding) 554 (i).
—— Obstruction *re*, Charges by Govt: on M. for Sup., 9894 (v).
See 'Obstruction.'
SUPPLY:
Committee:
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics:
Archives, 671 (i).
Census and Statistics, 673 (i), 12879 (vii).
Exhibitions, 10569 (vi), 12889 (vii).
Experimental Farms, 12549 (vii).
Fruit and Dairying Industry, 10397 (vi).
Fumigation Stations, 12879 (vii).
Imperial Institute, Can. Exhibits, 10623
Live Stock Industry, 12894 (vii).
Meat and Canned Foods Act, 12893 (vii).
Patent Record, 672 (i).
Seed Control, &c., 5500 (iii), 12891 (vii).
Year Book, 677 (i).
Charges of Management:
Dom .Notes, 5562 (iii).
Offices of Assistant Receivers General, 12160 (vii).
Civil Government:
Agriculture, 645 (i), 12878 (vii).
Auditor General's Office, 635 (i).
Board of Civil Service Examiners, 12917 (vii).
Customs, 637 (i).
Finance, 637 (i), 5562 (iii), 12914 (vii).
Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office, 610 (i).
Inland Revenue, 645 (i).
Interior, 616 (i), 9693 (v).
Justice, 5505 (iii), 10396 (vi)
Labour, 12156 (vii).
Marine, 976 (i), 12915 (vii).
Militia and Defence, 611 (i), 8871 (v).
Mines, 646 (i).
Northwest Mounted Police, 8862 (v).
Post Office, 8872 (v).
Printing Bureau, 612 (i).
Privy Council, 610 (i), 12902 (vii).
Public Works, 638, 645 (i), 5698 (iii), 12916 (vii).
Railways and Canals, 10325 (vi), 12755 (vii).
Secretary of State, 611 (i).
Trade and Commerce, 648 (i).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Customs:
Printing, &c., 9577 (v).
Revenue Cruisers, &c., 9578 (v).
Salaries, &c., 9223, 9439 (v).
Salaries, Inspectors of Ports, &c., 9536 (v).
Departments Generally:
Charwomen, 10508 (vi).
Dominion Lands:
Salaries, &c., 10038 (v).
Surveys, &c., 9987 (v).
Dominion Police, 5509 (iii).
Excise:
Methylated Spirits, 820 (i).
Distillery Duty, 814 (i).
Duty collected, Expenses *re*, 817 (i).
Provisional Allowances, 817 (i).
Salaries, &c., 813 (i).
Stamps for Tobacco, 816 (i).
Travelling Expenses, &c., 814 (i).
Fisheries:
Dog Fish, Reduction Works, 13325 (vii).
Protection Service, 13326 (vii).
Salaries to Overseers, &c., 5777 (iii), 12261 (vii).
Geological Survey:
Boring for Oil, &c., 13162 (vii).
Maps, &c., 12260 (vii).
Victoria Memorial Museum, Specimens, 12261 (vii).
Govt. of the Northwest Territories:
General Vote, 10116 (v).
Govt. of the Yukon:
General Vote, 10107 (v).
Immigration:
Agents' Salaries, &c., 9769, 9840 (v).
Contingencies, &c., 9948, 9964 (v).
Deporting Immigrants, 9882 (v).
General Expenses, 5751 (iii), 13169 (vii)
Winnipeg Hospital, &c., 9982 (v).
Indians:
British Columbia:
Salaries, 12752 (vii).
Generally:
Destitute Indians, Relief, 5762 (iii).
Printing and Stationery, 5762 (iii).
New Brunswick:
Salaries, 12736, 13170 (vii).
Sioux, 5762 (iii).
Ontario and Quebec:
General Vote, 12729 (vii)
Inspection of Staples:
Salaries, 12264 (vii).
Justice:
Exchequer Court, 5505 (iii).
Printing and Binding, 5508 (iii)
Supreme Court:
Contingencies, 12917 (vii).
Legislation:
House of Commons:
Contingencies, 10502 (vi).
Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, 10508 (vi).
General Vote, 10490 (vi).
Printing and Binding, 10507 (vi).
Salaries, 10501 (vi).
Sergeant-at-Arms Estimate, 10503 (vi)
Voters' Lists, 10508 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Legislation—*Con.*
Library of Parliament:
General Vote, 10503 (vi).
Senate:
General Vote, 10489 (vi).
Lighthouse and Coast Service:
Agencies, Rents and Contingencies, 5039 (iii).
Aids to Navigation, 5039, 5773 (iii), 12263 (vii)
Dockyards, Maintenance, 5039 (iii).
Lightship at Point Pelee, 13325 (vii).
Limekiln Crossing, 13323 (vii).
Maintenance and Repairs, 5039 (iii).
Pilotage, Str. 'Eureka,' 5046 (iii).
Pensions to Pilots, 13324 (vii).
Repairs to Lightships, 5039 (iii)
Salaries and Allowances to Keepers, 4755, 5039 (iii), 13323 (vii).
Signal Service, 5045 (iii).
Thunder Bay, Ice Breaking, 5041 (iii).
Wireless Stations, 5045 (iii).
Mail Subsidies:
Can. and Australia, 13152 (vii).
Can. and G. B., 12728 (vii).
Can., Japan and China, 13152 (vii).
General Vote, 12262 (vii).
Marine Hospitals:
Further Amount, 5782 (iii)
Militia:
Annual Drill, 5662, 5732 (iii), 10286 (v), 13176, 13540 (vii).
Battlefields, Monuments, 13177 (vii).
Customs Dues, 5662 (iii), 12155 (vii).
Dominion Arsenal, 12154 (vii).
Gratuity to Caretaker J. Donovan, 13177 (vii).
Gratuity to Mrs. C. D. Murray, 13177 (vii).
Military Properties, Construction, &c., 12148 (vii).
Quebec Cliff Repairs, 12148 (vii).
Ordnance, &c., 12505 (vii).
Pay and Allowances, 12147 (vii).
Provisions, 5662 (iii), 12150 (vii).
Rifle Associations, Grants, 12152 (vii).
Royal Military College, 12152, 13177 (vii).
Salaries and Wages, 12147 (vii).
Warlike Stores, 12149 (vii).
Miscellaneous:
Can. Bank of Commerce, Yukon Services, 13167 (vii).
Chinese Riots, Vancouver, 13155 (vii).
Royal Commission, 13156 (vii).
Civil Service Commission, 13168 (vii).
Cotton Industry, Quebec, Commission, 13156 (vii).
Grant to National Gymnastic Society, 13167 (vii).
Jamaica Earthquake, 5784 iii).
Japanese Riots, B.C., 5783 (iii).
Labour Dept., 12261 (vii).
Marine and Fisheries, Investigation, 13169 (vii).
Mounted Police, Compensation, 8870 (v).
Olympic Games, Can. Representatives, 13167 (vii).
Oriental Labour Question, 13156 (vii).
Park Reservations, 5755 (iii).
Prince Fushimi's Visit, 5783 (iii).
Seed Grain Relief, 2770 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Mounted Police:
General Vote, 8863 (v).
Ocean and River Service:
Ice-breaker for Northumberland Strait, 1885, 1895 (i), 2941 (ii).
Maintenance and Repairs, Ice-breakers, &c., 1033, 1060 (i), 5763 (iii).
Patrolling Northern Waters, 3985 (ii), 4747 (iii).
Wreck Investigations, 3147, 3184, 3195 (ii).
Penitentiaries:
British Columbia, 12918 (vii).
General Vote, 5509, 5522 (iii), 12265 (vii).
St. Vincent de Paul, 12918 (vii).
Pensions:
Rebellion of 1885, *re*, 8870 (v).
Post Office:
Durston, Robt., Apptmt., 5561 (iii).
Mail Service, 5561 (iii).
Miscellaneous, 5562 (iii).
North Bay Office, 13152 (vii).
Salaries and Allowances, 9092 (v).
Public Works—Capital:
Buildings:
Archives, 5700 (iii).
Astronomical Observatory, 1450, 1485 (i).
Eastern Building, 1504 (i).
New Buildings, 1504 (i), 5701 (iii).
Parlt. Buildings, Additions, &c., 1486 (i).
Royal Mint, 1451, 1470 (i).
Victoria Memorial Museum, 1489 (i), 13477 (vii).
Harbours and Rivers:
Manitoba:
St. Andrew's Rapids, 5701 (iii).
Ontario:
Port Arthur, &c., Harbour Improvements, 12144 (vii).
Quebec:
Lake St. Peter Piers, 4752 (iii).
Quebec Harbour Improvements, 12144 (vii).
Sorel Property, 4751 (iii).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, 5035 (iii).
Dredging Plant, 4754 (iii).
Transportation Facilities:
Georgian Bay to Montreal, Surveys, 12145, 13326 (vii).
Port Colborne, Harbour Improvements, 12146 (vii).
St. Andrew's Rapids, 12145 (vii).
Marine Dept.:
Gratuity to mother of late J. Carbonneau, 13321 (vii).
Public Works—Collection of Revenue:
Graving Docks, Maintenance, 5731 (iii).
Land and Cable Lines, Lower St. Lawrence, 5731 (iii).
Telegraph Lines:
Ashcroft-Dawson, 5731 (iii).
Cape Beale Lines, 5731 (iii).
Operating Expenses, 13178 (vii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income:
Buildings:
British Columbia:
Chilliwack, Public Building, 13338 (vii).
Cranbrook, Public Building, 10864 (vi).
Cumberland, Public Building, 10864 (vi).
Fernie, Public Building, 5706 (iii), 10866 (vi).
Grand Forks, Public Building, 13338 (vii).
Greenwood, Public Building, 13338 (vii).
Ladysmith, Public Building, 10866 (vi), 13338 (vii).
Quesnel, Public Building, 10867 (vi).
Revelstoke, Public Building, 13339 (vii).
Vancouver, Examining Warehouse, 13339 (vii).
——— Public Building, 10868 (vi).
Vernon, Public Building, 10870 (vi), 13339 (vii).
Victoria, Immigration Building, 10874 (vi).
——— Post Office, 10883 (vi).
Williams Head, Quarantine Station, 10883 (vi).
Generally:
Construction of Armouries, 10886 (vi).
Experimental Farms, 10904 (vi), 13339 (vii).
General Vote, 10886 (vi).
Manitoba:
Brandon, Drill Hall, 8517 (v), 10953, 10974 (vi).
Dauphin Public Building, 8519 (v).
Elmwood, Public Building, 13335 (vii).
Emerson, Public Building, 8534 (v), 13335 (vii).
Neepawa, Public Building, 8536 (v), 13335 (vii).
Portage la Prairie, Public Building, 13336 (vii).
Selkirk, Public Building, 8547 (v).
St. Boniface, Public Building, 8566 (v).
Souris, Public Building, 13336 (vii).
Winnipeg, Examining Warehouse, 8566 (v).
——— Immigration Building, 8573 (v).
Winnipeg, Military Buildings, Hospital, 10955 (vi).
——— Fort Osborne Barracks, 10969 (vi), 13336 (vii).
Winnipeg, Post Office, Land and Building, 8575 (v).
Winnipeg, Postal Station 'B,' 8576 (v).
New Brunswick:
Fairville, Public Building, 13328 (vii).
Fredericton, Military Buildings, 13328 (vii).
Grand Falls, Public Building, 13328 (vii).
Hillsborough, Public Building, 13328 (vii).
Moncton, Armoury, 13328 (vii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
New Brunswick—*Con.*
St. John, 5703 (iii), 7186 (iv), 13329 (vii).
Tracadie Lazaretto, 7187 (iv).
Nova Scotia:
Antigonish, Public Building, 7110 (iv).
Bridgewater, Public Building, 7135 (iv).
Glace Bay, Public Building, 7139 (iv).
Halifax, Dom. Buildings, Repairs, 7140 (iv).
——— Immigrant Building, 7142 (iv).
——— Immigrant Detention Building, 7143 (iv).
——— Military Quarters, 7143 (iv).
——— New Building, 7144 (iv).
——— Quarantine Station, 7171 (iv).
Inverness, Public Building, 7172 (iv).
Lunenburg, Public Building, 13326 (vii).
Parrsborough, Public Building, 13327 (vii).
Shelburne, Public Building, 7173 (iv).
Westville, Public Building, 7179 (iv).
Wolfville, Public Building, 13327 (vii).
Yarmouth, Public Building, 7180 (iv).
Ontario:
Arnprior, Public Building, 7454 (iv).
Belleville Armoury, 7454, 7678 (iv).
Brantford, Public Buildings, 7455 (iv).
Dominion Public Buildings, 7467 (iv).
Glencoe, Public Building, 7473 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Guelph Armoury, 7678 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Hamilton Drill Hall, 7692 (iv).
——— Post Office, 7696 (iv).
Harriston, Public Building, 13331 (vii).
Kincardine, Public Building, 7698 (iv).
Kingston, Military Buildings, 10907 (vi).
——— New Gun Shed, 7700, 7814 (iv).
——— New Guard-house, 7701, 7814 (iv).
——— New Hospital, 7702, 7814 (iv).
——— Royal Military College, 7702 7819 (iv).
——— Royal Military College, Stables, 10907 (vi).
——— New Magazine, 10907 (vi).
Leamington, Public Building, 7701, 7815 (v), 13331 (vii).
Listowel, Public Building, 13331 (vii).
London, Military Buildings, 7705 (iv).
Markham, Public Building, 7709 (iv), 13331 (vii).
Mount Forest, Public Building, 13331 (vii).
Mitchell, Public Building, 13332 (vii).
Niagara Falls, Public Building, 13332 (vii).
North Bay, Public Building, 7712, 7810 (iv), 13332 (vii).
Ottawa, Departmental Buildings, Sky-lights, 7816 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Ontario—*Con.*
Ottawa Post Office, 5705 (iii).
——— Printing Bureau, 7817 (iv).
Owen Sound, Public Building, 7817 (iv).
Parkhill, Public Building, 13332 (vii).
Peterborough, Armoury, 13332 (vii).
Port Arthur, Public Building, 7825 (iv).
Renfrew, Public Building, 7825 (iv).
St. Mary's, Public Building, 7826 (iv).
Sarnia, 7829 (iv), 13332 (vii).
Seaforth, Public Building, 13332 (vii).
Simcoe, Public Building, 7830 (iv), 13333 (vii).
Sudbury, Public Building, 13333 (vii).
Tilsonburg, Public Building, 13333 (vii).
Uxbridge, Public Building, 13333 (vii).
Waterloo, Public Building, 13333 (vii).
Walkerville, Public Building, 13333 (vii).
Welland, Public Building, 7830 (iv).
Whitby, Public Building, 7833 (iv).
Prince Edward Island:
Georgetown, 7182 (iv).
Quebec:
Arthabaskaville, Public Building, 13329 (vii).
Chicoutimi, Post Office, 7279 (iv).
Cookshire, Post Office, 7281 (iv).
Dominion Public Buildings, 7286 (iv).
Dundee, Custom House, 7286 (iv).
Farnham, Post Office, 7287 (iv).
Grand Mere, Public Building, 13329 (vii).
Grosse Isle, Improvements, 7289 (iv).
Grosse Isle, Disinfecting Apparatus, 7290 (iv).
Joliette, Armoury, 13329 (vii).
Knowlton, Public Building, 7290 (iv), 13329 (vii).
Lachute, Public Building, 7293 (iv), 13329 (vii).
Lake Megantic, Public Building, 7294 (iv).
Lévis, Public Building, 7294 (iv), 13329 (vii).
Longueuil, Public Building, 7304 (iv).
Magog, Public Building, 7306 (iv), 13329 (vii).
Marieville, Public Building, 7306 (iv).
Megantic, Public Building, 13329 (vii).
Montreal, Barracks, 7407 (iv).
——— General Post Office, 7410 (iv).
——— Military Buildings, 7418 (iv).
——— New Postal Station, 'B,' 7418 (iv).
——— New Postal Station, Point St. Charles, 5703 (iii), 7419 (iv), 13330 (vii).
——— Eastern Postal Station, 7419 (iv).
——— New Examining Warehouse, 7423 (iv).
Nicolet, Public Building, 7428 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Quebec—*Con.*
Plessisville, Public Building, 7430 (iv), 13330 (vii).
Quebec Citadel, Drill Shed, 7430 (iv).
——— Governor General's Quarters, 7431 (iv).
——— Drill Hall, 7431 (iv).
——— Examining Warehouse, 7432 (iv).
——— Immigrant Building, 7432 (iv).
——— Immigrant Hospital, 7433 (iv).
——— Military Building, 7434 (iv).
Quebec East, Public Building, 7438 (iv).
Roberval, Public Building, 13330 (vii). (vii).
St, Henri, Post Office, 7439 (iv).
St. Hyacinthe, Public Building, 7440 (iv).
St. Johns, Military Buildings, 7440 (iv).
——— Public Buildings, 7444 (iv).
St. Therese, Public Building, 13330 (vii).
Shawenegan, Public Building, 13330 (vii).
Sherbrooke, Drill Hall, 7439 (iv).
Sherbrooke, Public Building, 13330 (vii).
Three Rivers, New Building, 13330 (vii).
Westmount, Public Buildings, 13330 (vii).
Rents, Repairs, &c.:
Dom. Public Buildings, Rents, 10981 (vi).
Electric Light, &c., 11011 (vi).
Elevator Attendants, 11011 (vi).
Furniture, 11007 (vi).
Grounds, 11012 (vi).
Heating, &c., 11009 (vi), 13340 (vii).
Immigration Buildings, 11008 (vi).
Major's Hill Park, 11015 (vi).
Post Office, 11007 (vi).
Quarantine Stations, 11008 (vi).
Rideau Hall, 11005 (vi).
Telephones, 5706 (iii), 11012 (vi).
Ventilation, Lighting, &c., 5707 (iii), 10981 (vi).
Yukon Buildings, 11005 (vi).
Saskatchewan and Alberta:
Barracks for Permanent Corps (Strathcona Horse), 10975 (vi).
Battleford, Public Building, 8576 (v).
Calgary, Public Building, 8578 (v).
Edmonton, Public Building, 5705 (iii), 8579 (v), 13336 (vii).
Estevan, Land Office, 8581 (v), 13336 (vii).
Humboldt, Public Building, 8582 (v).
Lethbridge, Armoury, 13336 (vii).
Maple Creek, Public Building, 8600 (v), 13337 (vii) .
Medicine Hat, Public Building, 8601 (v).
Moose Jaw, Armoury, 13337 (vii)
——— Public Building, 13336 (vii).
Prince Albert, 8601 (v), 13337 (vii).
Regina, Post Office, 8602 (v).
Saskatoon, Public Building, 8602 (v), 13337 (vii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Saskatchewan and Alberta—*Con.*
Strathcona, Buildings, 13338 (vii).
Wetaskiwin, Public Buildings, 13338 (vii).
Yorkton, Public Building, 8603 (v).
Yukon Territory:
Commissioner's Residence, 10883 (vi).
P. O. Building, 13339 (vii).
Dredging:
Mar. Provs., New Plant, 12142 (vii).
Ont. and Quebec, 13351 (vii).
Harbours and Rivers:
British Columbia:
Spillumcheen River, 13351 (vii).
Thompson River, 13351 (vii).
Manitoba:
Grand Marais Harbour, 12140 (vii).
Lake Dauphin, Lowering Lake, 12141 (vii).
Mar. Provs.:
General Vote, Creosoted Timber, 12028 (vi).
New Brunswick:
Beaver Harbour, Wharf, 13344 (vii).
Buctouche, Channel, 11679 (vi).
Campbellton, Wharf, 11685 (vi), 13344 (vii).
Caraquet, Wharf, &c., 11685 (vi).
Dorchester Wharf, Addition, 13344 (vii).
Dover, Wharf, 11692 (vi).
Harbours, Rivers and Bridges, Generally, 11693 (vi).
Harvey Bank, Wharf, 13344 (vii).
Leonardsville, Wharf, 13344 (vii).
Lorneville, Wharf, 13344 (vii).
Lower Newcastle, Wharf, 11695 (vii).
Madawaska River, Extension of Dyke, 11696 (vi), 13344 (vii).
Miscou, Wharf, 13344 (vii).
Moncton, Wharf, 11696 (vi).
New Mills, Wharf, 13345 (vii).
Richibucto, Extension of Piers, &c., 11698 (vi).
River St. John, including tributaries, 11698 (vi).
River St. John, Wharfs in Tide Water, 12000 (vi), 13345 (vii).
St. Andrews, Harbour Improvements, 12011 (vi).
St. John Harbour, Improvements, 5708 (iii), 12011 (vi).
Shippegan, Harbour, 12027 (vi).
Tracadie, Protection Works, 13349 (vii)
Nova Scotia:
Annapolis Harbour Improvements, 11207 (vi).
Baddeck Wharf, 11219 (vi).
Barachois, Training Pier, 11223 (vi).
Bay St. Lawrence, Harbour, 12224 (vi).
Big Lorraine Harbour, 11224 (vi).
Breton Cove, 11224 (vi).
Cape St. Mary, Breakwater, 11224
Cariboo Island, Causeway, 11224 (vi).
Charlo's Cove, Breakwater, 11225 (vi).
Church Point, 11225 (vi).
Cow Bay (Port Morien) 11225 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Nova Scotia—*Con.*
Digby, Harbour, 11226 (vi).
Fort Lawrence Wharf—Extension of head block, additional trestle approach, &c., General Vote, 13341 (vii).
Glace Bay, 11223 (vi).
Hall's Harbour, 11228 (vi).
Lake Ainslie, Boat Channel, 11228 (vi).
McPherson's Cove, Wharf, 11229 (vi).
Margaree River, Shear Dams, &c., 11229 (vi).
Middle River (Lower) 11229 (vi).
New Glasgow, Extension of Wharf, 11257 (vi).
Oyster Pond, 11258 (vi).
Parker's Cove, Improvements, 11258 (vi).
Parrsboro', Harbour Improvements, 11259 (vi).
Poirierville, Landing Pier, 11260 (vi).
Porter's Lake, Boat Channel, 11260 (vi).
Port Hastings, Wharf, 11265 (vi).
Port Hilford Breakwater, 11267 (vi).
Port Hood Harbour, 11268 (vi).
Port Joli West, Herring Rocks. Breakwater, 11279 (vi).
Port Royal, Madame Island, Wharf 11278 (vi).
Portuguese Cove, Breakwater, 11279 (vi).
Pugwash, Wharf, 11279 (vi).
Round Hill, Wharf, 11282 (vi).
Scotch Cove Breakwater. 11290 (vi).
Skinner's Cove, Dredging Channel, &c., 11290 (vi).
Sydney Harbour, Wharf, 11230 (vi).
Tancook Island, 11230 (vi).
Tatamagouche Bay, Wharf, 11290 (vi).
Yarmouth Harbour, Improvements, 11291 (vi).
Ontario :
Beaverton, Harbour Improvements, 12090 (vii).
Belle River, Dredging, 12090 (vii).
Blanche River, Improvement, 12090 vii).
Blind River, Dredging, &c., 12091 (vii).
Bronte Dredging, 5708 (iii).
Bronte Harbour, Repairs, 12091 (vii).
Burlington Channel Piers, 12092 (vi).
Chute à Blondeau, Wharf, 12092 (vii).
Cobourg, Dredging, &c., 12095 (vii).
Colborne, Wharf, 12095 (vi).
Collingwood Harbour, Improvements, 12096 (vii).
Goderich Harbour, Improvements, 12101, 13350 (vii).
Gore's Landing, Wharf. 12101 (vii).
Harbours, Rivers and Bridges, Generally, 12101 (vii).
Juniper Island, Wharf, 13350 (vii).
Lakefield, Wharf, 13350 (vii).
Little Current, 13350 (vii).
McGregor's Creek, 12103 (vii).
Magnetawan River, 13350 (vii).
Meaford Harbour, Improvements, 12103 (vii).
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Ontario—*Con.*
Michipicoten, Wharf, 13350 (vii).
Midland and Tiffin Harbours, 5709 (iii), 12103 (vii).
Montreal River, Wharf, 13350 (vii).
Petawawa, 12133 (vii).
Peterborough, Steamboat Landing, 12133 (vii).
Point Edward, Dredging, 5713 (iii).
Port Burwell, Improvement to Harbour, 12135 (vii).
Port Hope, Repairs, 12135 (vii).
Port Stanley, Harbour Improvements, 12136 (vii).
Rainy River, Improvements at Long Sault Rapid, 12136 (vii).
Roach's Point, Wharf, 12136 (vii).
Rondeau, Harbour Improvements, 12137 (vii).
Rossport, Wharf, 12137 (vii).
Sault Ste. Marie, Wharf, 12137 (vii).
Severn River, 12137 (vii).
Southampton, Repairs to Chantry Island Breakwaters, 12137 (vii).
Stanley Island, Wharf, 5720 (iii).
Tobermory, Harbour, 13351 (vii).
Toronto Harbour, Improvements, 12137 (vii).
Victoria Harbour, Improvements, 12137 (vii).
Winnipeg River, Improvements, 12138 (vii).
Prince Edward Island :
Harbours, Rivers and Bridges, Generally, 11292 (vi).
McPherson's Cove, Wharf, 11292 (vi).
New London, 11292 (vi).
Rustico Harbour, Breakwater, 11293 (vi).
Souris, Knight's Point, Strengthening Breakwater, &c., 13341 (vii).
Summerside Harbour, Breakwater, 13343 (vii).
Quebec:
Anse à la Barbe, Breakwater, 12028 (vi).
Anse à l'Ilot, Landing Pier, 12029 (vi).
Baie St. Paul, 12029 (vi).
Barachois de Malbaie, Training Piers, &c., 12029 (vi).
Batiscan, Dredging, 12029 (vi).
Berthier, Wharf, 12029 (vi).
Bic Harbour, Wharf, 12030 (vi).
Cap St. Ignace, Wharf, 12030 (vi).
Chateauguay, Wharf, 12030 (vi).
Chicoutimi Harbour, Improvements, 12030 (vi).
Clarke City, Wharf Improvements, 12031 (vi).
East Templeton, Wharf, 12031 (vi).
Escoumains, Pier, 12031 (vi).
Father Point, Wharf, 12031 (vi).
Grand Méchin, Breakwater, 12031 (vi).
Grand Rivière (Gaspé), Wharf, 12031 (vi).
Harbours, Rivers and Bridges, Generally, 12031 (vi).
Lake Aylmer, Wharf, 12032 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Quebec—*Con.*
Lake Megantic, Piers, 12032 (vi).
Lake St. John Piers, Repairs, &c., 12033 (vi).
Lake St. Francis (Beauce) Wharfs, 12033 (vi).
Lavaltrie. Wharf, 12033 (vi).
Les Eboulements, Repairs, 12033 (vi).
Lotbiniere and Portneuf Counties, Government Wharfs, 12033 (vi).
Magdalen Islands, Breakwaters, &c., 12033 (vi).
Malbay (Gaspé) Boat Shelter, 12034 (vi).
Matane Breakwater, &c., 12034 (vi).
Montmagny, Wharf, 12034 (vi).
Nicolet Harbour, 12034 (vi).
Notre Dame du Portage, Wharf, 12034 (vi).
Petite Decharge, Lac St. Jean, 12034 (vi).
Piché Point (Lake Temiskaming) Pile Wharf, 12035 (vi).
Point aux Trembles, Wharf, 12035 (vi).
Rimouski, Wharf Improvements, 12035 (vi).
Rimouski, Dredging Approach, &c., 12035 (vi).
River Ashouapmouchouan, Training Dykes, &c., 12035 (vi).
River Batiscan, Dredging Channel, 12036 (vi).
River Bonaventure, Training Pier, 12036 (vi).
River du Loup (Fraserville) Harbour Improvements, 12036 (vi).
River du Loup (en haut) Dredging, &c., 12036 (vi).
River du Lièvre, Lock and Dam, 12037 (vi).
River Maskinonge, Dredging, 12037 (vi).
River Ouelle, Dredging, 12037 (vi).
River Richelieu, Ice Piers, 12037 (vi).
River Richelieu, Improvements, 12038 (vi).
River Saguenay, Dredging, &c., 12040 (vi).
River St. Francis, Ice Piers, &c., 12040 (vi).
River St. Lawrence, Ice Piers at River St. Jacques, 12041 (vi).
River St. Louis, Improvements, 12040 (vi).
River St. Maurice, Channel between Grandes Piles and La Tuque, 12041 (vi).
River St. Maurice, Dam at Grandes Piles, 12041 (vi).
River Yamaska, Lock, &c., 12041 (vi).
St. Alphonse (de Bagotville) Addition to Wharf, 12041 (vi).
St. Anne des Monts, 12041 (vi).
St. Francois, Island of Orleans, 12042 (vi).
St. Ignace de Loyola, Wharf, 12042 (vi).
St. Jean des Chaillons, Wharf, 12042 (vi).
St. Jean, Island of Orleans, 12042 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Quebec—*Con.*
St. Laurent, Island of Orleans, 12042 (vi).
St. Omer, Landing Pier, 12042 (vi).
St. Pierre les Becquets, Pile Wharf, 12042 (vi).
St. Siméon, Wharf, 12042 (vi).
Sorel, Deep Water Wharf, 12042 (vi).
Three Rivers, Deep Water Wharf, 13349 (vii).
Varennes, Wharf, 12042 (vi).
Yamaska River, Dredging, 5708 (iii), 12043 (vi).
Saskatchewan and Alberta:
Lesser Slave River, 5719 (iii), 13351 (vii).
Old Man's River, 12142 (vii).
Miscellaneous:
Architectural Branch, Salaries, 11096 (vi).
Cement Testing Laboratory, 11078 (vi).
Deep Waterways Commission, 11101 (vi).
Gratuity to Mrs. Thos. O'Leary. 5730 (iii).
Engineering Branch, Salaries, 11093 (vi).
Insufficient Appropriations, 11119 (vi).
International Commission, Red River of the North, 11118 (vi).
Monuments to late Sir L. H. Lafontaine, R. Baldwin, 11118 (vi).
Monuments at Brantford *re* Telephone Invention, 11118 (vi).
Surveys, &c., 11071 (vi).
Technical Books, 11100 (vi).
Telegraph Service, Salaries, 11097 (vi).
Temporary Assistance, &c., 11099 (vi).
Roads and Bridges:
Shellmouth Bridge, 12143 (vii).
Telegraph Lines:
General Operating Expenses—Lower St. Lawrence, &c., 12143 (vii).
Maritime Provs.:
Generally, 5730 (iii).
Quarantine:
Salaries, Public Health, &c., 5504 (iii).
Railways and Canals—
Canals—
Carillon:
Dam. 12768 (vii).
Chambly:
Macadamizing Towpath, 12226 (vii).
Cornwall:
Gate Lifter, 12226 (vii).
Repairs to Bank, 12768 (vii).
Galops:
Generally, 5671 (iii).
Generally, 5696 (iii).
Sunday Work, 13174 (vii).
Lachine:
J. Richard, Loss of Horse, 13174 (vii).
Leak at Lock No. 1, 5672 (iii).
Slope Walls, 5663 (iii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Railways and Canals—*Con.*
Canals—*Con.*
Lachine—*Con.*
Staff, 5696 (iii).
Walls, 12226 (vii).
Murray:
Houses, 12226 (vii).
Quebec Canals, Steam Road Roller, 12225 (vii).
Rideau:
Generally, 5689 (iii).
Improvements, 12227 (vii).
Sault St. Marie:
Construction, 12223 (vii).
St. Lawrence Canals, District Office, 12225 (vii).
Soulanges:
Improvements, 12225 (vii).
Manning and Macdonald's Claim, 5668 (iii).
Trent:
Construction, 12225 (vii).
Dam at Buckhorn, 12227 (vii).
Improvements, 12227 (vii).
New Lock, &c., Lindsay, 12227 (vii).
Properties, Damages *re* Flooding, 12768 (vii).
Welland:
Dredge Slide in Deep Cut, 5673 (iii).
Electric Lighting, 12195 (vii).
Port Colborne, Improvements, 12211 (vii).
Port Maitland, Entrance, 5673 (iii).
Queenston, St. Bridge, &c., 12207 (vii).
Surveys, 12207 (vii).
To Purchase Boat, 5691 (iii).
Widen Canal, 12210 (vii).
Railways:
Hudson Bay Ry., Surveys, 12704 (vii).
Intercolonial Railway:
Additional Line, Moncton to Truro, Survey, 12760 (vii).
Amherst Improvements, 12233 (vii).
Antigonish, Accommodation, 12229 (vii).
Campbellton, Improvements, 12258 (vii).
Chatham, Improvements, 12757 (vii).
Double Tracking, 12236 (vii).
Fredericton, Improvements, 12758 (vii).
General Vote, 5693 (iii), 10126 (v).
Halifax Accommodation, 5548 (iii), 12227 (vii).
Increased Accommodation, &c., 12259 (vii).
Indiantown and Blackville, Improvements, 12258 (vii).
Machinery for Shops, 12257 (vii).
Moncton Shops, &c., 12250 (vii).
Mulgrave, Improvements, 12229 (vii).
New Glasgow, Accommodation, 12230 (vii).
North Sydney, Improvements, 12229 (vii).
Petit Rocher, Spur Track, 12759 (vii).
Pictou, Accommodation, 12230 (vii).
Rolling Stock, 5549 (iii), 12257 (vii).
St. Cyrille and Drummondville, 12756 (vii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Railways and Canals—*Con.*
Railways—*Con.*
Intercolonial Railway—*Con.*
St. John, Accommodation, 12257 (vii).
Ste. Rosalie, Improvements, 5558 (iii), 12259 (vii).
Sackville, Improvements, 12235 (vii).
Springhill, Accommodation, 12233 (vii).
Stellarton, Accommodation, 12230 (vii).
Strengthening Bridges, 12259 (vii).
Sydney, Increased Accommodation, 12229 (vii).
Sydney Mines, Extension, 12229, 12759 (vii).
Truro, Accommodation, 12231 (vii).
National Transcontinental Ry.:
Surveys and Construction, 12238, 12728 (vii).
Prince Edward Island Railway:
Hillsborough Bridge, 12762 (vii).
Surveys of Branch Lines, 12764 (vii).
Miscellaneous:
Arbitrations and Awards, 10329 (vi).
Compensation to C.P.R. *re* Right of Way, 5561 (iii).
Extra Clerks, &c., 10342 (vi).
G. T. P. Ry., Inspections, 10390 (vi).
International Congress, Subscription, 10377 (vii).
Legal Expenses, 10357 (vi).
Miscellaneous Works, 10328 (vi).
Ry. Commission, 10361, 10385 (vi).
Ry. Statistics, 10328 (vi).
Remuneration to A. Brunet, 10378 (vi).
Staff and Repairs, 10304 (vi).
Statistical Offices, 10317 (vi).
Surveys, &c., Canals, 10338 (vi).
To provide for Quebec Bridge Plans, 12769 (vii).
Scientific Institutions:
Astronomical Observatory, 9737 (v).
General Vote, 12262 (vii).
Hydrographic Surveys, 13169 (vii).
Steamboat Inspection:
General Vote, 12262 (vii).
Supt. of Insurance:
General Vote, 12160 (vii).
Trade and Commerce:
Chinese Immigration Act, 12264 (vii).
Concurrence:
Assay Office, Vancouver, 13573 (vii).
Geological Survey, Explorations, &c., 13571 (vii).
J. G. Artz, Salary, 13578 (vii).
Mines Branch, Investigation of Ore Deposits, &c., 13569 (vii).
Sessional Clerks, 13577 (vii).
South Lake, N.S., Opening Channel, 13568 (vii).
Telephone Invention, Monument *re*, 13567 (vii).

Supreme Court Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 121.'
Supreme Court of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 91.'
Supreme Court, Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 12917 (vii).
——— Registrar's Official Uniform: in Com of Sup. (Mr. Owen) 5597 (iii).

Surveys of Dom. Lands: *See* 'B. No. 9.'
Surveys of Public Lands: *See* 'Dom. Lands.'
Surveys, Slides and Booms: in Com. of Sup., 11071 (vi).
Sussex Military Camp: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 9836 (v).
Sussex St. Property Purchase, Payments to Jos. Riopelle, Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3844 (ii). *See* 'Public Works, Ottawa.'
Sutherland Rifle Sight Co. Ltd., Patents of: *See* 'B. No. 63.'
Sutherland Rifle Sights, Contract *re* Additional Number: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5257 (iii).
——— M. for Copies* (Mr. Worthington) 5476 (iii).
——— Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5206 (iii).
——— Number, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 569 (i).
Swamp Lands in Man.: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 10105 (v).
Swan Lake Indian Reserve, Acquisition of by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 693 (i).
——— Sale of: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 12729 (vii).
——— Settlement, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 633 (i).
Sydney Cement, Quality, &c.: Remarks (Mr. A. C. Ross) in Com. of Sup., 11227 (vi).
Sydney Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup, 11230 (vi).
Sydney, Increased Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
Sydney Mines, Extension, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12229 (vii).
——— Ry. Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 12759 (vii).
Sydney to Sydney Mines, Branch Ry., Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 7201 (iv).
Synod of the Diocese of Keewatin: *See* 'B. No. 179.'
Taché, J. C., Apptmt. in Public Works Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 8180 (iv).
Tancook Island Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 11230 (vi).
Tatamagouche Bay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 11290 (vi).
Tatamagouche Dredging, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 11701 (vi).
Technical Books of Reference, Public Works Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 11100 (vi).
Technical Education, Commission of Inquiry: Prop. Res. (Mr. Gutherie) 2856 (ii).
——— Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 12660 (vii).
Tecumseh Park Breakwater, Dangerous Condition: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 12657 (vii).
Telegraph Branch, P. W. Dept., Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11097 (vi).
Telegraph Cos.: *See* 'B. Nos. 11 and 118.'
Telegraph Lines, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5731 (iii).
——— Marconi System: in Com. of Sup., 12143 (vii).
——— Operating and Maintenance: in Com. of Sup., 13178 (vii).
Telegraphs and Telephones, and Man. Boundaries, Legislation: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3042 (ii).
Telegraph, Yukon, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup,. 13178 (vii).
———ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 37 (i).
Telephone Invention, Monument at Brantford: in Com. of Sup., 11118 (vi).
Telephone Rates: *See* 'B. Nos. 11 and 118.'
Telephone Wires, Applications to cross Ry. Tracks: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 690 (i).
Temiskaming Wharf, Montreal River: in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vii).
Temperance Colonization Society, Land Grants to, Terms of Settlement, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonell) 4774 (iii).
Temple, Mr. W. A., Emplymt. by Govt. in Yukon: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1126 (i).
Temporary Govt. Loans, Rates of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 233 (i). *See* 'Finance,' &c.
Tenders, List of Papers *re* Advertisements: Read (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 7476 (iv).
Tenders, Opening of: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Haggart) 2738 (ii).
Tenders for Public Works, &c.: *See* 'Advertisements.'
Tercentenary at Quebec, Apptmt. of French Canadian Commission: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 4770 (iii).
Tercentenary at Quebec: *See* 'Battlefields,' 'Quebec,' &c.
Territories Real Property Act, Payments *re* Land to Alberta and Saskatchewan: prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 7094 (iv).
Teulon Immigration Sheds, Number Cared for: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 892 (i).
Thames River Wharf, Damages to: Remarks (Mr. Clements) 7506 (iv).
Thanksgiving Day, Change from Thursday to Monday: Remarks (Mr. Kemp) 13085 (vii).
Thessalon Post Office, Charges *re* Postmaster: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 660 (i).
'Thin Red Line': *See* 'Dom. Elections Act.'
Thirteenth Hussars, General Service Medal: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 13533 (vii).
Thompson River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Three Rivers, Deep Water Coal Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13349 (vii).

Three Rivers, Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
Thunder Bay, Ice-breaking, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5041 (iii).
Tidal Service: in Com. of Sup., 3215 (iii).
Tignish Harbour, Pet. *re* Extension: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 682 (i).
——— Breakwater Repairs: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 3229 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 11679 (vi).
Tiffin Harbour Dredging: in Com .of Sup., 5709 (iii).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Tiffin Dredging, Tenders *re* Owen Sound Dredging Co.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8892 (v). *See* 'Midland,' &c.
Tilbury Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vii).
Tilsonburg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).
Timber Berths awarded between June, 1904, and July 15th, 1896, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Crawford) 3851 (ii).
Timber Berths granted in Man. and N.W.T., Petition by Original Grantees: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2546 (ii).
Timber Berths: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lennox) 4833 (iii).
Timber Berth, East Sask., Conditions of Ownership: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3839 (ii).
Timber Berths in Man. and N.W. Ters. under Licenses, Applicants' Names, Amounts paid, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 852
Timber Berths Nos. 645, &c., Original Tenders, &c.: M. for Papers* (Mr. McCraney) 4247 (iii).
——— Nos. 652, &c., Applications, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. McCraney) 4589 (iii).
——— Nos. 1031, &c., on Order for Ret.: Amt. (Mr. White) 850 (i).
——— Nos. 1046, &c., Original Applications: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 4247 (iii).
——— Nos. 1048, &c., on Order for Ret.: Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 850 (i).
——— Nos. 1050, &c., Bonuses, Rentals, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 852 (i).
——— No. 1100, Area, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 364 (i).
——— No. 1168, Area, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 363 (i).
——— Nos. 1220-1272: on Order for Ret., Amt. (Mr. Lake) 849 (i).
——— No. 1279, Applications, Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 555 (i).
Timber Berths, Opening of Tenders: Ques. of Priv. *re* Speech of Mr. Foster (Mr. Turriff) 11303; Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) 11304; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 11304 (vi).
Timber Berths, Original Documents: M. for Papers (Mr. Lake) 2855 (ii).
——— Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2856 (ii). *See* 'Documents.'
——— Original Documents: M. for Ret. (Mr. Boyce) 2983 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Boyce) 3318 (ii).
Timber Berths, Par. in Toronto 'News': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Turriff) 5077 (iii).
——— Tenders, &c., Original Documents: M. for Ret. (Mr. White) 2983 (ii).
Timber Berths, &c.: *See* 'Documents, Original.'
Timber Cutting by Sawmill Owners, Applications *re*: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2168 (ii).
Timber Lands, Sale to Messrs. Rutherford, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1293 (i).
——— Sale or Lease, subsequent to Ret. of April, 1907: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 555 (i).
Timber Leases *re* Saskatchewan Valley Land Co.: on M. (Mr. Turriff) to Com. of Sup., 8697 (v).
Timber Licenses, Applications to Mr. Mackenzie's Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 3242 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3038 (ii).
Timber Licenses cancelled from May, 1905, to Nov., 1907, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 181 (i).
Timber Licenses, Conditions and Forms in force at present: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 359 (i).
——— Grants to Messrs. McLeod, Lundy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 236 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1739 (i).
Timber Licenses in Manitoba and N. W. Ters., Renewal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 691 (i).
——— during 1896-7: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 2396 (ii).
——— Man., Sask. and Alberta, Renewals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 1127 (i).
——— Renewals in N. W., Number of Miles, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 181 (i).
Timber Limits, Application of Mr. Gentles: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 7100 (iv).
——— Denial *re* Application (Mr. Taylor) 7100 (iv).
Timber Limits, Applications, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Talbot) 3578 (ii).
Timber Limits, Leasing, Alienation, &c., Com. of Investigation *re*: Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 2269, 2310, 2466, 2595; Amt. neg. (Y. 55; N. 111) 2736 (ii).
Timber Limits, Statement quoted by Mr. Turriff: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 2386 (ii).
Timber Limits: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 3580 (ii).
Timber Marking Act Amt: *See* 'B. No. 193.'
Timber Permits to Settlers, *re* Cutting in Twp. 39, Range 11: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 11495

Timber Permits to Sawmill Owners, O.C. *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 179 (i).
Timber Sales to Saskatchewan Valley Land Co.: Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 8751 (Amt.) 8778; Neg. (Y. 46; N. 91) 8833 (v).
Timber Sales, &c.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Burrows) *re* Par. in Winnipeg 'Telegram,' 9023 (v).
Tobacco Customs Seizure at Charlottetown, Penalties, &c., Cor. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2982 (ii).
Tobacco Duties, Total Amount for 1908: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 13064 (vii).
Tobacco Excise Taxes, Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 566 (i).
Tobacco, Foreign, Total Amount of Refund, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Dugas) 4402 (iii).
Tobacco Industry, Amt. to Inland Revenue Act, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Dubeau) 178 (i).
Tobacco Manufacturers, in Mar. Provs., Amounts of Fines, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 363 (i).
Tobacco Manufacturers in P.E.I., Violation of Inland Revenue Act: Cor. read (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 9237 (v).
—— on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 9514 (v).
Tobacco, Prohibition of: *See* 'B. No. 173.'
Tobacco Prohibition, Res. from Moral Reform Associations: Remarks (Mr. Telford) 11302 (vi).
Tobacco, Protection to Canadian Industry, Pets., &c., *re* Amt. to Inland Rev. Act: M. for Copies (Mr. Dubeau) 899 (i).
Tobacco Resolutions: in Com. on Ways and Means, 6118 (iii).
Tobacco Stamps, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 143.'
Tobacco Stamps for Imports, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 816 (i).
Tobermory Harbour Booms: in Com. of Sup., 13351 (vii).
Tobique Manufacturing Co.: *See* 'B. No. 8.'
Toll Gates upon Island of Montreal, Abolition of: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 3299 (ii).
See 'Montreal Turnpike,' &c.
Toney River Boat Harbour, Amount of Contract, Extras, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9711 (v).
Toronto and Schomberg Ry. Blockade: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 3901 (ii).
Toronto Barracks, Approval of Plans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 7203 (iv).
Toronto (eastern gap) Harbour, Amount of Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 354 (i).
—— Contract Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 10014 (v).
—— Date of Murray & Cleveland's Contract, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1507 (i).
—— M. for Copies* (Mr. Macdonell) 2397 (ii).
Toronto (western gap) Harbour, Construction of Entrance: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 354,518 (i).
—— Contract *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 4587 (iii).
—— Delay in Contract: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 5915 (iii).
Toronto Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
Toronto Harbour Life Saving Station, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 4586 (iii).
Toronto Island Tunnel, Deputation *re* Construction by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 5564 (iii).
Toronto Postmaster, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2594 (ii).
Torrens Land Title Fund, Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10916 (vi).
Townsend, Arthur James, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 196.'
Townsend Whaling Licenses: *See* 'Whaling.'
Town Site Property, Section 32, Public Works, &c., *re*: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1125 (i).
Tracadie Harbour Breakwater, Pet. *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5472 (iii).
Tracadie Lazaretto, Laundry, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7187 (iv).
Tracadie Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 13349 (vii).
Trade and Commerce, Agents' Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 648 (i).
—— Chinese Act: in Com. of Sup., 12264 (vii).
—— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 7 (i), (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5199 (iii).
Trade and Nav. Returns: Presented (Mr. Paterson) 7 (i).
Trading Stamps: *See* 'B. No. 212.'
Trans.-Canada Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 107.'
Transcontinental Ry. Commission, Expenses in Salaries, Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 13517 (vii).
Transcontinental Ry. Commissioners' Rep.: Presented (Mr. Graham) 7 (i).
See 'G.T.P.,' &c.
Transportation Facilities: in Com. of Sup., 12211 (vii).
—— Georgian Bay Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 12145, 13326 (vii).
Trap Bag Nets in Pokemouche River, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 9476 (v).
Trap-Net Licenses issued to John A. Webster, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 7204 (iv).
Travellers Life Assurance Co. of Canada: *See* 'B. No. 35.'
Travelling Expenses, Minister of Marine at Colonial Conference: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 985; (Mr. Foster) 998 (i).
—— ref. to in Com. of Sup., 3985 (ii).

Travelling Expenses, Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 1040 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. Foster) 562 (i).
See 'Colonial Conference.'
Treasury Board: in Com. of Sup., 5562 (iii).
Treaty-Making Power, Status of Canada: Notice of Motion (Mr. Thompson) 3172 (ii).
Trent Bridge Post Office, Re-opening of: Remarks (Mr .Owen) 609 (i).
Trent Canal, Bradford Canal, Building of: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 13476 (vii).
—— Buckhorn Dam: in Com. of Sup., 12227 (vii).
—— Cameron Lake Water Levels, Purchase of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 9772 (v).
—— Claims for Damages: Remarks (Mr. Ward) in Com. of Sup., 10308 (vi).
—— Clearing of Logs, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com .of Sup., 10310 (vi).
—— Construction: in Com. of Sup., 12225 (vii).
—— Contracts, Deposits, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1734 (i).
—— Damages *re* Floods: in Com. of Sup., 12768 (vii).
—— Engineers Rep.: Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 6925 (iv).
—— Extension from Balsam Lake to Gull River, Reps., Plans, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. S. Hughes) 2991 (ii).
—— Holland River Dredging Advertisements, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bennett) 3241 (ii).
—— Holland River Extension: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 11939 (vi).
—— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12227 (vii).
—— Lindsay Lock and Dam: in Com. of Sup., 12227 (vii).
—— Surveys: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 10338 (vi).
—— Surveys, Reports *re*: Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 6988 (iv).
—— Tributary Works, Completion of Works, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1115 (i).
—— Tributary Works, Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1114 (i).
Trois Pistoles Station, I.C.R., Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 12652 (vii).
Trueman, Mr., and N.B. Cold Storage Co.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Pugsley) 9343 (v).
Truro Armoury, Estimate for Heating and Electric Wiring: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3429 (ii).
Truro Inreased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 12231 (vii).
Truro, N.S., Tax Bill, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3480 (ii).
Trust Funds: *See* 'Colonial Securities.'
Tuberculin Tests, Results of: Ques. (Mr. R. N. Walsh) 9270 (v).
Turgeon, Hon. A., Apptmt. to the Senate: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7935 (iv).
Turtle Mountain Timber Reserve, Preservation of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) on M. for Sup., 7647 (iv).
Two-Cent-a-Mile Rate: *See* 'B. No. 11.'
Under-Secretaries of State, ref. to in debate on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 25 (i).
U.S., Treaties with: *See* 'Anglo-American,' &c.
U.S. Warships on Great Lakes, Inquiry *re* Armaments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 7502 (iv).
U.S. Warships passing through Canadian Canals: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5338 (iii).
—— Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5788 (iii).
—— O.Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Taylor) 5800 (iii).
Unleavened Bread, Pet. *re* Customs Duties: Ques. (Mr. Bristol) 8616 (v).
Uxbridge Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).
Vacancies in Electoral Districts: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
Vacancy in Stanstead, Issue of Writ: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 569 (i).
Vacant Land Reservation, Instructions to Agents *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1935 (i).
Valleyfield Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 7687 (iv), 10892 (vi).
Valleyfield, Clock in Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 7115 (iv).
Valleyfield Floods on Lake St. Francis, Damage, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) on M. for Sup., 7808 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 7996 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 10339 (vi).
Valleyfield, P.E.I., Change of Mail Route: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 11297 (vi).
Valleyfield Regiment, Organization of, Cor., &c., *re*: M. for Copy* (Mr. Bergeron) 3434 (ii).
Vancouver Bank: *See* 'B. No. 32.'
Vancouver Bank incorp. B. No. 32 (Mr. Macpherson) on Order for 2°: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 779 (i).
Vancouver Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vii).
Vancouver Island and Eastern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 87.'
Vancouver, New Westminster and Yukon Bridge Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 13308 (vii).
Vancouver Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10868 (vi).
Varennes Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 12042 (vi).
Vaudreuil County, Dredging. Supt.'s Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4587 (iii).
Vautelet, Mr., Payments to: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 641 (i).

Venoit, Mr., Collector of Customs at Bathurst, N.B., Political Interference: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 6406, 7730 (iv).
Ventilation of House of Commons: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 13340 (vii).
See 'Public Works, Ottawa".
Vernon Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 10870 (vi), 13339 (vii).
Vernon River Bridge, P.E.I., Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5471 (iii).
Vickers Maxim Co., Purchases from by Govt. Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 356 (i).
Victoria Beach Piers, Amounts expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 237 (i).
Victoria Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12137 (vii).
—— Tenders for Dredging: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 8893 (v).
Victoria Immigration Building: in Com. of Sup., 10874 (vi).
Victoria Memorial Museum: in Com. of Sup., 1489 (i), 13477 (vii).
See 'Public Works—Ottawa.'
Victoria Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 10883 (vi).
'Victor' Tug, Repairs to by Govt.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 9774 (v).
'Vigilant' Cruiser, Investigation *re* Collision: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 682 (i).
Votes and Proceedings, Correction in Names of Clerks: (Mr. Bergeron) 13066 (vii).
Walker, Andrew, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 124.'
Walkerville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).
Wallace, Michael J., Emplymt. in Customs at Windsor: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 7500 (iv).
Wallberg, Mr. E. A., Contract *re* Cement, Patent, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 3230 (ii).
—— Contracts with Marine Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 3843 (ii).
—— Contracts with Steel Concrete Co., Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3842 (ii).
—— Payments to by Public Works Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 5085 (iii).
—— Purchase of Cement for Heath Point Works: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Staples) 4773 (iii).
Warlike and Other Military Stores: in Com. of Sup., 12149 (vii).
Washington Fisheries Commission, Expenses *re*: Ques. (Mr. Finlayson) 1732 (i).
Washington Treaty and Behring Sea Commission, Duration of: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2165 (ii).
Water Carriage of Goods: *See* 'B. No. 178.'
Water Carriage of Goods: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 13416 (vii).
Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 195.'
Waterloo Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vii).
Water Mains across Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 44.'
Water Power Privileges in Alberta, Sale or Lease of: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 8378 (v).
Watson, Mr., Apptmt. as Counsel *re* West Elgin Election Frauds: Remarks (Mr. Northrup) 6848 (iv).
See 'Cassels.'
Waugh and Perrin, Immigration Agents, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 514 (i).
Waugh, James, Immigration Agent, Refund to Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 4765 (iii).
See 'Immigration.'
Ways and Means—The Budget—Financial Statement, 5137 (iii).
—— For Debate: *See* 'Budget.'
Ways and Means: M. for Com. (Mr. Fielding) 554 (i).
—— in Com on Tobacco Resolutions, 6118 (iii).
Weapons, Carrying of: *See* 'B. Nos. 65, 78 & 93.'
Weather Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 37.'
Wednesday Evening Sittings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 11232 (vi).
Welchpool, N.B., Wharf, Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 7935 (iv).
Welland Canal, Boundary Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 12207 (vii).
—— Cost of Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4245 (iii).
—— Culvert and Dock, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4245 (iii).
—— Deepening, Estimated Cost: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) in Com. of Sup., 10311 (vi).
—— Dredging Deep Cut Slide: in Com. of Sup., 5673 (iii).
—— Electric Lighting, Power Plant: in Com. of Sup., 12195 (vii).
—— Feeder, Rep. of Judge Madden *re* Investigation: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lalor) 852 (i).
—— Investigation *re* Water Rents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 174 (i).
—— Piers and Bridges at Queenston Heights: in Com. of Sup., 12207 (vii).
—— Widening: in Com. of Sup., 12210 (vii).
Welland Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7830 (iv).
Western Alberta Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 125.'
Western Block Extension, Total Cost, Area, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 512 (i).
Western Rifle Associations, Pet. *re* Govt. Grant: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 5743 (iii).
Western Rivers Improvement Co.: *See* 'B. No. 55.'
West Indian Trade, Reciprocity Negotiations: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 1860 (i).
Westmount Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vii).
West Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 24.'
Westport, N.S., Installation of Marine Alarms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9274 (v)

Westville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7179 (iv).
——— Total Amount of Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 9474 (v).
Wetaskiwin Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vii).
Whale Fishing Cos. in B.C., Licenses granted, &c.: M. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 10259 (v).
Whaling Licenses, B.C., Moneys Due, Penalties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5996 (iii).
Wharfage Dues in Soulanges County, Amounts received, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9276 (v).
Wharfs and Bridges in Quebec, Construction of: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vii).
Wharfs, Piers, Amount of Revenue collected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 2391 (ii).
——— Harbours Expenditure since 1895: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5078 (iii).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 5476 (iii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Blain) 5800, 5802 (iii).
Wharfs, Piers, &c., and other Public Works, Expenditure since Jan. 1st, 1897, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L .Borden) 1130 (i).
——— and Revenues Ret.: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4867 (iii).
Whisky, Illegal Distribution of in Thetford Mines: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 9894 (v).
See 'Yukon.'
Whitby Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7833 (iv).
White Head Wharf, Report *re* Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6463 (iv).
Whitehorse Townsite, Portions sold and retained, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11496 (vi).
White Pass Ry. Co., Appeal of Dawson Board of Trade: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 10736 (vi).
Wheat Frozen in Shipping from Man., &c.: M. to adjn. House (Mr. Blain) 825 (i).
Wheat Shipments, Feed, Special Arrangements with Ry. Cos.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 893 (i).
Wheat Transportation, Financial Aid to: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1938 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Pringle) 173 (i).
——— M. (Mr. Foster) for copies of Memorials, &c., 899 (i), 2173 (ii).
——— Negotiations with Banks, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 171 (i).
See 'Grain,' 'Finance,' &c.
Wiarton Dredging, Payments to Mr. Bowman: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 6407 (iv).
——— Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 6236 (iv).
Wilberforce Dam, Obstructions to Traffic, Cor., Plans, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. S. Hughes) 2988 (ii).
Wiley, Mrs. Louise, Claims against Mr. Congdon, Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1131 (i).
See 'Yukon.'
William's Head Quarantine Station Building: in Com. of Sup., 10883 (vi).
Williams, Thos., Emplymt. on I.C.R., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Emmerson) 2388 (ii).
Willson, T. L., Payments *re* Ottawa Carbide Co.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 11498 (vi).
Wilson Cordage Co., Cor., Accounts, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Clements) 1129 (i).
——— Payments to Mr. A. Smith: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 653 (i).
Winding-Up Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 95, 102, 144.'
Windsor, Chatham and London Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 108.'
Windsor, Detroit and Belle Isle Ferry Co., Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Clements) 1131 (i).
——— Expiration of Franchise: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1940 (i).
Windsor Pump and Foundry Co., Ltd., Patents of: *See* 'B. No. 72.'
Winfield Basin Dredging, Tender, Inspection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 6461 (iv).
Winnipeg Bank: *See* 'B .No. 19.'
Winnipeg Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 8566 (v).
——— Immigration Building: in Com. of Sup., 8573 (v).
——— Military Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vii).
——— Military Building: in Com. of Sup., 10969 (vi).
——— Military Hospital: in Com. of Sup., 10955 (vi).
——— Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 8575 (v).
Winnipeg River, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 12138 (vii).
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Hospitals: in Com. of Sup., 9982 (v).
Winnipegosis Lake, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 12141 (vii).
Winter Mail Service: in Com. of Sup., 3216
See 'P.E.I.'
Wireless Tel. Stations on Pacific Coast, Erection of: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 683 (i).
Wireless Stations, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5045 (iii).
See 'Marconi.'
Wires Across Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 44.'
Wolfville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13327 (vii).
Women's Auxiliary to the Missionary Society of the Church of England in Canada: *See* 'B. No. 75.'
Wood, Mr. David, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 568 (i).
Wood and Pulp Industry, Preservation of: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 7449 (iv).
See 'Pulp.'

Woodstock Armoury: Remarks (Mr. Carvell) in Com .of Sup., 10899 (vi).
Woodstock, N.B., Postmaster C. L. Smith, Interference in Elections: Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. Crocket) 2886 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2794 (ii).
Woollen Industry, Deputations *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lalor) 13082 (vii).
—— Legislation *re* Relief: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 12772 (vii).
—— Number of Employees, Value of Output, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 7504 (iv).
—— Reply to Manufacturers' Ass'on. by Prime Minister: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 13420, 13518 (vii).
—— Specific Duty: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 6988 (iv).
Wool, Raw, Quantity imported into Canada: Ques. (Mr .Stanfield) 5201 (iii).
Wrecks, Investigations: in Com. of Sup., 3147, 3184, 3195 (ii).
Wrecking Plant Subsidies: in Com. of Sup., 3221 (ii).
Writs of Elections: *See* 'B .No. 66.'
Yamaska River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 5708 (iii), 12043 (vi).
Yamaska River Lock: in Com. of Sup., 12041 (vi).
Yarmouth Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 11291 (vi).
—— Dredging Contracts, Tenders, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 11500 (vi).
Yarmouth Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 7180 (iv).
Year Book: in Com. of Sup., 677 (i).
Yeomans, Indian Agent, Complaints by John Franklin, &c., Letters *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Knowles) 1513 (i).
York, Electoral District, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1018 (i).
Young, Mr. W. C., Inquiry *re* Charges as Mining Inspector, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1127 (i).
Yukon Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 169.'
Yukon Placer Mining Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 150.'
YUKON:
Bank of Commerce Compensation: in Com. of Sup., 13167 (vii).
Boyle Concession, Memorials from Dawson Legislature: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 509, 562, 681 (i).
Britton, Mr. Justice, Payment *re* Treadgold Commission: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5474 (iii).
Buildings, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 11005 (vi).
Clements. Mr. W. H. P., Services in Yukon, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 5650 (iii).
—— O.Cs., Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Sproule) 5801 (iii).
YUKON—*Con.*
Commissioner's Residence, Dawson: in Com. of Sup., 10883 (vi).
Concession Cases, Appeal from Supreme Court, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 10301 (v).
Charges against Administrators, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 1690 (i), 2170 (ii).
Charges of Dr. Pringle *re* Immorality, &c.: (Mr. Foster) on M. for Sup., 9580 (v).
Congdon, Mr. F. T., Instruction *re* Trust Estates: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 12413 (vii).
—— Investigation *re* Estates and Trusts: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 12050 (vii).
—— Reply from Yukon: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 13420, 13518 (vii).
—— Stmnt. *re* Estates Administration: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 10111 (v).
Congdon vs. Mrs. Wiley, Investigation, Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 565 (i).
—— Papers laid on Table (Mr. Aylesworth) 841 (i).
—— Amt. (Mr. Foster) *re* Ret., 1691 (i). *See* 'Wiley,' &c.
Corruption Charges in Public Officials, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 1131 (i).
—— Incomplete Return: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5785 (iii).
Elections Conspiracy, Cor., &c., *re* Trial: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 1131 (i).
Expenditures, Total Amount: Remarks *re* Question (Mr .Foster) 1128 (i).
Financial Administration, Rep. of Mr. Beddoe: M. for Copy* (Mr. Foster) 1132 (i).
—— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 6464 (iv). *See* 'Revenue.'
Finnie, Mr. O. S., Investigation *re* Charges, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Thompson) 1513 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Thompson) 4316 (iii).
Freight Rates, Rep. of Ry. Commissioners *re*: Ques. (Mr. Thompson) 894 (i).
Girouard, J. E., Resignation from Yukon Council: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 11938 (vi).
Gold Commissioner's Office, Number of Clerks, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 10108 (v).
Gold Cos., Holdings by Guggenheims, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 7725 (iv).
Govt. Officials, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 10107 (v).
Judges' Salaries: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 11123 (vi).
Liquor Permits, Agents, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1127 (i).
—— Corrected Answer (Mr. Oliver) 5048 (iii).
Lithgow. J. V., Girouard, J. E., and F. F. Congdon, Emplymt. by Govt., Date of Apptmt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5999 (iii).

YUKON—*Con.*
Mail Service: Complaints *re* (Mr. Thompson) 2022 (ii).
Mail Service during Winter: Remarks (Mr. Thompson) 5136 (iii).
Mining Regulations published in 'Yukon World and Official Gazette': M. for Copy* (Mr. Lennox) 5801 (iii).
Money Transmission, Rates *re*: Ques. (Mr. Thompson) 2979 (ii).
Morality Charges, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Thompson) 1513 (i).
——— inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10303, (vi).
——— Letter of Rev. Dr. Shearer, Inquiry for (Mr. Sproule) 10689, 11016 (vi).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10303, 11122 (vi).
Placer Claims, Renewals by Gold Commissioner, Fees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 4245, 4588 (iii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 4589 (iii).
Placer Mining Act, Grants *re*, Claims, Names, &c., for one year: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 698 (i).

YUKON—*Con.*
Revenue and Expenditure from March 31st to June 30, 1907: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1114, 1346 (i).
See 'Finance.'
Sunday Observance Law, Instructions to N.W.M.P. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 565 (i).
Telegraph Service to Prince Rupert, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 1934 (i).
Telegraph System, Receipts and Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 512 (i).
——— Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13178 (vii).
Temple, Mr. W. A., Emplymt. by Gobt.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1126 (i).
White Horse Ter., Original Grants of Land, Names, &c.: M .for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 2796 (ii).
Wiley, Mrs. Louise, Claims against Mr. Congdon, Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1131 (i).
See 'Congdon.'
Young, Mr. W. C., Inquiry *re* Charges as Mining Inspector, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1127 (i).